Genocide: The Comparative Turn

Edited by

William R. Pruitt

Foreword by Dennis Klein

Master of Arts in Holocaust and Genocide Studies
at Kean University

The Master of Arts in Holocaust and Genocide Studies program is a significant response to teaching mandates and the demand for informed global policymakers and scholars knowledgeable about genocide in comparative perspective. To meet these demands, the program –

• Offers 19 interdisciplinary courses taught by dedicated faculty in mentoring roles
• Offers a partnership with the United Kingdom's University of Leicester School of Law's human rights program (M.A./ L.L.M.). Like Kean, the University of Leicester is nationally recognized for its social diversity and, just an hour outside of London, takes advantage of international political, economic and cultural organizations
• Develops skills for independent research and pedagogical innovation
• Prepares graduates for teaching – including The Holocaust, Genocide, and Modern Humanity course at Kean – and for promising careers as global and social entrepreneurs, nonprofit policymakers, public affairs writers and journalists, human rights advocates, and as leaders in religion, government and global corporations

For more information, contact Dr. Dennis Klein, director, at dklein@kean.edu.

Master of Arts in Holocaust and Genocide Studies at Kean University
Can You Imagine™
Grad.kean.edu/mahgs
Find us on Face book at HGS Kean
Follow us @KeanHGS_

Credit: Cover illustration by W. Carl Burger / commissioned by the Master of Arts in Holocaust and Genocide Studies at Kean University.

Contents

Foreword: It's Dialectical

Dennis Klein
Director, Master of Arts in Holocaust and Genocide Studies
Professor of History
Kean University

Ever since the Eichmann trial a half century ago, witnesses to genocide have exerted considerable influence on the subject's interpretive framework. As Annette Wieviorka argued, witnesses acquired testimonial authority.[1] One result was the paradigm that the Holocaust, and by extension any genocide, was unique and incomparable. By privileging witnesses' accounts, it could not have been otherwise. The immediacy of their perspectives, however, is both its strength and limitations: Witnesses represent singular experiences. Good scholarship – Yehuda Bauer and Steven Katz stand out – have ratified this view, arguing not only that the Holocaust is distinctive but is, moreover, a prototype of genocide in general.[2]

The present volume takes a different line of argument. It situates the Holocaust and other genocide in broad contexts. Importantly, it is doing so without asserting the universality of one genocide or the other, and, therefore, effacing its historical specificity. Comparisons constitute the benefit of mutual instruction. As I recently argued,[3] this development is exemplified by research on "micro-annihilation" in East Europe during the Holocaust era and in Rwanda during its 1994 genocide period. By interpreting killing as often spontaneous and incremental, and assailants by their actions instead of by their personalities, cross-cultural scholarship arrives at conclusions that challenge canonic arguments: In the cases of the Holocaust and Rwanda, genocide, in comparative perspective, is as much an endogenous phenomena as it is the result state and doctrinaire violence.

Comparative study is fraught. It presumes parity, though its real benefits show differences as well. It also threatens to diminish the attention that events, characterized as unique, garner or that survivors, in hopes for recognition, want and deserve. These implications are not, however, inherent. As this volume shows, it is not necessary to assert a paradigm or hierarchy of genocidal destruction to affirm the place of a particular genocide in history as an event that awakens the world to an exorbitant international crime.

The essays in this volume constitute the research results of our program's first Master Seminar in Genocide Studies. Its contributors, distinguished members of the North American academy, gathered at the Human Rights Institute at Kean University on April 10-11, 2014, to explore one common problem: the viability of studying genocide comparatively.

The 2014 seminar was designed for interdisciplinary debate and discussion. Under the leadership of Kirsten Dyck, its "master scholar," presentations of research were really first drafts. Dr. Dyck, the 2014 Cummings Foundation Fellow at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and a member of the faculty at James Madison University in Virginia, is, herself, an accomplished scholar in the comparative study of genocide. The results of this invigorated exchange are represented here.

---

[1] Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness (*Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

[2] See Yehuda Bauer, *Rethinking the Holocaust* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002); Steven T. Katz, *The Holocaust in Historical Context: The Holocaust and Mass Death Before the Modern Age*, Vol. 1 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

[3] Dennis Klein, "Locality and the Hidden Realities of Genocide," *Historical Reflections/*Reflexions Historiques, 39, no. 2 (2013): 30-39.

Introduction: Comparison matters when studying genocide

William R. Pruitt

Genocide, as a word and a crime, did not exist until the mid-20th century. However, the act of genocide—killing based on race, ethnicity, religion, or nationality—has existed for millennia.[4] The academic study of genocide though is relatively recent. This lack of international response and academic inquiry is most likely linked to the notion of national sovereignty, a concept commonly interpreted to mean that a state could not be held accountable for their actions by other states.

Even after the United Nations Genocide Convention was ratified in 1950, little attention was paid to the agreements made in the Convention when faced with genocide.[5] The world was mired in the Cold War and communism had become the (assumed) predominant threat to the United States and the world. The interest in genocide generated by World War II and the Holocaust quickly faded. Thus, the study of genocide came to an abrupt halt and it stayed in limbo for several years.[6] During this period there were episodes of crimes against humanity that might have risen to the level of genocide. However, no signatory nation to the Genocide Convention raised any concern over these instances.

The recent history of the public and the academic interest in war crimes and genocide began after WWII. The United States was increasingly becoming the dominant world power and other nations would follow the lead of the US. When the United States failed to ratify the Genocide Convention or implement it when it was required, the other international community members saw no reason to take counter action.[7] Cold War tensions diverted any attention away from criminal activity not associated with communism.

In the late 1960's the West was faced with images of mass starvation in Nigeria; this starvation was really a genocidal policy of the state to defeat a secessionist group from breaking away. Other genocides occurred in East Pakistan and Burundi. Since these conflicts were not seen as important to the fight against communism, no country, least of all the United States, took any action to stop or punish these acts.[8] This sole ideological focus on communism soon led to the US invasion of Vietnam and the resulting long-lasting war. In neighboring Cambodia, genocide reigned for nearly four years from 1975 to 1979. The genocide began as the US withdrew from Vietnam and the Khmer Rouge came to power in Cambodia. While some attention was paid to this genocide, the victims were mostly political opponents not protected by the UN Convention. This meant that the UN Convention could not be applied and no state called for protection of the political dissidents. "The Cold War showed with great clarity that the world's major players paid only lip service to their postwar commitment to 'never again' stand by while genocide took place."[9] It was not until the Bosnia-Herzegovina war in the early 1990's that true scholarship and official action on genocide arose. The genocide in Bosnia became the most closely watched and reported genocide in history.

As the academic study of genocide has proceeded many scholars have returned to Raphael Lemkin's original concept of the term. When Raphael Lemkin coined the word genocide he did so having witnessed the atrocities committed against the Armenians in World War I *and* the Jews in World War II.[10] From its inception genocide has been based on comparative knowledge. If we are to be true to the trail-blazing path set by Lemkin then we must look at genocide through a comparative lens. Comparative analysis provides the ability to see similarities and differences in an attempt to more fully understand the process of genocide.

For example, comparative-historical methodology has been used for generations. Comparative-historical case studies were the foundation of the social sciences and utilized by the original founders of the social sciences.[11] This form of research fell out of fashion with the rise of quantitative, statistical research methods. But recently, comparative-historical methodology has re-emerged as a leading form of methodology in the social sciences.[12] Comparative-historical analysis (CHA) is best understood as a methodology oriented toward the explanation of substantively important outcomes. CHA is designed to answer questions about large-scale outcomes. When cases share an outcome, they can be systematically compared across time to understand the causes of these large-scale outcomes.[13] Since it is difficult to quantify genocide studies, then the appropriate methodology turns to qualitative methods, and CHA appears to be the best approach to fully understanding the causes of genocide.

Comparative-historical analysis has certain aspects that make the process unique. CHA is fundamentally concerned with the identification and explanation of causal conditions that result in large-scale outcomes.[14] When using CHA, researchers analyze historical sequences and analyze processes over time. The ability to take history and time sequence into account makes comparative-historical analysis stronger than some other methodologies. The most unique aspect of CHA is the ability to engage in systematic and contextualized comparison of cases on an intimate level.[15] CHA has benefits that quantitative methodology does not.

While the generalizability of comparative-historical research may be more limited than quantitative analysis, the in-depth knowledge gained from case studies using this method outweighs the speed associated with quantitative methods. Most methodologists would agree that obtaining reliable inferences through quantitative methods alone is difficult.[16] Comparative-historical analysis seeks to determine if the degree of generality of any causal condition is

constant across time and place. Comparative-historical methodology uses process tracing and congruence testing in order to examine the generality of the causal conditions. Process tracing involves analyzing a case into a sequence of events and then showing how those events are linked.[17] Researchers must first make deductions about how events are linked over time. The cases analyzed through CHA then either support or weaken those deductions. If the case studies support the prior deductions then there is reason to believe that these events are a causal condition. However, if the case analyses do not support the deductions then those deductions should be re-evaluated before making any causal conclusions. Congruence testing is used to make claims of common patterns.[18] Congruence testing improves the understanding of how certain cases are related or different from each other. This process cannot be used to create universal generalizations, but it does assist in the comprehensive knowledge of particular cases of interest. Process tracing uncovers the causal conditions that lead to a specific outcome and then congruence testing analyzes how many cases with a shared outcome also share the causal conditions. The greater the number of cases studied, the more generalizable such studies can become.

Using process tracing allows the comparative-historical researcher to follow the causal sequence that leads to the outcome of interest. Causal conditions can be identified and then linked whereby A leads to B, which leads to C, until one arrives at Z (the outcome of interest).[19] Process tracing also allows for the identification of temporal effects in a causal sequence. The comparative-historical researcher can then analyze these temporal effects in order to establish if their presence is necessary.

The articles collected here represent comparative studies across several disciplines. These disciplines highlight the many angles of genocide study and could be buttressed by

continued comparative analysis. From these dimensions evolve several ways to compare genocide across time and space. From a pedagogical perspective Tesler examines the development of Holocaust education and Dobrick and Mikel seek to integrate Holocaust education into the classroom. The project, Pebbles for Peace, could represent any genocidal victimization. The importance is to remember as Chappine details while examining the psychological motivation of genocide deniers. Deniers often rely on false science to support their claims brining in what should be a neutral, unbiased field of study. Sorondo explores how Nazi Germany used science as a propaganda tool. Contrary to the idea that genocide is the abandonment of all hope, Posna posits that it is hope—however one defines it—that keeps the survivor going for one more day. As seen, genocide cuts across multiple fields of study, each contributing to the understanding of the whole. Pruitt examines some of these disciplinary offerings while adding the role of criminology.

Each idea explored herein, every theory tested, every hypothesis confirmed should be re-explored, re-tested, and re-confirmed by analysis among, between, and across genocides. Many have asked whether the Holocaust is a unique genocidal episode which cannot be compared to other episodes.[20] This claim limits our potential to explain, understand, and prevent future mass atrocities. "Whatever the future of 'genocide' as a subject of interest, comparison as a method of study will remain."[21]

Notes

1. Power, *A problem from hell*, 1.
2. Bartrop and Totten, "The history of genocide," 148-150.
3. Ibid.
4. Power, *A problem from hell*, 65-70.
5. Bartrop and Totten, "The history of genocide," 148.
6. Ibid., 150.
7. Power, *A problem from hell*, 19.
8. Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, "Comparative historical analysis: Achievements and agendas."
9. Ibid.
10. Mahoney, "Comparative-historical methodology."
11. Mahoney and Rueschemeyer, "Comparative historical analysis: Achievements and agendas."
12. Ibid.
13. Ibid.
14. Goldstone, "Comparative historical analysis and knowledge."
15. Ibid.
16. Mahoney, "Comparative-historical methodology."
17. Bloxham, "Holocaust studies and genocide studies," 63-65.
18. Ibid, 78.

Bibliography

Bartrop, P. and S. Totten, "The history of genocide: An overview." In *The genocide studies reader*, edited by S. Totten and P. Bartrop, 135-157. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Bloxham, D. "Holocaust studies and genocide studies: Past, present, and future." In *Genocide matters: Ongoing issues and emerging perspectives*, edited by Joyce Apsel and Ernesto Verdeja, 59-81. Abingdon: Routledge, 2013.

Goldstone, J. A. "Comparative historical analysis and knowledge accumulation in the study of revolutions." In *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences,* edited by J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer, 41-90. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Mahoney, J. and D. Rueschemeyer. (2003). "Comparative historical analysis: Achievements and agendas." In *Comparative historical analysis in the social sciences*, edited by J. Mahoney and D. Rueschemeyer, 3-38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.

Mahoney, J. (2004). "Comparative-historical methodology." *Annual Review of Sociology* 30, (2004): 81-101.

Power, S. *"A problem from hell": America and the age of genocide.* New York: Harper Perennial, 2002.

The American Jewish Response to the Holocaust in the Post- War Period: Development of Holocaust Education

Calvin Tesler
Lehigh University

American Jews responded to the Holocaust after World War II in various ways such as providing relief for Jewish refugees and relocating displaced persons from Nazi camps. Scholars discuss the response of the American government and Jewish community to the Holocaust during World War II yet there has not been nearly enough regarding the response in the post-war era. Scholars such as Peter Novick, Deborah Lipstadt, and Lawrence Baron argue that there was a lack of Holocaust consciousness amongst American Jews between 1945 and 1960. However, the 1960s experienced a rise in Holocaust awareness throughout the American Jewish and non-Jewish community. In reading the secondary and primary sources, I developed several questions such as why were the 1960s such a ripe time for the growing consciousness of the Holocaust? Why the delay in time from 1945 to 1960 in generating popularity around the subject of the Holocaust? However, the most striking question not adequately discussed by scholars is: Why was there little emphasis on Holocaust education in the American Jewish community between 1945 and 1960? In the 1960s the United States encountered a surge in the development of Holocaust education as a result of the social and cultural changes occurring within the Jewish community and larger society. These social and cultural changes intersected with the duplication of information and scholarship on the Holocaust, changing priorities of American Jewish organizations, pedagogical debates, and the Eichmann trial to create greater awareness of and commitment to the need to educate young people about the Holocaust.

The first section of this essay will highlight the lack of emphasis on Holocaust education in America before the 1960s through the activities of American Jewish organizations and leaders.

The second section will explore how social and cultural changes within the American Jewish community and society intersected with other factors to explain why Holocaust education was neglected before the 1960s and what jumpstarted it during the sixties. The social and cultural factor involves a change in the reluctance to speak about the Holocaust and the stress on positivism and heroism in Jewish Education in the 1950s to the exposure of the catastrophe and implementation of Holocaust education in the 1960s. *The Eichmann trial sparked a newfound interest in the Holocaust which resulted in new courses and programs*. The duplication of information factor highlights the rapid growth of Holocaust literature and curriculum in the 1960's. Changing priorities concerns the shift of the American Jewish agenda from material aid to Jewish refugees and promotion of the Hebrew language in the forties and fifties to Holocaust instruction in the sixties. The *last factor,* pedagogical debates, explores the *intricacies of how and what to teach regarding the Holocaust which cause the delay in the development of Holocaust textbooks and curriculum.*

Evidence of these factors is revealed in primary sources from American Jewish organizations and leaders in the post-war era and secondary sources. Newspapers such as the *New York Times,* the *Jewish Advocate,* the *Jewish Exponent,* and the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, which are dependable news sources, were carefully selected in connection to the topic of Holocaust consciousness and education in America between 1945 and 1970. The stories and information in the newspaper articles line up accurately with the manuscript data of the activity and efforts of the American Jewish organizations during the post-war period. The manuscript collections housed in the Center for Jewish History in New York City contained abundant folders of correspondence, minutes, speeches, pamphlets, brochures, and publications from American Jewish organizations and prominent Jewish individuals during the post-war period. Comparing

the manuscript files from 1945 to 1960 to the files on 1960 to 1968 manifests the shift in priority and focus on the intellectual and educational response to the Holocaust. The sources exhibit proof of scholarly works and textbooks on the Holocaust not coming to light until the 1960's in the United States. Moreover, the Board of Jewish Education's records from 1945 to 1970 are the most important primary source of all. The Board of Jewish Education records reveal no activity on the Holocaust as far as events, promotions, programs, or Holocaust curriculum for schools and teachers between 1945 and 1960. However, in the files between 1960 and 1970, there are records of Holocaust programs, courses, textbooks, and how to teach the Holocaust. As a whole, these documents portray the lack of Holocaust education before the 1960s and allude to the social and cultural changes sparking the emergence of Holocaust education in the sixties.

The secondary sources demonstrate the popularity of the Holocaust in the press, publications, programs, and courses on the Holocaust in American universities and Jewish high schools in the 1960s. However, few scholars focus on the absence of Holocaust education in America before the 1960s. For example, Deborah Lipstadt's article "America and the Memory of the Holocaust" mentions that there were no courses on the Holocaust before 1960, but it does not elaborate further.[1] Before the 1960s, Hasia Diner argues that American Jews discussed the Holocaust through survivor stories, sermons, and liturgy in synagogues, and commemorating those who perished, but makes no reference to Holocaust instruction.[2] Nonetheless, there are some scholars such as Thomas Fallace and Marcia Sachs Littell that specifically discuss the emergence of Holocaust education in post-war America. Fallace and Littell are concerned with the gentile community and American public schools. However, the American Jewish community and Jewish schools is the focus of this study. In addition, Fallace and Littell provide reasons for

the rise of Holocaust consciousness in America, but they do not explain in depth the delay in Holocaust education until the 1960s.

The manuscript collections from Jewish organizations, conferences, and leaders demonstrate the scarcity of attention towards Holocaust education in the American Jewish community before the sixties. Harold Debrest, a prominent Jewish journalist and leader during the post-war era in America, in his weekly column called the "Remarkables" in the *Jewish Forum*, wrote about noteworthy people and events. In a 1946 column, Debrest featured a letter he wrote to Governor Herbert Lehman of New York articulating the meager efforts by Jewish and American leaders in assisting Jews in Europe. Debrest cried out to Lehman that there are "still 100,000 Jews in the concentration camps in Europe" and the leadership should rise to the occasion.[3] Another column in the "Remarkables," written nine years later in 1955, entitled "*Lo Alman Yisrael*" (Israel is not forsaken) Debrest called upon the United Nations to help displaced Jews and refugees in Europe. He commended Israel for standing up to the United Nations and "protesting against the threat of annihilation to the refugees from Nazi-land who managed to establish a *Makom Miklat* (a place of refuge) in the land of their fathers after seeing millions of their brethren slaughtered."[4] Harold Debrest wrote many other columns between 1945 and 1960 that contain similar topics but none mention anything pertaining to Holocaust education or efforts to push instruction in this area. As one can see, Debrest advocated strongly for assisting displaced persons, refugees, and Israel, but not Holocaust education until the 1960s.

The Jewish War Veterans of the United States, an American Jewish organization, does not address Holocaust education until the 1960s. The Jewish War Veterans wrote a letter to the Department of Commanders on December 29, 1949, urging all Jewish organizations and Jewish War Veteran units to act upon the threat of resurgent German nationalism in fear of a

revitalization of German anti-Semitism.[5] The Jewish War Veterans sent similar letters in the same year and subsequent years in the 1950s reiterating this issue of German nationalism and traces of assistance to displaced persons and Jewish refugees in Europe but make no reference to Holocaust education. Conversely, in the 1960s, the Jewish War Veterans began to focus on Holocaust education. At the turn of the decade, the Jewish War Veterans sent letters to different Jewish organizations titled "The Real German Issue," which addressed the need to educate American children about the Holocaust. Most American school children were taught the basics, including that Hitler was a dictator who initiated World War II, but "their texts do not go into the full extent of the persecution of the Jews."[6] Thus, in 1963 the Jewish War Veterans pushed for more funding in the area of Holocaust education.[7] Later that year, Jewish Veterans in their 68th Annual Convention in Washington D.C on August 4, 1963 urged the Senate to take measures on the prevention of genocide by educating others and making sure war crimes are punishable to the full extent. Furthermore, the Jewish War Veterans clearly did not promote Holocaust education until the sixties.

Other Jewish organizations and conferences that influenced the evolution of Holocaust education in America included the Jewish Labor Committee, American Jewish Conference, and the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany. Between 1945 and 1960, members of the American Jewish Conference and Jewish Labor Committee frequently requested relief for Jewish refugees and setting up committees in other countries to help. The Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany also advocated for aid to Jewish refugees but is more concerned with obtaining restitution and reparations from Germany for Jews who were persecuted by the Nazis. However, in 1962, the Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany allocated thousands of dollars to several Jewish organizations and institutions to

support their educational projects on the Holocaust. Some of these awards included "11,000 dollars to the United Hungarian Jews of the United States in New York to publish a volume on Neo-Nazism and its origins in Hungary. The World Union for Progressive Judaism in New York was awarded 8,000 dollars for a project on a volume titled 'Nazi persecution of the Jewish People' intended for the teenage reader."[8] Once again, one does not see the weight of Holocaust education until the 1960s.

Nevertheless, the most important American Jewish organization that accentuates this gap in the development of Holocaust education in America between 1945 and 1960 is the Board of Jewish Education. The Board of Jewish Education made no effort to promote or develop anything related to Holocaust education between 1945 and 1960. For example, the sixth annual exhibition on art in Jewish education "The March of Jewish History" from March 30 to May 15, 1949 at the Jewish Museum in New York City covered topics such as the Babylonian Exile, Prophets of Israel, Persian Period, Russian Jews in America, State of Israel, and Emancipation, but left out the Holocaust or Nazi destruction of European Jewry.[9] The Hebrew Culture Club, a division within the Board of Jewish Education, distributed numerous flyers on Jewish dancing, music, art, and Hebrew. In addition, the Hebrew culture council sent out lists of approved textbooks on Modern Hebrew, Hebrew literature, and elements of Hebrew for day and evening schools, yet no texts or programs concerning the Holocaust.[10]

Events and promotions in the 1950s followed the same pattern in not referencing the Nazi destruction of European Jewry as the Board of Jewish Education advertised Jewish art, Bible, Hebrew language, and ancient history. In preparing the seventh annual exhibition at the Jewish museum in New York City from March 22 to April 30, 1950, the Board featured an eclectic collection of Jewish art on the Bible, Prophets, ancient Jewish history, and holidays. Similar to

the sixth annual exhibition, there was no inclusion of art in Modern Jewish history. Moreover, the Board of Jewish Education did not incorporate teacher workshops or courses on Holocaust education in teacher training and curriculum planning programs in the 1950s. For example, the Jewish Education Committee of New York offered classes at the Herzl Institute in New York City on Jewish school teacher and principal workshops in 1956. The teacher and principal workshops focused on classroom policies and educational techniques. In addition specialized courses were offered on Dance Education, Dramatics, Early Childhood Education, Jewish Chorus, Jewish Art, and several others, excluding Holocaust education.[11]

However, in approaching the manuscript files on the 1960s there is sufficient evidence of Holocaust education making its way onto the agenda of the Board of Jewish Education. A popular publication from the Board of Jewish Education in New York City, called the *Brush and Color* in the 1960s, presented articles about the activities of Jewish camps and schools throughout New York. In the fall of 1961 at Camp Harlem in New York City, children and teenagers discussed stories related to the Holocaust with their counselors. One of the stories mentioned was about "Rabbi Leo Baeck leading the German children to safety," which referred to the German Jewish children saved during World War II by a prominent Jewish leader who survived the Holocaust. [12] This is one of the first references in the Board of Jewish Education Records to anything related to the Holocaust. The biggest push by the Board of Jewish Education for Holocaust education came in 1967 with the 25th Annual Pedagogic Conference in New York.[13] At the Pedagogic Conference there were various seminars on how to teach the Holocaust. These seminars will be discussed in depth later in the paper under pedagogical debates.

In addition to the manuscript collections, Jewish and general newspapers between 1945 and 1960 confirm the absence of Holocaust Education in the American Jewish community. In 1946 Louis Kraft, the executive director of the National Jewish Welfare Board, and Jacob Kaplan, president of the American Jewish Press, emphasized the importance of Jewish centers in America as "they are especially vital today as a result of the Holocaust in Europe…The Centers will be of tremendous aid in helping Jewish youth carry forward Jewish group life."[14] The centers provided Jewish education but concentrated on Jewish values, the Bible, and Hebrew. In 1947, American Jewish organizations joined with CARE (not for profit organization) and sent kosher food and supplies to Nazi victims.[15] Furthermore, American Jewish organizations were politically active as well when, in 1948, the Senate and the House passed a bill allowing a certain amount of Jewish immigrants into the United States from the Displaced Camps in Europe. Several American Jewish organizations denounced the bill as "un-American." The bill excluded Jews who were located in Baltic States during World War II and "denied relief to DPs [displaced persons] who entered DP camps after December 22, 1945, thus arbitrarily discriminating against 200,000 Jews."[16] Three years later in 1951, over 20 major Jewish organizations gathered together at a conference for "Material Claims against Germany" in New York City in order to claim restitution for Holocaust survivors including money and property confiscated by the Nazis during World War II.[17] It was not until the 1960s that the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* reported developments specifically within Holocaust education such as the significant growth of Judaic Courses in American colleges and universities, especially classes on the Holocaust.[18] The director of the National Curriculum Research Institute of the American Association for Jewish Education publicized the development of a project creating "teaching materials on the period of the Nazi Holocaust for students in Jewish elementary and secondary schools in 1965."[19]

Nearly three years later the first ever textbook on the Holocaust was published in 1968. Shortly after the publication of the textbook, it was utilized in numerous Jewish high schools and day schools in America.[20]

Furthermore, various scholars demonstrate the same patterns seen in the newspapers and manuscripts in relation to the emergence of Holocaust Education in America in the 1960s. Deborah Lipstadt, in her book *America and the Memory of the Holocaust, 1950-1965,* draws attention to the issue of Holocaust consciousness in the American Jewish community in the 1950s. Lipstadt argues, "There were no more than a few commemorations of Yom Hashoah (Holocaust Remembrance Day), or books, conferences, speeches, and museums dedicated to exploring the history and significance of the Holocaust."[21] One of the great scholars in American Jewish history, Peter Novick, makes a similar argument that "between the end of the war and the 1960s, as anyone who has lived through those years can testify, the Holocaust made scarcely any appearance in American public discourse, and hardly more in Jewish public discourse."[22] Both claim that the 1960s saw a rise of Holocaust consciousness and efforts to educate the public about the Holocaust in the form of scholarly works, novels, television shows, movies, and courses. Other authors such as Hasia Diner, an expert on American Jews and the Holocaust, maintains that Jews showed a considerable amount of interest in the Holocaust before the 1960s in "crafting liturgies, conveyed emotions, and sermons in synagogues about the Holocaust."[23] Despite these efforts, Diner does not mention anything regarding Holocaust education. Composing liturgies and sermons in the synagogue were confined to the sanctuary and utilized during services, but what about holding classes or programs for synagogue members or to the public on the Holocaust?

Nevertheless, in the 1960s, there was an increased pursuit in the field of Holocaust studies with the publication of new books and creation of departments in Jewish History and the Holocaust popping up across the United States. Immediately following World War II, Judith Gerson and Diane Wolf contend that "there were few public accounts of the Holocaust," akin to what Lipstadt and Novick argue.[24] However, by the mid-sixties, more classes appeared on the Holocaust in American colleges and universities as Charles Silberman "reported that almost two decades ago (referring to 1965) there were well over seven hundred courses on the history and the literature of the Holocaust in secular American colleges and universities and that those courses attracted more students than any others in Judaic studies."[25] Similar to Gerson, Wolf, and Diner, Kirsten Fermaglich in her study on early Holocaust consciousness in America agrees that it was not until the 1960s that the Holocaust gained momentum in American public discourse through discussions, movies, and literature.[26] The next section will explain the reasons for the lack of Holocaust Education between 1945 and 1960 and what accounted for its surge in the 1960s.

The American Jewish community after World War II experienced social and cultural changes from the reluctance in speaking about the Holocaust in the 1950s to openness in the 1960s. Many parents in the fifties tried to shelter their children from cruel and corrupt things in the world. Particularly, Holocaust survivors who migrated to America protected their children from the horrors of the concentration camps in Nazi Europe with silence. Lucy Steinitz, a child of a Holocaust survivor, and David Szonyi put together an impressive collection of testimonies from children of survivors to demonstrate the reluctance of parents speaking about the Holocaust in the fifties. Steinitz in her introduction states, "I learned through my mother's facial expressions, movements, and references, never to ask questions about the Holocaust."[27] This

was the unspoken rule in many American Jewish homes not to bring up the Holocaust in fear of bringing back memories of brutality and destruction.

When migrating to the United States, survivors wanted to put everything behind them and start a new life. For some, that meant not talking about their experiences during the war and instead retelling happy and positive stories to their friends and children. Steinitz recounts having to teach herself about World War II and the Nazis because of her parents silence given that "schools and synagogues have incorporated the study of the Holocaust into their textbooks, classrooms, youth activities and commemorations only since the 1960s."[28] Steinitz provides group interviews with multiple children of survivors who shared similar experiences growing up in their households. Meyer Goldstein, a legal aid lawyer in New York City, told Steinitz in her interview that "her father rarely spoke about the Holocaust, only occasionally mentioning a certain incident."[29] Steinitz responded to Goldstein that her parents did not even tell their story about living under the Nazis until the early 1970s. Dina Rosenfeld, who was present during the group interview, provided her own reasons for why their parents might have been silent about the Holocaust until the sixties and seventies such as the fact that it was too soon to talk about the atrocities. Many survivors were still traumatized by their experiences during the war, repressing their painful memories. Rosenfeld told Steinitz and the rest of the group that "after my brothers and sisters were killed, I was the new beginning. They were going to forget all the pain, the past, and start anew, have faith again, I guess."[30] In addition to trauma, American Jews like Charlotte Delbo completed the first two volumes of her work *Auschwitz and After* by 1947 "but she held onto them until the 1960s, perhaps waiting for a more receptive time."[31] This portrays how Americans in the 1960s became more open and willing to discuss certain topics that they otherwise would not have talked about in the previous decade. Some Holocaust survivors were

also discouraged by guards in the displaced camps from retelling their stories. As one interviewee claimed, "After the immediate post-liberation period, survivors were often actively silenced: Don't talk about, hush up for your bad dreams."[32]

Furthermore, Jewish day schools and religious schools concealed the tragedy of the Holocaust by focusing on heroic and positive stories throughout Jewish history. Curriculum in religious schools and Jewish day schools before the 1960s emphasized heroic Bible stories, achievements throughout Jewish history, and Hebrew language, leaving out the Holocaust. Thomas Fallace, in his book *The Emergence of Holocaust Education in American Schools,* explains that Jewish educators emphasized heroic stories "as a means of instilling a positive identity in their youth and repairing their fragile Jewish pride."[33] In essence Jewish schools were very careful not to disappoint children or discourage them from showing their pride in being Jewish by highlighting the good and hiding the bad.

During the 1950s, many Jewish educators stressed that "the purpose of Jewish education was to develop an attitude of ready acceptance of the fact of one's Jewishness so that Jews understand and accept their Jewishness as a positive value," of which the Holocaust did the opposite by degrading and demoralizing the Jew because he or she was identified as a Jew.[34] However, by the 1960s, Jewish educators began to incorporate the Holocaust into their curriculums. Meir Ben-Horin, a Jewish educator and scholar, explains that this shift occurred in the 1960s because "it was no longer adequate to tell only part of the Holocaust story. Concentrating on the heroic aspects of the event (which most religious schools and Jewish day schools did before the sixties), he argued, was an effort to apologize, to falsify through unwarranted prettification of the record."[35] No longer did Jewish schools tip toe around the subject of the Holocaust as the sixties triggered a time of openness, curiosity, and

experimentation. Judah Pilch asserts the Holocaust in the 1960s "became a topic of immediacy and relevance to our time…not only in the Jewish field, but in the general field (meaning secular education) as well."[36] It was the "immediacy and relevance to our time" that attracted not just non-Jews to the subject of the Holocaust but also secular Jews who had trouble connecting to the catastrophe.

Since non-Jews and secular Jews had difficulty connecting to the Holocaust, American Jews did not gain much support from the American public in responding to the Holocaust. David Wyman argues that America failed to help during the Holocaust because many perceived it as a "Jewish" question rather than a problem for humanity in general. Wyman claims that "comparatively few American non-Jews recognized that the plight of the European Jews was their plight too."[37] Thus, between 1945 and 1960, American Jews, for the most part, were alone and would have to put forth the effort themselves if they were going to educate others about the Holocaust. In addition, secular Jews who lost faith after the Holocaust and were not directly affected by the war had difficulty relating the tragedy to their own lives living in the United States. Nevertheless, by the 1960s, several prominent Jewish intellectuals completed literature that compared the Holocaust to life in America, helping those who could not connect to the event. For example, Stanley Elkins completed his dissertation "Slavery: A Problem in American Institutional and Intellectual Life" towards the end of 1959, which compared slavery in the United States to the Holocaust. Elkins analyzed the similarities between the concentration camps and SS guards in Nazi Germany to slave owners in America, which Fermaglich says "can help us to think anew about the history of American Jews, the history of the 1960s, and the significance of the Holocaust in American intellectual and political history in the postwar era."[38] This was especially relevant given the era of racial tension and inequalities between blacks and whites in

America and the civil rights movement in the 1960s. For American Jews, these links between the Holocaust and slavery provided them with a heightened sense of awareness and willingness to learn more about the Holocaust.

Other analogies between the Holocaust and American culture at the turn of the sixties included Betty Friedan's book *The Feminine Mystique*, which compared the plight of the housewife in America as a prisoner in her own home to the prisoners in the concentration camps. Though this comparison is a stretch, it reached a few American Jewish women in "believing her image of dehumanized victims perfectly represented their personal lives" and providing them with some sort of connection to the Holocaust.[39] Psychiatrist Robert Jay Lifton did a comparative study on Holocaust survivors and survivors of the atomic bomb in Hiroshima. One of Lifton's goals was to show others that the Holocaust in Europe set off other Holocausts throughout the world such as the bombing of Japanese cities. Lifton utilized the Nazi destruction of European Jewry to "understand problems of violence, technology, and alienation in American society."[40] Many of these different analogies helped young American Jews to think about the Holocaust in different capacities and learn more about the event.

Going back to Elkin's study on slavery and the Holocaust, it is significant to note the widespread involvement of American Jews in the civil rights movement throughout the 1960s in relation to their similar struggles during the Holocaust. The participation of American Jews in the civil rights movement is revealed in various sources throughout the 1960s. The Anti Defamation League, an American Jewish organization based in New York, published an article in the *Jewish Advocate* in 1963 entitled "ADL Leader Declares Whites Must Understand Negro Resentment," which urged Americans to join blacks in their struggle for equality. The ADL highlighted the fact that American Jews since the Holocaust were actively involved in securing

rights not just for Jews but also for humanity across the nation. Dore Schary, chairman of the ADL, maintained "what affects James Meredith as a Negro affects me as a Jew, and what affects me as a Jew affects Catholics."[41] Moreover, at the 68th annual convention of the Jewish War Veterans in 1963, Jewish leaders advocated for not only the protection of Jews since the tragedy of the Holocaust but also blacks who have suffered inequalities for many years in America, which "stand in diametric opposition to the principles of freedom and Democracy which are the fundamental laws of America."[42] Jewish agencies and leaders appealed to the American Jewish public to stand up and fight against racism and segregation given their similar persecutions under the Nazis during the war. Diner draws attention to the activity of "Jewish agencies at the local and national levels that became vigorous and highly prominent partners in the civil rights struggle… They did this boldly in the name of American Jewry and put the Holocaust into prominent relief and made these subjects the focus of programming and education within their community groups."[43] Therefore, by the 1960s, the Holocaust transformed itself into more than just a Jewish tragedy but also a universal issue and topic that drove more American Jews and non-Jews to explore and study the history of the Holocaust.

In addition to the issues of racial discrimination and segregation during the sixties, a resurgence of Anti-Semitism appeared in Germany alarming American Jews to combat this with Holocaust education. The Jewish War Veterans documented their "concern about recent waves of Anti-Semitic incidents in Germany on Christmas Day."[44] Two members of the German Reich party painted swastikas on synagogues in Cologne, Germany which brought back memories and visions of the Nazi Holocaust for American Jews. However, the Jewish War Veterans were concerned there were still many American Jews especially the youth who did not understand the magnitude of these Anti-Semitic events. This led to a meeting of educators in Washington D.C

determined to develop curriculum and textbooks on the Holocaust because students did not understand the "ideologies of Nazism and Fascism." [45]

Another event that opened the eyes of the American Jewish community in the 1960s was the Six Day War in Israel. In 1967, the Jewish State of Israel was surprise attacked by seven Arab nations, thus facing the threat of annihilation as the Jews did back in Europe during the Holocaust. Marcia Sachs Littell argues that the "Six Day War marked the awakening of American Jewish interest in the Holocaust. The realization that Jews might be destroyed in their homeland was a strong consciousness-raising experience for American Jews."[46] For example, Hannah Levinsky Koevary, a child of a survivor, experienced this realization on June 5, 1967:

> My mother's broken voice awakened me from my deep sleep. She stood at the threshold of my bedroom uttering over again Milcahama (war) Milchama (war) as if it were a litany. Could Haifa be burning? Could Netanya be bombed? I could see on my mother's face flashes of the past, a memory of what was, thinking that it could never happen again or could it?[47]

Several American Jews like Hannah's parents experienced flashbacks to the Holocaust in the face of war and destruction in Israel. Israel won the war in a dramatic military victory, which sparked a sense of pride, security, and comfort amongst American Jews and survivors who were now ready to open up about their experiences during the Holocaust, knowing that they were safe. The Six Day War also provided new connections to the Holocaust for American Jews pushing the desire to learn more about the Holocaust and teach others about it.

In the midst of these social and cultural changes in post-war America, an important event occurred that changed the way the American public reacted to the Holocaust. In May 1960, Israeli security service agents captured Adolf Eichmann, one of the most notorious Nazi war criminals, who organized the deportations of Jews to death camps during World War II.

Eichmann was put on trial in 1961 in front of the entire world as most newspapers in America featured the trial. In addition, various American telecasts featured the trial. The last time the Holocaust attracted close to this amount of attention in America were the Nuremberg trials immediately following the war. However, since the Nuremberg trials occurred right after the war, many survivors, as mentioned in the previous section on social and cultural changes, wanted to put everything behind them and start a new life. Thus, by 1961, with the Eichmann trial "the survivors, whose wounds had begun to be bound up by the passage of time, now had more physical and emotional stamina to demand justice" and openly talk about their experiences with others. [48]

The Eichmann trial not only affected survivors but also had a profound impact on American Jews and non-Jews. Rabbi Seligson asserted in a *New York Times* article that the Eichmann trial "shook the Jewish community and reverberated throughout the civilized world."[49] Rabbi Oscar Groner, assistant national director of B'nai B'rith Hillel, stated that "for many young students the trial was a first personal awareness of the real horrors of the Holocaust and of the Nazi in history as symbolized by Eichmann."[50] This reveals that students were shielded from learning about the Holocaust before the trial given the cautious social and cultural atmosphere in the fifties. Furthermore, in 1961, the *Jewish Telegraphic Agency* published an article on the reaction of American students to the Eichmann trial, stating that the trial attracted greater attention among students on college campuses in America than any other topic in the year prior to the trial. Students across the nation attended lectures, discussions, and film programs on the Eichmann trial. Many students, Jewish and non-Jewish, were "shocked by the testimonies from witnesses and Eichmann himself about the realities and horrors of the Holocaust, revealing their unfamiliarity with the Hitler period."[51] Thus, the Eichmann trial triggered a rise in Holocaust

consciousness of American Jews and a desire to learn and take classes on the Holocaust. In addition, one can see that the mass publicity of the Eichmann trial in the 1960s coincides with the social and cultural changes during the sixties, which ended the silence of the Holocaust and educated young American Jews about the event.

Furthermore, the change in priorities on the agenda of American Jewish organizations and leaders during the 1960s led to the growth of Holocaust education in America. The immediate priority for American Jewish organizations after World War II included relief to Jewish refugees and displaced persons in Europe and claims against Germany for restitution. One of the many examples of this was a letter sent to the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in New York from the General Jewish Committee in Bergen Belsen, Germany which thanked them for the large shipment of shoes for displaced persons in their camp.[52] A report later that year on the activities of the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee in the British Zone listed the allocation of supplies to Jewish refugees and displaced persons such as food and clothing.[53]

Similar efforts are revealed in the correspondence of the American Jewish Conference between 1945 and 1948, which called upon Jewish organizations throughout the United States to set up a post-war reconstruction committee. The conference reiterated that the immediate focus should be on the "problems of the immediate transition period of relief, restitution of property, repatriation, and retribution."[54] In conjunction with the American Jewish Conference the Jewish Labor Committee worked on lobbying politicians and other labor unions such as the American Federation of Labor to sign a resolution to lift the immigration quota in America for the admission of three to four million Jewish refugees.[55] This was a popular topic in Jewish newspapers and a top priority on most American Jewish organizational agendas during the 1950s

in regards to material claims against Germany. For instance, the U.S. Court of Restitution Appeals in Germany granted people who had their property confiscated by the Nazis the right to "obtain a judgment against the German Reich for restitution."[56] Other activities on this matter included the formation of an entire conference and committee on "Material Claims against Germany" in New York City. This is not to say that aiding Jewish refugees and displaced persons in Europe should not have been the immediate focus of American Jewish organizations and leaders, however the importance of Holocaust education got lost in the process.

Similar to the political activities of American Jewish organizations Jewish Education in America before the 1960s did not stress Holocaust education. Before the sixties, the Board of Jewish Education in New York placed a heavy emphasis on Hebrew language in Jewish and public schools. Almost every article, pamphlet, and brochure disseminated by the Board of Jewish Education promoted or discussed the magnitude of learning Hebrew. If the Hebrew language was not the main subject of these documents it was the Bible, Prophets, rituals, or Jewish holidays, with no mention of anything related to the Holocaust. Between 1940 and 1949, the Hebrew Culture Council stressed the success of Hebrew language in New York public and Jewish schools. For example, the Hebrew Culture Council sent out a pamphlet titled "Good News 26 High Schools now teach Hebrew," which publicized the success of new Hebrew courses in Bronx and Brooklyn junior high schools.[57] The Hebrew Culture Council emphasized that learning the Hebrew language "inspires children with a new appreciation for Jewish culture and helps to prepare them for a richly integrated and dignified life as Americans and Jews."[58] This relates back to the social and cultural atmosphere in the American Jewish community before the sixties which stressed only positive subjects amongst Jewish students. Emphasis on Hebrew language by Jewish educators continued into the fifties with the development of more textbooks

and curriculum on Hebrew, which left out the Holocaust. The Hebrew Culture Council in the forties and fifties sent letters to college advisors informing them that over 600 colleges across the nation were accepting Hebrew to meet college entrance requirements.[59] These letters revealed that it was more important for Jewish education leaders in America to meet requirements and fill quotas than educating the youth about the impact of one of the most significant events in Jewish History: the Holocaust. Nonetheless, by the 1960s, the priorities of the American Jewish community shifted to Holocaust education. Once again this goes back to the change in attitude amongst American Jews during the sixties and the willingness to discuss and teach others about the Holocaust.

The duplication of information and scholarship emerging on Nazi Germany in the 1960s generated a great desire to learn and educate others about the Holocaust. One of the first noteworthy books on the Holocaust was William Shirer's *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich* published in 1960. The Jewish War Veterans reported that Shirer's book was the latest piece of scholarship that brought the Holocaust to the forefront in America. The Jewish War Veterans praised Shirer's book as a "monumental work climbing to the best seller list indicating a revival of interest in the Hitler era."[60] Another major work published in 1961 on the Holocaust was Raul Hilberg's *Destruction of European Jewry.* This was the first comprehensive piece of literature completed on the Holocaust. Katherine Ann Porter published *Ship of Fools* in 1962 on German attitudes towards Jews during the war which was praised by the *New York Times*.[61] Scholars continued to publish books on the Holocaust in the early sixties as the "historical uniqueness of the Holocaust was beginning to emerge as the historiography matured."[62] This led to the availability of information on the history of the Holocaust that American Jews did not benefit

from before the 1960s. This was partially due to the fact that American Jews were not ready to confront the details and horrors of the Holocaust until the 1960s.

The growth of scholarship on the Holocaust in the sixties created pedagogical debates among Jewish educators on what to teach and how to teach the Holocaust. Meir Ben-Horin, a Jewish scholar and educator, wrote an article in 1961 expressing that when teaching the Holocaust one should expose all of the facts through utilizing memoirs and survivor testimonies. In addition Ben-Horin maintained that teachers need to be "scientifically" objective and "emotionally detach" themselves when discussing the Holocaust.[63] At the 37th annual conference of the National Council for Jewish Education in 1964, many teachers disagreed with Ben-Horin's approach in teaching the Holocaust, rejecting the need to be "scientifically" objective; instead, teachers recommended a focus on the "student's interests, concerns, and problems."[64] Judah Pilch added "the time had come for Jewish youth to be confronted with the entire story of Jewish martyrdom, including the recent tragedy, the Shoah (Holocaust)."[65] This clearly intersects the social and cultural factor because, in contrast to how Jewish educators perceived the Holocaust as jeopardizing the positive identity of young American Jews earlier in the fifties, Pilch argued that studying the Holocaust reinforced a positive Jewish identity.

These pedagogical debates between Jewish educators continued in 1966 before the publication of the first Holocaust textbook. Zalmen Slesinger, an author and Jewish educator, argued that the Holocaust should be taught from a universal perspective rather than a Jewish one. Slesinger claimed that one should not focus strictly on the atrocities of the Holocaust and "the idea of a collective and eternal guilt of the German people must be rejected."[66] Dr. Morton Siegel, director of the United Synagogue of America, rejected Slesinger's argument on how to teach the Holocaust, finding it to be too apologetic and "ultimately excusing all groups for

responsibility and ending up with a concept of purely personal and individual guilt."[67] Furthermore, these debates led to the publication of the first Holocaust textbook in America in 1967. Jewish educators waited to incorporate the Holocaust into Jewish education until more books were published on the topic. Dr. Morton Siegel, "explaining the delay in preparing such a textbook said that it was a very difficult topic to handle because an effort had to be made to include the how and why of such a disaster."[68] Many more pedagogical debates on the Holocaust like the one between Siegel and Slesinger erupted in the 1960s.

Overall, one can see that Holocaust education was non-existent in the American Jewish community between 1945 and 1960. American Jewish organizations and leaders were very active in relief efforts but not in educating the youth about the Holocaust. However, social and cultural changes in the community brought Holocaust education to the forefront in the 1960s. Every factor discussed contributed to the growth of Holocaust education in the 1960s but it is the social and cultural factor that binds them all together. The mass publicity of the Eichmann trial, Holocaust education becoming a priority for American Jewish organizations, the availability and publication of new Holocaust material, and pedagogical debates between Jewish educators would not have been possible without the change in philosophy and open minded attitude that swept the American Jewish community in the sixties. It was these very attitudes of receptiveness and the willingness to confront the Holocaust publicly that motivated American Jews to educate young people about the Nazi Destruction of European Jewry.

Moreover, Holocaust education continued to grow in the 1970's as more Jewish day schools, camps, and religious schools incorporated the Holocaust into their curriculums. American public schools introduced the Holocaust into their program of study for the first time. Between 1980 and 1990 Holocaust education increased at a rapid rate as did scholarship, which

opened up new fields within the Holocaust attracting more of the American population. Today the field continues to expand as colleges and graduate schools across the country offer a variety of courses, degrees, and programs on the Holocaust. The first and only American PhD program in Holocaust studies emerged in 1998 at Clark University in Massachusetts. It is crucial that developments in Holocaust education continue especially in the face of Holocaust denial and given the fact that many students are still ignorant concerning this atrocity in history.

Notes

1. Lipstadt, "America and the Memory of the Holocaust," 208.
2. Diner, *We Remember with Reverence*, 11.
3. Publication in the Remarkables by Harold Debrest, 1946, file 8, Harold Debrest Papers, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
4. Harold Debrest, "Lo Alman Yisrael", 1955, file 8, Harold Debrest Papers, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
5. Administration Records for Jewish War Veterans, 1949, file 1, Jewish War Veterans of the United States Collection, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
6. Headquarters Letters, 1960, file 5, Jewish War Veterans of the United States Collection, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
7. Administration Records for Jewish War Veterans, 1963, file 1, Jewish War Veterans of the United States Collection.
8. Summary of the 1962 Applications for Cultural and Education Reconstruction, 1962, file 8, Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
9. Events and Promotions 1940-1949, 1949, File 3, Board of Jewish Education (NY) Records, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
10. Events and Promotions 1940-1949, 1949, File 3, Board of Jewish Education (NY) Records.
11. Events and Promotions 1950-1959, 1949, File 4, Board of Jewish Education (NY) Records, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
12. Brush and Color Publications, 1961-1962, File 16, Board of Jewish Education (NY) Records, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
13. Publications Board of Jewish Education Bulletins, 1967, File 20, Board of Jewish Education (NY) Records, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
14. "Need for Jewish Centers Stressed At AJP Meeting." *The Jewish Advocate*, June 6, 1946.
15. "CARE Sends Kosher Food To Jews Abroad." *The Jewish Exponent*, September 12, 1947.
16. "Jewish Groups Attack Bill as un-American Ask Beatification." *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, June 20, 1948. Accessed January 26, 2012. http://www. archive.jta.org/article/1948/06/20/3014871/jewish-groups-attack-bill-as-unamerican-ask-beatification.
17. "World Jewish Parley Opens Today to Discuss Claims Against Germany." *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, October 25, 1951. Accessed January 26, 2012. http://www. archive.jta.org/article/1951/10/25/3027661/world-jewish-parley-opens-today-to-discuss-material-claims-against-germany.
18. "92 Colleges and Universities Reported Conducting Judaic Courses." *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, December 2, 1966. Accessed January 26, 2012. http://www. archive.jta.org/article/1966/12/02/3086002/92-colleges-and-universities-reported-conducting-judaic-courses.
19. "Let Our Children Know." *The Jewish Advocate*, October 7, 1965.
20. "First Textbook on Holocaust for Jewish Schools to Be Issued in July." *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, June 7, 1968. Accessed January 26, 2012. http://www. archive.jta.org/article/1968/ 06/07/2946125/first-textbook-on-holocaust-for-jewish-schools-to-be-issued-in-july.
21. Lipstadt, "America and the Memory of the Holocaust," 195.
22. Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life*, 6.
23. Diner, *We Remember with Reverence*, 11.
24. Gerson and Wolf, *Sociology Confronts The Holocaust*, 36.
25. Ibid., 42.
26. Fermaglich, *American Dreams and Nazi Nightmares*, 18.
27. Steinitz and Szonyi, *Living After The Holocaust*, i.
28. Ibid., iii.
29. Ibid., 35.
30. Ibid., 36.
31. Hayes and Roth, *The Oxford Handbook of Holocaust Studies*, 418.
32. Ibid., 418.
33. Fallace, *The Emergence of Holocaust Education*, 17.
34. Ibid.

35. Ibid., 19.
36. Ibid., 21.
37. Wyman, *The Abandonment Of The Jews*, xii.
38. Fermaglich, *American Dreams and Nazi Nightmares,* 25.
39. Ibid., 78.
40. Ibid., 128.
41. "ADL Leader Declares Whites Must Understand Negro Resentment," *The Jewish Advocate*, May 9, 1963.
42. Jewish War Veterans Conventions: Resolutions and Policy Statements, 1963, file 2, Jewish War Veterans of the United States Collection.
43. Diner, We Remember w*ith Reverence,* 294.
44. Headquarters Letters, 1960, file 5, Jewish War Veterans of the United States Collection.
45. Headquarters Letters, 1960, file 5, Jewish War Veterans of the United States Collection.
46. Littell, "Breaking The Silence, 200.
47. Steinitz, *Living After the Holocaust,* 141.
48. "The Eichmann Trial," *The New York Times*, April 8, 2011.
49. "Eichmann's Trial Assayed By Rabbi: Seligson Finds It Exposed Nazi Horror to World," *The New York Times, O*ctober 8, 1961.
50. "The Eichmann Trial," *The New York Times*, April 8, 2011.
51. "Hillel Foundations Report on Reaction of U.S. Students to Eichmann Trial." *The Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, December 7, 1961. Accessed January 26, 2012. http://www.archive.jta.org.article/1961/12/07/3067942/hillel-foundations-report-on-reaction-of-us-students-to-eichmann-trial.
52. Friedlander and Milton, "Letter from Riva Serman," 1322.
53. Friedlander and Milton, "Report on the Activities of the AJDC," 1336.
54. American Jewish Conference Correspondence , 1945-1948, file 2, American Jewish Conference Records, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
55. Activities on behalf of European Jewry, 1946, file 1, Jewish Labor Committee Collection, American Jewish Historical Society, New York.
56. "German Republic Must Return Property Seized Under Nazis," *The Jewish Exponen*t, March , 1951.
57. Events and Promotions 1940-1949, 1949, File 3, Board of Jewish Education (NY) Records.
58. Events and Promotions 1940-1949, 1949, File 3, Board of Jewish Education (NY) Records
59. Events and Promotions 1950-1959, 1949, File 3, Board of Jewish Education (NY) Records.
60. Headquarters Letters, 1960, file 5, Jewish War Veterans of the United States Collection.
61. Lipstadt, *America and the Memory of the Holocaust,* 196.
62. Fallace, *The Emergence of Holocaust Education,* 18.
63. Ibid., 20.
64. Ibid.
65. Ibid.
66. "Teaching the Holocaust, "*The Jewish Advocate*, July 14, 1966.
67. Ibid.
68. "First Textbook on Holocaust for Jewish Schools to Be Issued in July." *Jewish Telegraphic Agency*, June 7, 1968. Accessed January 26, 2012. http://www. archive.jta.org/article/1968/ 06/07/2946125/first-textbook-on-holocaust-for-jewish-schools-to-be-issued-in-july.

Bibliography

American Jewish Conference Records 1943-1949. American Jewish Historical Society. New York.

Baron, Lawrence. "The Holocaust and American Public Memory, 1945-1960." *Journal of Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 17 (2003): 62-88.

Board of Jewish Education Records (NY) 1945-1970. . American Jewish Historical Society. New York.

Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany 1956-1968. American Jewish Historical Society. New York.

Diner, Hasia. *We Remember with Reverence and Love: American Jews and the Myth of Silence after the Holocaust 1945-1962*. New York: New York University Press, 2010.

Fallace, Thomas. *The Emergence of Holocaust Education in American Schools*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

———. "The Origins of Holocaust Education in American Public Schools." *Journal of Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 20 (2006): 80-102.

Fermaglich, Kirsten. *American Dreams and Nazi Nightmares: Early Holocaust Consciousness and Liberal America, 1957-1965*. Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2006.

Friedlander, Henry and Sylbi Milton. *Archives of the Holocaust: An International Collection of Selected Documents*. New York and London: Garland Publishing, 1995.

Gerson, Judith and Diane Wolf. *Sociology Confronts The Holocaust: Memories and Identities in Jewish Diasporas*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007.

Harold Debrest Papers 1945-1968. American Jewish Historical Society. New York.

Hayes, Peter, and John Roth. *The Oxford Handbook of Holocaust Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Jewish Labor Committee Records 1945-1969. American Jewish Historical Society. New York.

Jewish War Veterans of the United States Collections 1945-1968. American Jewish Historical Society. New York.

Lipstadt, Deborah. "America and the Memory of the Holocaust, 1959-1965." *Journal of Modern Judaism* 16 (1996): 195-214.

Littell, Sachs Marcia. "Breaking the Silence: A History of Holocaust Education in America." In *Remembrance, Repentance, Reconciliation: The 25th Anniversary Volume of the Annual Scholars' Conference on the Holocaust and the Churches,* edited by Douglas F. Tobler. University Press of America: 1988.

Meyer Greenberg Papers 1945-1970. American Jewish Historical Society. New York.

Novick, Peter. *The Holocaust in American Life*. Boston, MA: Mariner Books, 2000.

Steinitz, Lucy and David Szonyi. *Living After the Holocaust: Reflections by the Post-War Generation in America*. New York: Bloch Publishing Company, 1975.

Wyman, David. *The Abandonment of the Jews: America and the Holocaust 1941-1945*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1984.

What "Teaches us to feel": Best Practices in Holocaust Education, Grades K-8

Alison Dobrick
William Patterson University

Holocaust Education in the United States

> The phrase 'Holocaust Education' is almost perverse in contradiction. 'Holocaust' and 'education' seem to pull in different directions, one pointing to the utter devastation of human values, the other insisting on their possibility.[1]

Today, teachers, survivors, educational leaders and others generally consider teaching about the Holocaust an important part of the American curriculum. However, for decades, it was nearly absent from the curriculum.[2] Legislation has been passed in many states, beginning in the 1990s, requiring teachers to teach about the Holocaust.[3] In addition, museums and educational centers have been established throughout the United States (and the world). These developments indicate tremendous agreement that teaching about the Holocaust is essential.

Why Teach about the Holocaust?

Elie Wiesel introduced the findings of the federal committee he chaired to investigate how the United States could honor the memory of the victims of the Holocaust with a "rhetorical question": "Why remember, why remember at all? Is not human nature opposed to keeping alive memories that hurt and disturb?"[4] Wiesel then eloquently describes many reasons for educating about and remembering the Holocaust:

> First, we cannot grant the killers a posthumous victory. Not only did they humiliate and assassinate their victims, they wanted also to destroy their memory…. Second, we cannot deny the victims the fulfillment of their last wish; their idée fixe to bear witness…. Third, we must remember for our own sake, for the sake of our own humanity…. [5]

Wiesel expresses notions found throughout the academic literature on Holocaust education. One of the main reasons given for educating students about the Holocaust is described as "an ethical imperative to remember."[6] Since violence against members of certain groups, institutional racism, and other features that characterized the Holocaust continue today, many theorists have pointed to the importance of teaching students to think about and act to increase social justice.[7] Developing empathy with others who are different from oneself,[8] becoming aware of the results of extreme racism and intolerance so that students consider their own, personal biases,[9] and learning to understand ways in which technology and bureaucracy can be used in inhuman ways[10] are all stated in the literature as reasons for teaching about the Holocaust. A final, ever-present reason to teach about the Holocaust is the reality of Holocaust denial, which began during the events themselves and continues to this day.[11]

While the suggestions given here are geared toward teaching about the Holocaust, they can and should also be applied to teaching about other genocides. Berger relates Elie Wiesel's assertion that "Every tragedy deserves its own name,"[12] listing such tragedies as Wounded Knee and Hiroshima to show the obvious diversity among genocidal events. Berger, and many scholars and educators of the Holocaust, emphasizes the importance of both the uniqueness and the universality of the Holocaust. The objectives, methods, and strategies discussed here can be applied to other genocides, but of course, in a manner tailored to the realities of each event. An inclusive approach to studying the Holocaust reveals the incomplete nature of treating the Holocaust or other genocides as either purely "particular" or "universal" events.

Best Practices in Teaching the Holocaust: Setting a Rationale

Holocaust education scholar Samuel Totten provides practical guidelines for teachers who seek to teach their students about the Holocaust.[13] His descriptions of how to envision and

put into practice courses of study on the Holocaust are the most commonly cited in the literature. In general, Totten, like most scholars of Holocaust education, stresses the importance of encouraging students' critical thinking rather than the memorization of facts about the Holocaust.

Totten emphasizes the importance of setting a rationale for a unit of Holocaust study. Rationales for including certain facts, teaching strategies, and resources in a unit of study are extremely important because the complexity of the topic is so daunting. Teachers must consider their students' ages, ability levels, and background knowledge as they form their rationales for study. The chosen rationale(s) must guide the content, govern the pedagogical approaches used, and be constantly reevaluated by the teacher throughout the unit. Some of Totten's rationales include: "to study human behavior"; "to teach students why, how, what, when, and where the Holocaust took place"; "to explore concepts such as prejudice, discrimination, stereotyping, racism, anti-Semitism, and obedience to authority."[14] Totten's rationales demonstrate a belief in a balanced approach to Holocaust education, one that can include a multitude of goals and approaches arranged under an overarching, highly meaningful and relevant concept.

Developmental Concerns with Teaching the Holocaust, K-8

Some scholars of Holocaust education argue that elementary-aged students should not be exposed to the history of the Holocaust. Totten, in a forceful essay entitled *Holocaust Education for K-4 Students? The Answer is No!*,[15] advances the argument that because of the "torturously complex" nature of the Holocaust and the background needed to understand the events involved, young children should not be exposed to its realities. He also observes that what has been called "Holocaust Education" for students before fifth grade is often actually education about prejudice,

racism and other related topics. In reality, he claims, "Holocaust Education" has frequently been a misnomer.

Karen Shawn of Yeshiva University supports Totten's argument against Holocaust education for students at the elementary level. Shawn declares that

> We fail our young people when we give them more information or sensations than they can process. We fail our children when we don't make classrooms an emotional haven. We fail our children when we invite them to enter, unsuspecting, a world filled with inexplicable, painful, harsh and terrifying realities: great violence, utter powerlessness, loss of control, xenophobia, betrayal, isolation, indignity, dehumanization, torture, murder.[16]

Shawn and Totten focus on the perils of teaching about a subject as difficult to comprehend as the Holocaust to primary school students. However, others support the teaching of the history of the Holocaust to students in the elementary grades. Heike Deckert-Peaceman of Germany's Fritz Bauer Institute asserts that while showing young students all of the photographs, sources, and facts available about the Holocaust would be ill-advised, children must learn the historical background of the Holocaust if they are to understand the messages that literature and other age-appropriate resources offer. Deckert-Peaceman offers the example of the United States Holocaust Museum's exhibit, *Daniel's Story*, as an activity that shows that historical content can be designed specifically for children. She also points out that Yad Vashem, the eminent Holocaust museum of Israel, has developed programs for the purpose of teaching about the Holocaust to young children. Deckert-Peaceman concludes that "evaluation of the work done at *Yad Vashem*…seems to reinforce the idea that young students are neither emotionally nor cognitively overwhelmed by the historical facts, if presented in a suitable manner."[17] The fact that today's young students already possess understandings and misconceptions related to important concepts in history, such as violence and intolerance, is a

significant counter-argument to Shawn's argument for sheltering children from negative influences in the classroom.

In order to fully understand the context of the fervent debate over the appropriate nature of teaching about the history of the Holocaust to young students, it is useful to refer to literature about the teaching of history, in general, to elementary level students. Some theorists claim that young children are not equipped with an understanding of time that allows them to effectively grasp historical studies. However, when students are helped to engage with their own misperceptions and with the study of history itself, they can successfully think as historians.[18]

Elementary-aged children enter the classroom with incomplete, often incorrect understandings of history, culture, and society, which teachers must address by helping students to reflect upon, change, and add to their own perceptions. Lectures should be avoided as the sole or central activity, while discussions and critical thinking should be encouraged. Unfortunately, many researchers have found, this state of affairs is often the opposite of the reality in many classrooms:

> Research in classrooms where history is taught indicates that the primary concern there is with consuming and reproducing events and details found mostly in books, as though interpretive practices, be they engaged in by historians, teachers, or students, simply did not exist. The standard textbooks, combined with lectures delivered by teachers, are considered definitive. Tests measure the results.[19]

Best Practices in Teaching the Holocaust, K-8: Teaching with Literature

As described above, many educators and others are concerned about the importance of teaching the history of the Holocaust to elementary school students in a developmentally appropriate way. Thus, numerous discussions of elementary level Holocaust curricula center on the use of children's literature, rather than the teaching of the actual history of the Holocaust to young students. Literature has established a meaningful foundation of study in any examination

of the Holocaust with young students, one that allows teachers to begin to address the complex and difficult themes involved.

Most educators agree that some historical background knowledge is a necessary precondition for successful learning about the Holocaust (or any other, complicated subject). Literature, though, plays a different role in the study of the Holocaust than that of historical facts. Baum expressed the view that "while historical knowledge is essential to any understanding of the Holocaust, Holocaust literature teaches us, in part, how to feel about the historical facts."[20]

Baer analyzed ways in which morality is presented in children's literature about the Holocaust. She explored the ways in which "children's literature has a long tradition of wrestling with the question of presenting evil to children."[21] For Baer, the well-trodden notion of children's literature having to be morally instructive is sharply called into question when applied to Holocaust literature. Baer described why she believes that children's literature about the Holocaust should ideally meet four requirements if it is to be used in classroom study:

> The book must grapple directly with the evil of the Holocaust…the book should not provide simplistic explanations, but rather it should present the Holocaust in its proper context of complexity, even meaninglessness, of difficult questions for which there are no formulaic answers…the book must convey…a warning about the dangers of racism and anti-Semitism, and of complacency…the book should give the reader a 'framework of response,' that is, to create in the child a consciousness, a 'memory,' and a sense of personal responsibility regarding prejudice, hatred, and racial discrimination.[22]

While Baer's assertion that literature should be used to teach about the realities of the Holocaust drives much instruction, developmental appropriateness is still a central concern. Kidd published a reply to Baer's encouragement to realistically teach about the themes of the Holocaust to young students. In this reply, Kidd strenuously maintains that the psychological trauma of learning about the events of the Holocaust must be considered before engaging in any

form of study of the Holocaust with young children, especially one involving literature that meets Baer's conditions of realism, important lessons, and controversial themes.[23]

Shawn offers a different set of requirements for Holocaust literature to be used in the classroom. Shawn's requirements reflect a belief in the possibility and, indeed, the imperative for moral values to be taught through Holocaust literature. To Shawn, books included in units of study for elementary aged students should be

> [R]ooted in historical context and reflect historical reality…personalize the statistics, fostering empathy, compassion, and involvement…[and] feature- rather than marginalize- the Jewish experience and particular Jewish responses during the Shoah, rather than such aspects as, for example, the actions of the perpetrators.[24]

Teachers at the elementary school level must contend with the kinds of issues raised by Baer, Kidd, and Shawn when selecting which literature to read and discuss with their students. They must consider developmental, academic, and psychological concerns that all Holocaust educators face, as well as those unique to elementary level teachers.

Simulation and/or Complication

A discussion of best practices in Holocaust education would be incomplete without the fact that certain activities in which teachers frequently engage are not considered pedagogically sound by the majority of scholars of Holocaust education. The most extensively criticized activity that is, nevertheless, commonly found in schools is the simulation. Simulation activities are role-play lessons meant to have students re-enact certain aspects of the Holocaust in hopes that they will further empathize or learn about the experience.[25] Some of these simulation lessons, which have been documented in elementary, middle, and high school classrooms, include activities in which students are told to stand in a small space together, imitating the cattle

cars in which Holocaust victims were transported to concentration camps. Other activities involve the teacher telling brown-eyed students to "persecute" blue-eyed students throughout a class period or an entire school day in order to simulate the intolerance demonstrated against Jews and other groups.[26] One rabbi created an extensive set of learning activities around a Holocaust-themed board game in which students are forced to give up their religion, family, and home in the form of small cards.[27]

According to Totten, simulations "are invariably simplistic; they frequently convey both skewed and incorrect information vis-à-vis the Holocaust; and more often than not, they are ahistorical."[28] After a study of all of the Holocaust curricula in use in American schools at the time, Dawidowicz stated the case against simulations even more strongly:

> The Jews who lived under Hitler's rule were confronted with cruel dilemmas, forced to make difficult, even impossible, choices about matters of life and death for which conscience could offer no direction and the past could give no guidance. Yet many high school curricula frivolously suggest role-playing exercises in which students imagine how they would behave if confronted with such dilemmas. What kind of answers can come from American children who think of the Gestapo as the name of a game?[29]

While some educators describe their desire to have students "experience what the victims experienced,"[30] avoiding simulations is one way that teachers can "show sensitivity to the memory of the victims and the feelings of the survivors."[31]

Conclusion

Educators who seek to teach about the Holocaust or any genocide to their young students face many challenges. Before teaching about historical facts, developmental concerns must be considered. Before selecting literature to share with young students, psychological and academic understanding of one's students is essential. In general, a teacher must know his or her students

and community before beginning a unit of study by establishing a meaningful rationale that will be effective for his or her classroom situation.

While teaching about the Holocaust and other genocides to young children is indeed a daunting prospect, filled with challenges, it is also an experience that can lead to the kind of learning that caring educators value most. Holocaust and genocide education can include meaningful discussion of concepts like human rights, prejudice, racism, bullying, conformity and so many more. In today's era of standardized-test-centric educational reform, it is crucial that topics like the Holocaust and other genocides remain in the curriculum. To this end, the educational establishment must ensure that the kind of creative, thought-provoking instruction central to truly meaningful learning be allowed to thrive.

Notes

1. Baum, “What I have learned to feel,” 44.
2. Dawidowicz, “How they teach the Holocaust,” 25.
3. Weeden, “State policies.”
4. President’s Commission on the Holocaust, *Statement to the President.*
5. Ibid.
6. Morris, *Curriculum and the Holocaust*, 3.
7. Banks, *Teaching strategies.*
8. Baum, “What I have learned to feel,” 44.
9. Totten, *Holocaust education.*
10. Ibid.
11. Zimmerman, *Holocaust denial*.
12. Berger, “Academia and the Holocaust.”
13. Totten, *Holocaust education.*
14. Ibid., 5
15. Totten, “Holocaust education for K-4 students?”
16. Shawn, “Choosing Holocaust literature,” 144.
17. Deckert-Peaceman, “Holocaust education for K-4 students?”
18. Van Sledright, “To think historically.”
19. Ibid., 1090
20. Baum, “What I have learned to feel,” 44.
21. Baer, “A new algorithm in evil,” 379.
22. Ibid., 384-385.
23. Kidd, “‘A’ is for Auschwitz.”
24. Shawn, “Choosing Holocaust literature,” 141.
25. Dawidowicz, “How they teach the Holocaust,” 25.
26. Totten, *Holocaust education.*
27. Fallace, “Playing Holocaust.”
28. Totten, *Holocaust education,* 119.
29. Dawidowicz, “How they teach the Holocaust,” 31.
30. Greenbaum, *Bearing witness.*
31. Totten, *Holocaust education,* 122-3.

Bibliography

Baer, Elizabeth. “A new algorithm in evil: Children’s literature and the Holocaust.” *The Lion and the Unicorn* 24, (2000): 378-401.

Banks, James. *Teaching strategies for ethnic studies*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2003.

Baum, Rachel N. “‘What I have learned to feel’: The pedagogical emotions of Holocaust education.” *College Literature* 23, no. 3 (1996): 44.

Berger, Alan. “Academia and the Holocaust.” *Judaism* 31, no. 2 (1982): 166-76.

Dawidowicz, Lucy S. “How they teach the Holocaust.” *Commentary* 90, no. 6 (1990): 25.

Deckert-Peaceman, Heike. “Should there be Holocaust education for K-4 students?” *University of Minnesota Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies: Educational Resources*. Accessed April 5, 2006. http://www.chgs.umn.edu/Educational_Resources/Curriculum

Fallace, Thomas. “Playing Holocaust: The origins of the *Gestapo* simulation game.” *Teachers College Record* 109, no. 12 (2007): 2642-65.

Greenbaum, Beth Aviv. *Bearing witness: Teaching about the Holocaust*. . Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2001.

Kidd, Kenneth. “‘A’ is for Auschwitz: Psychoanalysis, trauma theory, and the children’s literature of atrocity.” *Children’s Literature* 33, (2005): 120-49.

Morris, Marla. *Curriculum and the Holocaust: Competing sites of memory and representation*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2001.

President’s Commission on the Holocaust. “Statement to the President.” *President’s Commission on the Holocaust,* Elie Wiesel, chairman, 1979. Accessed July 29, 2006. http://xroads.virginia.edu/~cap/HOLO/holo.htm.

Shawn, Karen. “Choosing Holocaust literature for early adolescents.” In *Teaching and studying about the Holocaust*, edited by Samuel Totten and Stephen Feinberg, 141-155. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon, 2001.

Totten, Samuel. “Holocaust education for K-4 students? The answer is no!” *Social Studies & the Young Learner* 12, no. 1 (1999): 36-9.

———. *Holocaust education: Issues and approaches*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 2002.

Van Sledright, Bruce A. “What does it mean to think historically . . . and how do you teach it?” *Social Education* 68, no. 3 (2004): 230-3.

Weeden, D. (2005). “State policies concerning Holocaust education.” *Education Commission of the States: State Notes.* Accessed April 5, 2006. http://www.ecs.org.

Zimmerman, John. *Holocaust denial*. Maryland: University Press of America, 2000.

Pebbles for Peace:
The Impact of Holocaust Education

Melissa Dawn Mikel
Goodwin Learning Center

Abstract

"Studying the Shoah (Holocaust) forces students to consider what it means to be human and humane by examining the full continuum of individual behavior, from *ultimate evil* to *ultimate good.*"[1] The Pebbles for Peace project was created with the intention to explore these character extremes and to provide tangible examples of choices that can be made in life. This thesis is an auto ethnographic exploration of the Pebbles for Peace project that will include the researcher's narrative reflection on her personal journey through education, specifically Holocaust education, as well as observations of the impact on classroom participation in the project.

"When asked, "How can you bear to teach the Holocaust?" researcher C.W. Syndor gave as his response, "How can we not?"[2]

Purchasing a train ticket is neither a difficult nor remarkable task. Purchasing a train ticket after travelling twenty-one hours in a foreign country and not knowing the language offers a slightly greater challenge, but still not impossible. So why even mention such an insignificant event? The difficulty in the purchase of the ticket was not in the communication or purchase itself; the difficulty was in the destination. Standing in the train station in Krakow, Poland, I purchased a one-way ticket to Oswiecim – better known today as Auschwitz. As I made the purchase I couldn't help but feel a slight shiver of trepidation as I contemplated the number of

people throughout Europe who had made this same purchase to this same destination under completely different circumstances. I was venturing to Oswiecim for an intensive week of training at the Auschwitz State Museum on the Auschwitz-Birkenau Concentration Camp within the context of the Holocaust; those who had travelled before me had lived the deadly history in which I was about to be immersed.

While my experience in no way, shape, or form would come close to resembling the experiences of those who travelled this route in the 1940's, and I certainly by no means am trying to make that comparison, standing on the platform waiting for the train to arrive I couldn't stop my mind from racing to thoughts of what that experience might have been. Books that I had read, photographs that I had explored, research that I had discovered, even personal survivor testimony could not prepare me for this experience: being on the grounds of one of the worst crimes in history.

As I stood on the five-track, slightly run down, typically European, outdoor train platform, I did not fear for my life. I did not witness guards or police randomly meting out punishment, drunk with the power they took in wielding their guns and playing God, determining who would live or die. Having visited Oswiecim on two separate occasions one year ago, I knew my destination; I was not travelling into parts unknown to be 're-settled' with my fractured family that I was being promised with a reunion. I did not face the separation and destruction of my family and community or the terror and dehumanization that had accompanied the occupation of European countries by the Nazi regime and their collaborators. Yet, in waiting for the train's arrival, I had a constant feeling of uneasiness.

As the passenger train arrived, my ears were met with the familiar metal-on-metal, piercing screech. The train car came to a full stop, the doors opened, and I entered a box that was far from deluxe – straight-back, red faux-leather bench seats facing each other with a large window in between. If you pulled hard enough the window would open slightly from the top to let the stifling heat of the car out. This was luxury compared to the cattle cars that previously travelled these tracks transporting the innocent victims to their either immediate or drawn out, tortuous deaths.

As the train pulled out of the station in Krakow I tried to take in my surroundings. Four teenage boys were sitting in the seat in front of me, quietly carrying on a conversation, occasional laughs disturbing the rhythmic hum of the moving train; a young woman stylishly dressed with her Zara shopping bag sat to the right, appearing to be heading home after a day of shopping in the old city, intent on staring out the window; a mother and her two children sat across from me, all reading and writing in notebooks. The young girl gave little attention to the box with the brand new Barbie doll and horse sitting on the seat beside her. They were all riding with me on the train that ended its run in Oswiecim. *The train ends in Oswiecim*, I repeat to myself – so many precious things were ended in Oswiecim. I wondered if the other passengers ever thought about this while they rode the train. They all seemed to be familiar with the ride; I assumed it was not the first time they had taken this journey. Did they ever think about the boarded up stations along the tracks? Were these stations sites of sadness and desperation from families being torn apart? The deep valleys and luscious, green forests – were they sites of terror and execution? I wondered if these thoughts ever crossed their minds, or was this simply the landscape that had become a part of their daily existence, passing by, moving forward, and

letting the mistakes of the past slowly disappear into the new developments and new life that happened with time.

The train moved slowly through the countryside, stopping at every station along the way; because of the frequent stops we also travelled from station to station at a slow pace. The train moved so slowly down the tracks – they moved slowly then too, dragging out the end to an excruciating journey, draining the last bit of strength and dignity from those on the train. We passed roadways where passersby were forced to stop for our train to pass. Impatience could be seen in the drivers through the drumming of their fingers on the steering wheel and the way in which the vehicles were slowly inching forward. Today, life stopped for the train to pass as it slowly rolled down the tracks. Life had been stopped for millions on these tracks in the past.

Each station that passed seemed to add weight to my heart. Why was I doing this? What was I thinking venturing all this way on my own? Why put myself through this emotional distress and turmoil? The clouds thickened and despite the humidity and heat given off by the late day sun that sporadically peaked through the clouds, a chilling breeze passed through the rail car, chilling me to the bone.

Graffiti marked each station - whether it was boarded up or remained a working rail station. The colorful designs, both words and images, seemed to offer a bit of normalcy to the experience. Having travelled through Italy several years earlier by train, graffiti - in my mind - had become a comfortable aspect of the European landscape. Bright colors and cartoon images to lighten the dreariness and degradation of the deteriorating buildings. Most of the words were foreign to me, much of it celebrating and supporting different football teams so I had been told on a previous journey to Poland. I had been drifting in and out of my thoughts when I was sharply snapped back to reality – 'Anty-Jude,' along with a Star of David was spray painted in a

bright orange, simple, thin line, capital letter, free-hand font on the side of a rail station. I grabbed my camera in order to record this sight, something that I felt was necessary as I knew I would think back to the image in my mind and question the validity of the memory due to the state of fatigue under which I was operating.

As the train pulled out of the station I frantically scanned the walls for any further messages of hate or intolerance. I was alert. As the train pulled out of the station I started wondering if I had missed other anti-Semitic messages disguised in the artistic graffiti that littered the stations along the way. I searched for the name of the station to be able to record the town and find it at a later date in relation to Oswiecim. The need for identifying the distance to Oswiecim quickly became unnecessary. The train had very little time to build up any speed as we pulled into the next station only a short distance away – Oswiecim. The spray-painted, anti-Semitic graffiti on the side of the railway station ended up being a single stop before Oswiecim – the town that notoriously became the symbol of 'Anty-Jude' action in the 1940's. With the history of not only the town, but the entire country, continent and even the world, how could the words 'Anty-Jude' along with all of its insidiousness be so publicly displayed in such close proximity to Auschwitz-Birkenau?

One year earlier, I had embarked on my first journey to Poland with sincere, yet naïve intentions. The luxury of time and experience, of course, now allows me this insight when reflecting back on the journey. When I first travelled to Poland I felt that I would return home with answers. I would grasp the unimaginable hatred that resulted in the Holocaust and be able to take this newfound knowledge and share it with the students whom I taught on a daily basis. I certainly was able to see the Holocaust through a lens that is only allowed after having stood on the grounds and, as author and victim of torture survivor Marina Nemat once stated, having

come "face to face with human cruelty" and the capability of humanity at its worst – walking the soil that carried the burden of the despised, feeling the air that sucked the breath out its victims, listening to the sounds of absence from fence-post to barrack to guard tower, and witnessing the souls that had been forced to find their resting place forever on these grounds - did I see things differently upon my return? Yes. Did I have all the answers I was looking for? No. In fact, the questions had multiplied ten-fold. With each visit the questions continued to multiply. Sitting on the train and travelling into the depths of this terrible crime in history was no exception. How could this hatred still exist? As an educator it reinforced not only the importance of ensuring that Holocaust education was a part of my classroom, it illustrated the *need* for Holocaust education to be in *every* classroom.

Several years prior to this journey to Poland, as a result of drive and determination of the students whom I was teaching, I had started a project called Pebbles for Peace. This project, which at its core was commemorating the Jewish victims of the Holocaust and creating a tangible record of what six million actually looked like through the collecting of six million pebbles, became – and continues to be - the foundation of peace education at the school. It allowed both the staff and students to create connections: connections between the past and the present; connections between global and local events; connections between each other and the ways in which we treat those around us. The lessons and discussions that built the project from a small school initiative to a much larger community project allowed us to investigate the "…issues that stand as moral and ethical challenges within the larger framework of humanity."[3] Students were able to delve into 'real' history and 'real' stories. They were given a voice, an opportunity to speak about incredible stories carried out by real people, and witnessed firsthand what it meant to be human and humane. Characteristics such as respect, integrity, empathy,

courage and responsibility were no longer words on a page or ways we defined fictional characters, they were real character attributes that defined real people's lives – choices that illustrated deep caring, choices that real people made each day that determined their moral values and beliefs; values and beliefs that we could understand because they represented choices that we faced each day as well. The Pebbles for Peace project, while including education on the harsh facts of the Holocaust, has a focus on "soul, love and wisdom," keys that are identified by researcher Grace Feuerverger as being essential to creating a meaningful curriculum for our children today.

I had a unique introduction into teaching. When I graduated from teacher's college, I stepped into a teaching position at a new, small private school that was opening very close to home. I had built a relationship with the owners through their summer school day camp. I also looked at this opportunity, not only as a great teaching position, but an incredible professional learning opportunity for myself. The owner of the school had taught for 31 years in the public system and was a wealth of knowledge, skills, and strategies. Her reasoning for opening the school was a result of her frustration with the public system in their handling of children with learning challenges. She felt that the current education system was working so hard to fit the students to the programs that a large population was being left behind, never realizing their abilities and potential because they did not fit the 'mold.' The school's motto was "Success: A Child's Right: Not all children learn the same thing on the same day or in the same way." This school, which would follow the curriculum expectations mandated by the Ontario Ministry of Education, would provide the opportunity to allow children to learn at their own pace and to find a lifelong love of education and learning. Connelly and Clandinin refer directly to the school's philosophy, "Empowering relationships involved feelings of connectedness that are developed in

situations of equality, caring and mutual purpose and intention."[4] In order to reach the students we needed to know the students. "The power and privilege of teaching lies in its potential to connect with every student's deepest needs."[5] Many of the students we worked with had become disillusioned with the education system and felt that teachers were working against them, not with/for their best interests; therefore we needed to make a connection with them in some way in order to gain their trust. With their trust we would be able to help them gain confidence, recognize their strengths, address their individual challenges and pave the way for them to embark on a lifelong journey of learning. In the early days the challenge was finding the interest and passion that would drive the students to take the leap of trust and immerse themselves in their learning.

While the school followed the Ontario Curriculum, there was flexibility within the material covered. Specific and overall expectations shaped the program material presented; however, the focus wasn't always on the content, rather on the learning skills/concepts behind the subjects. We felt that the skills were necessary to move the students forward and prepare them for the next step in their academic career, but the content could be shaped around the students' interests to engage them and give them a voice in their learning. For example, in social studies / history / geography the concepts behind the subject include: Significance, Cause and Consequence, Continuity and Change, Patterns and Trends, Interrelationships and Perspective.[6] These concepts underlie all social studies thinking and learning, according to the curriculum document, therefore are used to explore all topics that are presented. We extended this belief to our own approach to social studies allowing us to explore areas of the students' interests. Topics like the World Wars, the civil rights movement, racism, genocide, and bullying were ideas regularly requested by the students, along with the subject of the Holocaust.

When studying the Holocaust, the question of, '*What is six million?'* was often asked. None of us had ever seen a collection of six million of anything, so to understand that not only six million Jewish people were murdered in the Holocaust, but approximately eleven million people for all different reasons had been annihilated, the enormity of the numbers were simply too much to truly understand.

The early approach to understanding and building connectivity was through personal testimony supported by historical fact. Language class became the primary instructional period for Holocaust education. *Four Perfect Pebbles* by Marion Blumenthal Lazan, *Number the Stars* by Lois Lowry, *Night* by Elie Wiesel and *The Diary of Anne Frank* became priorities on our reading list.

We were also fortunate to have survivors of the Holocaust visit the school. Former Polish political prisoner Eugene Moshynski came in to speak and share his personal testimony and to help build our understanding of the impact of the atrocities of the Holocaust on numerous occasions. At the age of 15, Eugene was riding his bicycle down the road in his Polish hometown when a military truck stopped and arrested him. He became a slave laborer for the remaining four years of the war and never saw his family again as they were all killed during his internment. When Eugene came in to speak to the students, the death of his family members was a part of his story, but they were not his *whole* story. Eugene told of the bonds that were created between prisoners, he spoke of the ways in which the prisoners resisted their captivity, and he spoke of their desire for freedom. He shared items he had made while imprisoned – a chess set and a pair of knit socks became two tangible examples of resistance for the students. They learned that if Eugene had been caught with these items, he could have been shot as they were considered contraband, a misuse of German property. Both items had been made while Eugene

was on work detail, forced labor for the Nazi regime. The students physically touched a part of history. They discussed these items after the visit and related the simplicity of these items to their own lives. One student commented that he had a whole drawer full of socks and would throw them out with no second thought. Yet the value of this one pair of socks for Eugene that had originated more than 60 years earlier and had been made from a sweater that was stolen and unwoven to be re-knit, was paramount to his survival.

Students were able to extend what they learned from Eugene about the Holocaust to the need to protect the freedoms that we have in Canada today – the need to speak up and be involved in our communities. The need to value what we have and not take it for granted. Eugene became the living example of connectedness, demonstrating to the students that the lessons of the Holocaust went far beyond a history class. A parent interviewed by Grace Feuerverger in a study of her ESL students eloquently stated, "…we are all living together and that means that our cultures – we have to bring them into the public – into the mainstream. We have to learn to share what we know . . . if you respect your neighbor then you will be respected."[7] The students understood this lesson of respect. The discussions following Eugene's visit were thoughtful comments and questions that investigated democracy, what freedom means, and solutions for resolving conflict. How do people commit these atrocities? How do people not stand up and speak out? Where did the problem start? Thoughtful, intelligent questions such as these elicited reaction from even the quietest student. Academically we witnessed the most reluctant students become more involved, not only in these discussions, but in all subject areas. They became more engaged in their learning, asking questions, contributing positively and productively to the classroom environment.

Socially, an interesting trend became visible in both classroom and playground settings.

Following these intense, meaningful discussions, it appeared that respect was internalized more regularly and independently. Students did not interrupt each other during class discussions, a problem that had initially plagued the classroom. They allowed each person to speak and waited their turn. No comment or question was laughed at or ridiculed inside or out of the classroom. In fact, there were many times where as the teacher, I became facilitator, observing as the discussion was taken over by the students in the class. They began supporting each other with answers to questions or echoing the questions with which others were struggling. In one discussion, where the question *How do people do this to each other?* was raised, another student responded immediately with "I don't understand either. They all had families too. What if it had been their family that was hated?" While these discussions intensified around Eugene's visits and were brought up again during specific topics and themes, they were not exclusive to one particular time of year. Oftentimes the most powerful and meaningful exchanges were a result of a great teaching moment that the students would initiate, for example, when a problem had occurred on the schoolyard. In one instance, one student was intentionally excluded from a game on the schoolyard by a peer. A third student who had watched it all happen as a participant in the game compared the situation to Eugene being taken away from his family and friends – he had been intentionally excluded by the Nazis. This wasn't okay and a change needed to be made according to the third student who had brought the issue to my attention. Students would recall a message from Eugene and make a suggestion on how to solve the problem in a peaceful manner.

In 2007, six years after the school had been opened, one of the teachers brought the documentary *Paperclips* to school and it was shown to the students. *Paperclips* is the story of Whitwell Middle School in the small town of Whitwell, Tennessee and their quest to grasp an understanding of what six million looked like. The number six million, representing the number

of Jewish victims of the Holocaust, was such an enormous number that none of the students could envision how many people this was; it was too big to understand. We could understand this question as it had been raised in our own studies many times. Given the challenge of finding something relevant to collect to provide a tangible understanding of the number, the Whitwell students determined that the paperclip, a sign of resistance in Norway during the Second World War, was significant and collectible. The documentary followed their journey from the collection of the paperclips to the establishment of a Holocaust memorial at their school where today, they have an original rail car and a collection of more than 30 million paperclips on display.

Watching the documentary, my students were inspired to begin their own collection. *What can we collect*? was the immediate response to the documentary. Offering the same challenge: find something relevant to collect, resulted in their response of pebbles. In researching the tradition, the significance of a stone left on a Jewish grave has many different explanations, from personal to traditional to religious. The students that made this suggestion offered the explanation that a stone left on a grave indicated that someone had come to visit a loved one that had passed away and that person had not been forgotten. And thus the Pebbles for Peace project began.

We, the staff and students, started collecting pebbles in October of 2007 with the intent to create an extension to our current peace garden that would display the six million pebbles. The garden had already been established in connection to our peace studies. As a school, staff and students, we had wanted to create a space to go to when we were feeling frustrated, angry, sad, or happy and reflective. It was our first *do something* project that we had taken on as a school. There were several challenges in the collection.

As we embarked on the journey, there was also the intention to ensure that as the educators, we were taking an approach to the subject matter in a sensitive and effective manner. While we had seen the positive results both socially and academically in students firsthand due to their participation in this topic prior to the project, we wanted to ensure we had academic support and guidance to extend our own personal learning as well as the knowledge to support our students as we carried out this project and extended and deepened the meaning and experience. The field of education takes many interesting turns and leads you down paths that you rarely anticipate – provided you keep an open mind and take the leap when the path changes course. While my initial thoughts about this project were based on the students' interest and the potential impact it could have on their lives, "I did not realize it then but I had just embarked on a quest for meaning in both my personal and professional life."[8] Little did I know, this project was about to change my life forever.

Karen Riley states, "The study of history allows students to probe, inquire, and practice problem solving techniques while at the same time evaluate behaviors which have been influenced by societal values of the past."[9] For students to truly learn these skills they require time and in-depth coverage of a subject. She believes that for students to learn these valuable skills along with "employing critical thinking," students must be provided with models. According to Riley, "The Holocaust as a model has endless possibilities."[10] We had already laid a foundation of Holocaust education by including Holocaust novels in our literacy studies, including Holocaust films in our curriculum and inviting survivors to speak. We wanted to continue to include these components, but take the learning to a deeper level – instill critical thinking skills, develop reflective writing and build character education and art studies into the Pebbles for Peace project; infuse Holocaust education and lessons learned from this period into

all subject areas. Consistent themes in how-to-teach the Holocaust can be found in the research of Doron Avraham, Geoffrey Short, Thomas Misco, Nurith Ben-Bassat, and Carole Ann Reed.[11] According to these researchers, teaching the Holocaust should include:

1. Consistent presentation of the Holocaust; reflect age and cognitive ability of students;
2. Personal stories/testimony from many perspectives;
3. A study of the specific circumstances;
4. Making the connection from past to present; and
5. Moving forward – connect to present day.

We felt we had already started with the initial introduction to these topics: moving from the big concepts, inward – external to internal; global impact to personal. The creation of a safe, caring environment within the classroom is integral to the effectiveness of this programming – again, something that we felt we had established. We had gained the trust of our students and would continue to build on the environment of deep caring and safety within the classroom structure, especially when new students joined the project as it progressed. We believed that students needed to feel comfortable to ask the difficult questions that they had on their minds and that they were able to express the emotions they felt as the program progressed without fear of persecution or judgment. We also felt it was imperative that each student find their voice through this experience and have the confidence to express themselves and their connection to the material. Above all, the content of instruction could not focus on the death and destruction, rather the hope and courage through lessons learned and actions of remarkable individuals who would not accept hate and intolerance. Yes the Holocaust was one of the darkest periods in our world's history, but there were also beacons of light that shone through the darkness in the form of humane acts and efforts to maintain and protect the dignity of the victims. Finally, as Stefan

Wilkanowicz emphasized in a collection of writings about teaching the Holocaust, we must teach not only that the Holocaust *did* happen, but that it *can* happen.[12] The Pebbles for Peace project was a way, in my view, of doing something to guard against the repetition of history, a way to take action and create positive change.

1. Consistent Presentation

"Education without courage is useless."[13]

There is often great concern and debate around how young to begin teaching the Holocaust. While caution does need to be exercised to avoid traumatizing students, Carrington and Troyna found in their research, "that young children are able to cope intellectually and emotionally with political topics previously thought suitable only for an older age group."[14] Use of appropriate language, approaching the subject with sensitivity, being aware of the emotional and developmental readiness of each individual student, creating a culture of caring within the classroom environment and opening up lines of communication for students, teachers, and parents as a team of learners allows for the topic to be approached. While the students were grouped into similar age and/or ability groups within the school, the Pebbles for Peace project was an initiative for the whole school, Junior Kindergarten to Grade 8. Holocaust education with the Grades 6, 7 and 8 students was more in-depth and offered more detail to the historic facts of the event in comparison to the younger grades; however, we did not avoid using the appropriate terminology or explaining the history when questions were asked. As Ruth Shoemaker asserts, "appropriateness of various approaches is determined by students' developmental readiness."[15] We were highly cognizant of each child's readiness and it was reflected in our daily lessons and activities. We evaluated student readiness based on a number of factors. We listened for

questions that demonstrated an ability to seek deeper meaning in their academic work in all subject areas, including current events and novel studies. We observed and recorded comments that were being shared, evaluating whether the student was able to offer thoughts and ideas that related past experiences to the new material that was being presented. We evaluated the emotional readiness of the students based on their interactions with teachers and peers. We looked for opportunities that the students shared where they demonstrated empathy, responsibility, respect, integrity, and courage both through their words and in their actions. Finally, we looked for interest in the topic. There was no clear scale that indicated readiness and not all factors needed to be in place in order to include the student in the study of the Holocaust as each area is further developed through the experience; however, these were all factors that contributed to our decision of how in-depth to present the topic.

With the older students I witnessed, "…studying the Shoah becomes a vehicle that allows students to engage in sophisticated conversations that stretch their understanding of the world and their ability to evaluate the many complex, multilayered moral situations they will encounter as adults."[16] In one lesson that was based on Holocaust survivor Simon Wiesenthal's story *The Sunflower*, the topic of forgiveness was raised. On a forced labor detail at a hospital, Wiesenthal had been taken to the bedside of a dying Nazi soldier. This soldier's Catholic upbringing had led him to seek absolution before death in order to reach the afterlife. The soldier had asked for a "Jew" and Wiesenthal was delivered. This soldier confessed to horrific actions he had personally taken against entire Jewish communities, including locking one community of Jewish citizens in their local synagogue and burning it to the ground, shooting anyone that tried to escape. When asked for forgiveness, Wiesenthal said nothing; he left the room. His explanation was that he was not able to grant forgiveness for something that was not done directly to him.

By granting forgiveness he would have accepted Nazi ideology of Jews as one being, one interchangeable with the next possessing one singular identity. Wiesenthal struggled with his response – had he done the right thing? Was he perpetuating hatred or taking a valid stand? Wiesenthal ended the story asking the reader: *What would you do?* Students were asked to formulate a response to Wiesenthal's question. The initial discussion began slowly with few students offering their thoughts. However, once the participation began, it was very difficult to bring the experience to a close. One student who started the conversation related to his own Catholic background and stated that he would have forgiven the soldier. Citing the pressure of Nazi ideology, his peers and the threat of death if you didn't take part in these atrocities as his reasons to forgive the dying soldier. Another student supported this decision by saying, "he didn't have a choice." There was hesitation after this initial response as many disagreed with the opinion. The next student to speak very cautiously approached the subject by asking what if it had been his family in the synagogue. The discourse that followed was conducted in a respectful manner and most students weighed in with their thoughts. The discussion was not led by any one student in particular nor was any idea discouraged or ridiculed. This activity reflected most of the discussions that were held about the Holocaust. Students who previously remained silent in literature and math lessons found their voice and shared their thoughts and opinions. They asked questions in class, then read books independently and searched for information on the internet, bringing it in the following day to extend the previous day's discussion. They initiated conversations with their parents at home and shared the information they were learning with their family members and, on occasion, with peers in settings outside of their classroom.

One of the school tasks for the Pebbles for Peace project was to send out letters requesting pebbles from actors and actresses, politicians and presidents, newspapers and

magazines, friends and family. The mailing list was generated by all of the students in the school. When letters and pebbles started pouring in, we shared these letters with all of the students. While the level of understanding differed, the underlying topics of respect, love, human rights, and justice were a consistent part of the discussion for all grade levels. The relevance of the study was illustrated perfectly by one of the Grade 1 students in the school. Very early in the project, Global News Toronto found out about the project and decided to feature the students and the project on their *Making a Difference* segment of the evening news. News anchor Susan Hay travelled with a camera crew and interviewed a number of students. We had received a donation of polished stones for the project and while interviewing the Grade 1 student, she held a polished stone up and asked if all of our pebbles looked like that one specific stone. The Grade 1 student quickly responded by picking up a stone from the gravel driveway and answering that we collected all different kinds of pebbles, "after all, all different kinds of people died in the Holocaust." This student went on to explain different types of people who had been persecuted – young, old, different religions, people from different countries, and so on. When the camera was turned off, Susan Hay turned to ask if we had practiced the response with the student. We had not. We did not have any preparation for how the day would go, who would have the opportunity to be interviewed or what questions would be asked.

While debates surrounding age appropriateness are lively and plentiful, there is support for presentation of Holocaust education at younger ages. A teacher in Ruth Shoemaker's study revealed, "Indeed, the longer I teach, the more I think that we need to get at the underlying issues of the Holocaust – discrimination, prejudice, stereotypes, etc. – at a much earlier age, certainly beginning in grade three. Yes, there will be kids who are too young for that – but I think it needs to become part of their vocabulary before they learn behavior and then essentially have to

'unlearn' it in middle school or later."[17] This Grade 1 student's response in the interview was of his own interpretation of the meaning of the pebbles and the project based on the discussions that we had held in our lessons. At six years old, he had an understanding of discrimination and the consequences of that type of hate when left unchecked.

One of the issues we did initially face in teaching the Holocaust in a multi-age setting was teaching for extended periods of time from one year to the next. The question was how to make the material an important learning experience from year to year without tiring the students of the topic – often cited as one of the dangers of multi-grade level Holocaust education. As Kimberley Ducey stated, "We need to continue to develop ways to make the material intellectually challenging, significant, emotionally engaging, and interesting."[18] After the second year of teaching the Holocaust in the school (before the Pebbles for Peace project had started), monotony of the subject proved not to be an issue at all, rather the repetition a strength. We were able to take the previous years' learning and build on that knowledge to create further learning opportunities with different approaches and from different perspectives. "We learn the same thing in many different ways and each way gives us a layer of understanding that builds a foundation upon which our understanding rests."[19] The continual development of the content allowed students to question, to draw on prior learning and work to develop their critical thinking skills. The learning was no longer coming from the teachers alone; the students themselves were assisting in the development of the classroom discussions and content of the lessons.

2. Personal Testimony

"Survival is a privilege which entails obligations. I am forever asking myself what I can do for those who have not survived. The answer I have found for myself is: 'I want to be their mouthpiece.'"[20]

"It is difficult for learners to understand the scale of genocidal policies when they are rendered as statistical abstractions."[21] Personal testimony and humanizing the time period is imperative in teaching the history of the Holocaust. "…One needs to reveal their personal stories. . . Holocaust education should strive to reconstruct identities and stories of hitherto anonymous victims, track their history, culture, communities and lives . . . to re-construct the lives – with all its aspects and meaning – of those murdered, and not just their deaths."[22] To extend Doron Avraham's assertion, the stories of the perpetrators, the bystanders, the resisters, the righteous and the survivors need to be included in this as well.

Perpetrators need to be seen as human. While their actions were monstrous, they were human beings that started out the same way we all did. They made choices along the way that make it difficult to understand and sometimes view them as human, but they must be seen in this way. The fact that we all have good and evil inside of us is a key discussion to present to students. A college professor teaching Simon Wiesenthal's *The Sunflower* insists that her students understand "most of us could be Karl [Nazi soldier] as easily as we could be Simon [Holocaust survivor]."[23] We all have choices and consequences to accompany those choices – they may be difficult choices, but they are still a choice we get to make.

"We must understand the dynamics of participation in acts of genocide and other human rights violations if we are to empower youth for humane, active, and morally engaged participation in a democracy."[24] Students need to understand that bystanders were enablers of

the Holocaust. While it may not have been active participation, the lack of action demonstrated by the average person indicated to the perpetrators they could get away with the acts they were committing because no one, or at least very few, would put any effort into stopping what was happening. Many bystanders turned their head the other way as their neighbors were being marched off. Many bystanders didn't question the "disappearance" of community members and colleagues. Many bystanders listened to the hateful messages broadcast on the radio and displayed in posters and in print, but did not raise their voice in protest. Bystanders could be found all over Europe. Bystanders could also be identified worldwide. "By learning about the Holocaust, students and teachers come to understand . . . the necessity of speaking out against abuse of power and the danger of remaining indifferent to human suffering."[25] It is Barbara Coloroso who makes the connection of the short path from bullying to genocide. The relevance of including the bystander in the study is imperative in connecting the relevance of the past to the present. This has been one of the easiest connections for students of all ages to make. They understand the role of the bystander because they have all done it. Discussions regularly include this terminology. For those that have entered into the study of the Holocaust, they will often make reference to the dangers of the bystander syndrome based on the knowledge they have gained through the study of the Holocaust. Primary evidence in the form of photographs has been used in the Pebbles for Peace project to illustrate the role of the bystander. Photographs of Nazi SS[26] laughing at Jewish citizens who they have forced to clean the streets with their beard while German citizens look on; German police kicking Jewish men who have fallen on the street, faces lit up with smiles; Jewish men being paraded through the streets with placards around their neck as passersby watch – some turning away others looking directly at the men, while others still smile from ear to ear. These artifacts generate discussion on active and passive bystanders –

is there a difference? What choices would you have in situations like these? How do you change what's happening? The questions are student directed and focused on generating deep caring and a connectivity to the past. Entering into a discussion on choice is mandatory for the bystander role as well. We cannot minimize the difficulty in making the choice to stand idly by, but it was still a choice.

Voices that are less often heard are those that resisted and/or rescued. For some, there is a struggle to include these voices, as the roles they played were disproportionate to that of the bystander. There is a fear of distorting history by focusing too much on the resister and/or rescuer. "The righteous need to be presented carefully in order to show balance – we do not want to distort the past to make it look like more people stood up and resisted."[27] The righteous and the resisters represent the "ideal" – those that risked everything against all odds: they smuggled food for the starving; they offered medicine for the sick; they hid those being hunted; they offered a kind word when the world had gone mad; they demonstrated kindness when intolerance was the norm. The righteous and the resisters stood firmly in their beliefs despite the deterioration of humanity around them. They made the choice to do something. The righteous and resisters exemplify character traits that are being promoted in character education programs in schools across Ontario. They bring to life the characteristics that are studied: respect, initiative, integrity, honesty, and responsibility. In the Pebbles for Peace project we have introduced students to real people who made the choice to stand up. People like Irena Sendler, who rescued 2,500 children from the Warsaw ghetto. Smuggling them out of the ghetto through sewers, in garbage bags and tool chests, she found homes for these children with sympathetic Polish citizens. Recording their names and new identities on little pieces of paper and hiding them in a jar, her plan was to reunite families at the end of the war. She was, however, reported

and arrested by the Gestapo.[28] After being tortured for days but revealing nothing, the Polish underground managed to bribe a guard and she was released on her day of execution. Irena lived to be 98 years old. Despite all of her courage and perseverance during that time, when asked about her heroism, she consistently responded, "I didn't do enough." This model of integrity and courage has had a tremendous impact on the students that have heard her story. Parents have come into the school asking about Irena Sendler because their children have gone home talking about her. Discussions about *What I would have done if I was Irena* have been overheard during lunch discussions and on the schoolyard. And this is only one example. There are thousands of individuals who chose to say no to hate and are recognized as the Righteous among the Nations.

The survivors represent not only their own personal stories, but also the voices of those that were silenced. Survivors offer a unique perspective – the persecuted that survived. They can share from firsthand experience what it is like to be hated, and hated for the most sinister reason – because of one aspect of who you were at birth, something you could not change. Survivors offer a glimpse into the past that none of us today can ever come close to personally understanding. Survivors like Eugene Moshynski have provided life lessons in resistance and resiliency for the students, and inspired thoughts and ideas that will stay with them for the rest of their life. Survivors like Faigie Libman have shared optimism and hope through the darkest and most desperate of times. Faigie, as a young child, had a Shirley Temple doll that her aunt from New York had sent to her as a young child in Kaunas, Lithuania. When the Nazis came to their door, her mother told her she could take one item with her. She chose her doll. The Shirley Temple doll travelled with her to different ghettos and work camps. On one occasion, having been taken with her mother on a work detail at a munitions factory, she returned to the labor camp amidst a chorus of moans and sobs. All of the children had been rounded up that day.

Parents were returning to their imprisonment to find their children gone, never to be heard from again. If Faigie had been left behind in the camp that day, she would have been taken as well. All of her friends were gone and she became aware of the seriousness of her situation. She took her doll and smashed it to pieces. Many years later a kind stranger made Faigie a doll to try to repair the sadness and despair of the past, a reminder that there are good people in the world today. When Faigie spoke to my students and showed her doll, you could have heard a pin drop in the room. Later, as the students moved back to the classrooms, listening to the discussions, they all focused on the doll and the random act of kindness. In a reflection following the experience one male student wrote, "I think the doll was a way to try to repair a missing piece of your heart."

Travelling to sites of the Holocaust in Eastern Europe, I have been fortunate to have had the accompaniment of a survivor who travelled these paths at the age of fifteen. He was arrested and imprisoned in Auschwitz-Birkenau Concentration Camp along with his family because of his religion – he was Jewish. He and his family were deemed not fit to live. They were not of the human species anymore, race scientists worked diligently to prove this; therefore they did not deserve the treatment of the human race. This survivor bravely ventures back to these sites of sadness and destruction despite the fact that his mother, father, younger brothers and baby sister were murdered on these grounds. I have stood on the *Judenrampe* where he last saw his mother and siblings before they were marched to the gas chamber and crematorium. I have walked past the remains of gas chamber and crematorium V where he thought he saw bodies jumping into the fire. Now, of course, we know that he was witnessing the burning of the bodies in 1944 in the outdoor pits because the ovens could not keep up with the bodies being gassed in the chambers. The Nazis were losing the war, therefore they stepped up their efforts to complete the Final

Solution.[29] We have entered the *Sauna* where he witnessed his first murder – a young man aboard the same transport train that drew them slowly through the countryside from the Czech Republic to southern Poland lost his glasses in the shower. As the young man frantically searched on his hands and knees for his glasses that had fallen off his face as a result of the assault he received from guards moving him through the showers, he was stomped to death by an SS guard. I have stood outside the hospital where this survivor was rescued from the hell of Birkenau by a fellow inmate in a rare act of kindness and compassion. Following a severe beating for not working hard enough, this survivor was brought back to the hospital for treatment (the hospital was set up in case of a Red Cross visit, but was also used as an attempt to maintain the slave labor that was enabling the industrial growth of the Third Reich). If your hospital visit lasted for more than three days, you were placed on a stretcher and delivered to the gas chamber. This survivor was on the stretcher – but for some reason fate stepped in and changed the course of his life. A Polish doctor, arrested as a political prisoner trying to escape Poland to join the Home Army, pulled this survivor off of the stretcher and gave him a job in the hospital, an act that to this day he credits with saving his life. I have met the family of this doctor. I have witnessed these sites with one of the most courageous and inspiring people I have ever had the opportunity to meet. I have walked the grounds, experiencing firsthand the life-altering impact of learning this history with a person who lived through it. By introducing a 'face' to accompany the statistic, students learn to see the human cost of the Holocaust. To apply to future situations, students will link these lessons to examples of injustice today. "People possess a stronger tendency to help those they see as similar to themselves and with whom they have a special bond or commitment."[30] Students will be more apt to 'see' victims of injustice today and make the choice to do something to make a positive difference.

I can say with complete confidence that most of the students that have been witness to survivor testimony have had their lives positively changed by the event. One of our academic exercises following survivor testimony is to write letters to the survivor to express our gratitude for their willingness to share such a painful part of their past. A challenge that we always pose to students is to extend the lessons they have learned by connecting them to their own personal lives. The responses are vast, but the commonality is the humanity and hope:

"Thank you so, so, so much for coming and speaking to us. Your story, paired with your positive attitude was inspiring . . . when you look at everything you went through and how positive you are now, it sort of goes to show how small our problems really are."

"The message I took away was always have hope. After everything you have been through, you are still one of the most positive people I have ever met."

"You had a positive impact on everyone in my school."
"What has stayed with me is to cherish life."
"I knew what the Holocaust was and what they did but hearing it from a survivor, it takes it to a whole new level . . . It makes me want to stand up and say something."
"It taught me to accept other people. I can tell other people about the impact of labeling and stereotyping."
"The most important thing I learned was that if people actually do try, innocent civilians can be saved."

3. Study of Specific Circumstances

The study of the Holocaust is the study of a time and period in history, it is not to be used as an era on which to pass judgment. At the very beginning, establishment of the key concepts is important. What does genocide mean? Where did the term originate? How do you arrive at genocide? What is racism, prejudice, stereotype, bias? What is respect and integrity? Initial establishment of these definitions allows for further application as the study proceeds. These terms will no longer just be words, they will be infused throughout the studies yet to come. The reinforcement of these terms from year to year with the Pebbles for Peace project has been integral to the continued growth and development of the study. It cannot be assumed that with one introduction to the word, the students have a firm grasp on the concept and a full understanding of what the terms mean. This is sophisticated terminology with even more difficult content to understand. Time and repetition is needed to fully develop comprehension.

The importance of the consistent review can be seen in the number of students who have returned to the school following their graduation and have shared the lasting impact of the project. One of the students who was part of the Pebbles for Peace project from the very beginning expressed that the project, for her, led to a clear understanding of the Holocaust and anti-Semitism. She confidently defined much of the terminology for her classmates once she was introduced to the subject in her Grade 10 history course. She had been quite surprised to learn that most of her peers had heard of the Holocaust, but had not been able to identify that "religion, physical appearance, age, and sexual preference" were all factors that contributed to persecution during the Holocaust. She felt there was a misconception that Jewish people were the only victims during the period of the Holocaust.

While a great deal of research into Holocaust education indicates success and advocates for the increased exposure for students to this education, there are some cautions to be offered. Most commonly expressed is the fear of the study of the Holocaust inspiring children with violent tendencies – glamorizing the Nazi regime and leading to a fascination with the movement that continues to be very active in our world today. Secondly, the fear of confirming, rather than dislodging, stereotypes i.e. the Jew as money-hungry and cheap, the German as controlling and orderly. These concerns, issued by Geoffrey Short, Bruce Carrington and Nurith Ben-Bassat, are important to consider. The Holocaust cannot be a tool for perpetuating further hatred. However, the cautions also cannot serve as a deterrent to reduce, limit or exempt Holocaust education from the education curriculum either. These dangers must guide our practice as educators, and lead us to create curriculum that is thorough, authentic, historically accurate, emotionally compelling and relatable to society today. Maintaining these guideposts, keeping the studies student-focused, encouraging students to raise their voice and explore their thoughts, opinions and misconceptions and addressing issues that may be difficult head on will allow for a successful, meaningful and effective learning experience rich with connectivity and development of deep caring. As Wilson Frampton so eloquently states, "Education must not reflect the societal silence that polluted the mainstream of humanity only a short time ago."[31] We must demonstrate the courage to teach these difficult, sensitive subjects, not because we have to, but because they offer life changing, 'aha' moments that will shape our lives and those we teach forever.

4. Making the Connection:

"The Holocaust is not only the tragedy of the Jewish people; it is the tragedy of all of us, and we all are responsible for it." ~Stanislaw Obirek SJ

The Holocaust happened more than 70 years ago, how does this relate to our lives today? Connelly and Clandinin claim that, "Empowering relationships involve feelings of 'connectedness' that are developed in situations of equality, caring and mutual purpose and intention."[32] What do we do with this information that we learn about the Holocaust? How do events from the past impact actions on the schoolyard? How does this information impact our daily interactions with our family? With our peers? With our communities? What have these real stories meant to each individual on a personal level? These questions are repeatedly investigated in the Pebbles for Peace project. The responses vary from class to class, from year to year, and even sometimes from day to day. The connections that we make, the lessons that impact our lives are shaped by our own personal stories. I am repeatedly asked what my connection is to the Holocaust. I have no familial ties, I am not Jewish, nor am I a particularly religious person. I struggle with the answer to this question. I feel that to answer with: I am human and we are connected through humanity, could be perceived as trite or insincere. Yet, this is how I feel. "When we know ourselves to be connected to all others, acting compassionately is simply the natural thing to do."[33] Finding our connectedness, realizing that when we strip away all labels and barriers that we place on people, we are all human. As Canadian Member of Parliament Irwin Cotler recently stated at a charitable event, "all acts of hatred are an attack on humanity." The Holocaust was a period where humanity was left behind. If we can find a way to reclaim that humanity, to teach children to have an open mind and to think critically, then we can find a connectedness that maybe – just maybe – will change the path of hatred and intolerance in this world to respect, love and compassion.

Students who have graduated from the school offer a unique perspective when they reflect back on the Pebbles for Peace project. Oftentimes they identify patience, empathy and respect as the key lessons from the project and ways to relate to the topic today – 'real' life examples that create a connection from the past to the present. One student felt some people were hesitant to teach topics such as the Holocaust, feeling that it wouldn't benefit the students. It was clear that she felt they couldn't be more wrong. Many students, past and present, cite that studying the Holocaust is a call to action, a lesson in the power of the individual to make a difference.

Empowerment, I believe, comes through voice. Allowing students to find their voice – to express themselves, to ask questions, to engage in genuine dialogue - regardless of how long it may take for them to find their voice, is an integral piece to establishing connectedness and making the content relevant today. As Melinda Fine identifies in her study of the Facing History program, "changes in consciousness do not come easily. Connections students draw between historical subject matter and their everyday lives seem profound at one moment and tenuous at the next."[34] The Pebbles for Peace project has provided a unique opportunity for students to find their voice and to witness firsthand the connectedness that we all have through this project, not only from a local perspective but also within a global context. Letters requesting pebbles have been sent out each year to help us reach our goal of six million pebbles. We encouraged people in our request letter that if they wanted to send a reply with their pebble explaining their donation, they were welcome to do so. The letters have come in by the hundreds and have contained overwhelming, heartfelt sentiment. One example of a letter was from an anonymous source. The letter read:

> I have read the story about the pebbles. I have two pebbles and their names: David and Jackie. Both were young Jews, early 20's,

> and they were hiding in my apartment with the great help of my landlady. One morning, very early, June 1943 the Gestapo came to arrest them (someone must have called them) and took them to an army camp and from there I suppose to one of the death camps. I went to visit them while they were waiting to be sent away. I never saw them again, they didn't survive . . .
> Yes, you are right, it was only 20 years before the Beatles, but to me it was like a century ago. . .
> Let us make sure it will never happen again. I am now in my 80's but I will never forget those two completely innocent young men whose crimes were just to be Jews!
> I am including two letters they sent me while at the Caserne Dossin in Malines, Belgium, waiting to be sent away . . . to the work camps. I am also including one of the 'blazon' they were supposed to wear on their clothes at all times.
> Two of the young people we were hiding survived and were later married. Michael and Dina.

This letter, along with the two pebbles that were mailed to us, is often referred to by students as being the most memorable. The copies of the notes from 'David and Jackie' along with the yellow Star of David were real. The students were able to see that with the Pebbles for Peace project, they were having an impact on the lives of those that had lived the history we were learning about. Our project validated this anonymous writer's efforts to rescue during the Holocaust as much as it made the importance of our project real and relevant to the students today. Remembering, commemorating the lives lost, had taken a tangible form – students could read the letter, touch the letter, hold it in their hands – the difference they were making was right in front of them. The connection from the past to the present didn't seem so distant.

Letters that simply included a pebble touched hearts in the same manner:

"This is a pebble from the beach in front of our house. My grandson brought it to me when he was two years old. He is now eighteen. I am happy to have it included in this worthy Endeavour."

The value of the pebble was evident in this letter, and yet she had decided to share the pebble with us. We now became the protector of the pebble. There is great responsibility that has come with the pebbles. The students are very cautious around them. Once they are counted, the pebbles are poured very carefully into our collection pile by the students. There is a gentleness and care that is put into the pebbles that indicates a realization of the responsibility. One student early in the project suggested we estimate the number of pebbles that fit per bucket in order to help us move along more quickly. Another student responded immediately and with great concern – we could not estimate as every single pebble represented a life lost and every person counted. These pebbles were no longer pebbles; they were people. We had become the guardians of these lost souls - the guardians of memory. We, the members of the Pebbles for Peace project, will carry on the testimony and memories that we have learned, we will share these treasured histories with future generations. We are living the lessons that have been learned from the Holocaust in order to do our part to make the world a better place. It is my belief that once the connectedness has been found, it will be carried within us wherever we may go - teachers and students alike, no matter where our life journey takes us. I feel the tenuousness in thoughtful comments and understanding that Melinda Fine identified has been limited in this project and it is my belief that the letters from these complete strangers who continually pour their hearts out to us is a primary reason.

Parents, throughout the period of this project, have shared at different times the connections that they are making with the Pebbles for Peace project as well. For some, they have connected to family roots that had been long neglected. Some have enriched their lives by exploring religious differences and challenging their own personal beliefs. One parent whose daughters have been involved with the Pebbles for Peace project since it began shared that the

importance of the project in her mind was the empowerment that was given to her daughters. She stated that schools usually encourage students to make a difference but often there are no opportunities to see the direct impact of their actions taken. They may take part in fundraisers or food drives, but the impact of their donation is not usually witnessed firsthand. The Pebbles for Peace project, in her mind, is unique because the students actually get to see the impact they're making – through the letters that are mailed in, the phone calls and email messages in support of the project and the meaning that it has with people all over the world.

5. Moving Forward:

All politics can do is keep us out of war; establishing a lasting peace is the work of education.~ Maria Montessori

Once we bear witness to these facts, to these stories, we have a responsibility to carry it forward. We have the obligation to *do something.* The Pebbles for Peace project was born out of this idea – the need to carry the message forward; our *do something*. I believe a reason for the success of the project is the continued, meaningful exploration of the Holocaust. Themes and topics must continue to be discussed throughout the year and related and connected to other topics of study in all disciplines. It is imperative that students see what they can do in their everyday lives to make a difference and how it is linked to making a change from events in the past.

I also believe that if a topic is presented with passion, the students will feed off of the enthusiasm and enter the experience looking for meaning and deep understanding. My own personal experiences: being immersed in Holocaust education during the week of training at

Auschwitz-Birkenau, visiting a number of the concentration camps with survivors and bearing witness to their testimony, all became catalysts in my personal quest to teach about the Holocaust. I felt a responsibility to share the knowledge that I had learned. I had felt such a profound impact on my own life, both personally and professionally, that I felt if I shared it, I could help others too. In addition, early in my pursuit of higher education I was asked four simple words that changed the course of my thinking and provided a new drive and determination that I had not experienced before. The question: "Why do you care?" This question was asked of me in a graduate level multicultural children's literature course. Walking from a coffee shop on a sidewalk in Toronto on one of Canada's most prestigious educational institutions on a brisk, star-lit February evening, I was asked by a fellow educator, why I cared?

A little background information on the discussion is necessary to fully understand the significance of the question. A controversial political event dealing with issues in the Middle East was being held on campus. In order to prepare for this event, promotions such as posters and bookmarks were being posted and handed out on campus. One week earlier, bookmarks advertising the event had been passed around the multicultural children's literature course. There had been no discussion regarding the information being passed out – in my opinion it was propaganda as it only portrayed one side of the story. My view of the event was that it perpetuated hatred rather than offering real discussions to create peace. It pitted people against each other and forced individuals to choose sides. I don't know if my uneasiness with the topic was read through my silence in the class and this particular discussion; however, during our break the following week a colleague and I were walking back to class when she asked me my opinion on the event. It had been a good friend of hers who had passed the bookmarks out and had been very vocal during the previous week's class in support of the event. My colleague,

herself, confessed to not knowing very much about the event, but spoke of her boyfriend, who she identified as being Jewish, and several of her friends who strongly opposed this event. I did share my opinion: the misuse of vocabulary, the attempt to play on emotions and heart-strings by exploiting women and children in the literature supporting the event, the failure to look at both sides of the story, and the fear that is felt by students on campus as a result of this event. The potential for violence, I felt was, and continues to be, enormous. When I finished my explanation my colleague - who had been very quiet, listening intently - responded with, "Well, I guess you would care since you're Jewish and all." When I told my colleague I was not Jewish, her response was one of shock and disbelief. With eyes wide, she explained the basis for her assumption; my colleague thought I was Jewish because 1) I worked for a "Jewish" organization; 2) I "looked" Jewish and 3) I was dressed all in black. I indicated that I did not work for a "Jewish" organization and once again I assured her I was not Jewish. That's when the question was asked.

"Why do you care?"

Once I gathered myself together – at this question, it was my turn to be taken aback – I responded with an answer that explained the importance of humanity. *I believe that we need to stop dividing people into all of these socially constructed classification systems based on race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, and so on. I care because I care for humanity. I care for people*. We finished our discussion, with no other remarkable comments as we reached class, and carried on with our evening. However, the question, "Why do you care?" did not leave me. I struggled with the response I had offered as the discussion re-played over and over in my head. Had I answered sufficiently? Had I expressed myself with clarity and precision –

did I say what I meant? Should I have posed a question back to my colleague – "Why would I *not* care? Don't you care?"

Following this discussion the question, 'why do I care,' was the source of many writing attempts. I started many ideas for picture books, children's stories and personal journal entries trying to come to terms with my personal reaction as well as create something positive out of the question – a way to move forward creating a positive difference. Why did I care? Throughout history right up to current day, there are numerous stories of individuals and groups who stood up for their beliefs. Barbara Coloroso reports on a whole community in the United States that pulled together in 1993 to deal with the escalating anti-Semitism in their community. Following a series of events that included vandalism of cemeteries, hate-filled messages spray-painted on walls and finally the shattering of a window of a home that displayed a menorah, it was suggested by town authorities that the owner of the home remove all symbols that identified her as Jewish. Instead, within the community, "Vigils were held. Petitions signed. A painter's union led 100 people in repainting houses. Within days, the town erupted in menorahs – purchased at K-Mart, Xeroxed in church offices, and printed in the local newspaper."[35] When the homeowner's son asked if all of the townspeople were Jewish, his mother responded, "No . . . they're friends."[36] I came to realize that I take for granted that care and respect for others is common sense, a common practice held by the majority. I don't consider myself a remarkable person for caring; I truly feel everyone should care because it's the right thing to do. How does one learn to care? More importantly, from an education perspective, how do we instill this sense of deep caring into our students today, and provide our students with tools to move this empathy and respect forward? My belief is through teaching 'real world' events – teaching about the Holocaust.

Notes

1. Lindquist, "Meeting a Moral Imperative," 26.
2. Ibid., 28.
3. Feuerverger, *Teaching, Learning and Other Miracles,* 85.
4. Connelly and Clandinin, "Stories of Experience," 4.
5. Feuerverger, *Teaching, Learning and Other Miracles,* 35.
6. Canadian and World Studies: Geography, History, Civics (Politics). Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/ canworld910curr2013.pdf (accessed 2013).
7. Feuerverger, *Teaching, Learning and Other Miracles,* 97.
8. Ibid., 65.
9. Riley, "The Holocaust and Values Education," 33.
10. Ibid., 35.
11. Avrham, "The problem with using historical parallels"; Short, "Holocaust education in Ontario high schools"; Misco, "Teaching the Holocaust through case study"; Ben-Bassat, "Holocaust awareness and education"; Short and Reed, *Issues in Holocaust Education*.
12. Wilkanowicz, "Let's Try to Understand."
13. Lindquist, "Meeting a Moral Imperative," 27.
14. Short, "Holocaust Education in the Primary School," 120.
15. Shoemaker, "Teaching the Holocaust in America's Schools," 192.
16. Lindquist, "Meeting a Moral Imperative," 28.
17. Shoemaker, "Teaching the Holocaust in America's Schools," 197.
18. Ducey, "Using Simon Wiesenthal's The Sunflower," 170.
19. Shoemaker, "Teaching the Holocaust in America's Schools," 197.
20. Ducey, "Using Simon Wiesenthal's The Sunflower," 167.
21. Shiman and Fernekes, "The Holocaust, Human Rights," 60.
22. Avrham, "The problem with using historical parallels," 34.
23. Ducey, "Using Simon Wiesenthal's The Sunflower," 171.
24. Shiman and Fernekes, "The Holocaust, Human Rights," 61.
25. Kalisman, "Examples of best practice 2," 79.
26. From modest beginnings the SS (*Schutzstaffel*; Protection Squadrons), became a virtual state within a state in Nazi Germany, staffed by men who perceived themselves as the "racial elite" of Nazi future. The SS controlled the German police forces and the concentration camp system..
http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007400
27. Ben-Bassat, "Holocaust Awareness and Education," 421.
28. German Secret State Police, http://www.ushmm.org
29. "The Nazis frequently used euphemistic language to disguise the true nature of their crimes. They used the term 'Final Solution' to refer to their plan to annihilate the Jewish people. It is not known when the leaders of Nazi Germany definitively decided to implement the 'Final Solution.' The genocide, or mass destruction, of the Jews was the culmination of a decade of increasingly severe discriminatory measures."
http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005151
30. Short, "Antiracist Education and Moral Behavior," 53.
31. Frampton, "Holocaust Education," 35.
32. Connelly and Clandinin, "Stories of Experience," 4.
33. Feuerverger, *Teaching, Learning and Other Miracles,* 58.
34. Fine, "Facing History and Ourselves," 49.
35. Coloroso, *Just because it's not wrong,* 213.
36. Ibid.

Bibliography

Avrham, D. "The problem with using historical parallels as a method in Holocaust and genocide teaching." *Intercultural Education* 21, no. 1 (2010): 33-40.

Ben-Bassat, N. "Holocaust Awareness and Education in the United States." *Religious Education* 95, no. 4 (2000): 402-423.

Canadian and World Studies: Geography, History, Civics (Politics). Retrieved from http://www.edu.gov.on.ca/eng/curriculum/secondary/anworld910curr2013.pdf (accessed 2013).

Coloroso, B. *Just because it's not wrong doesn't make it right: From toddlers to teens, teaching kids to think and act ethically.* New York, NY: Penguin Group, 2005.

Edelsky, C., ed. *Making Justice Our Project: Teachers Working toward Critical Whole Language Practice*. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Connelly, M.F. and D.J. Clandinin. "Stories of Experience and Narrative Inquiry," *Educational Researcher* 19, no. 5 (1999): 2-14.

Ducey, K.A. "Using Simon Wiesenthal's The Sunflower to Teach the Study of Genocide and the Holocaust." *College Teaching* 57 (2009): 167-175.

Feuerverger, G. *Teaching, Learning and Other Miracles*. Rotterdam, Netherlands: Sense Publishers, 2007.

Fine, M. "Facing History and Ourselves: Portrait of a Classroom." *Educational Leader,* (1992): 44-49.

Frampton, W. "Holocaust Education and the Need for Consistence." *Journal of Jewish Education* 59, no. 1 (1991): 31-35.

Kalisman, R. "Examples of best practice 2. Holocaust education as a universal challenge." *Intercultural Education* 21, no. 1 (2010): 78-80.

Lindquist, D.H. "Meeting a Moral Imperative: A Rationale for Teaching the Holocaust." *The Clearing House* 84, no. 1 (2011): 26-30.

Misco, T. "Teaching the Holocaust through Case Study." *The Social Studies* 100, no. 1 (2008): 14-22.

Riley, K. "The Holocaust and Values Education." *Journal of Jewish Education* 58, no. 1 (1999): 33-35.

Shiman, D.A. and W.R. Fernekes. "The Holocaust, Human Rights, and Democratic Citizenship Education." *The Social Studies* 90, no. 2 (1999): 53-62.

Shoemaker, R. "Teaching the Holocaust in America's Schools: Some considerations for teachers." *Intercultural Education* 14, no. 2 (2003): 191-199.

Short, G. "Antiracist Education and Moral Behavior: Lessons from the Holocaust." *Journal of Moral Education* 28, no. 1 (1999): 49-62.

_____ "Holocaust Education in Ontario High Schools: An antidote to racism?" *Cambridge Journal of Education* 30, no. 2 (2000): 291-305.

_____ "Holocaust Education in the Primary School: Some reflections on an emergent debate." *London Review of Education* 1, no. 2 (2003): 119-129.

Short, G and C.A. Reed. *Issues in Holocaust Education*. Vermont: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2004.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Holocaust definition. Retrieved from http://www.ushmm.org (accessed 2013).

Wilkanowicz, S. "Let's Try to Understand." In *Why Should We Teach about the Holocaust?*, edited by Jolanta Ambrosewicz-Jacobs and Leszek Hondo, 52-54. Cracow, Poland: The Jagellonian University Institute of European Studies, 2005.

The Psychology of Holocaust Denial

Patricia Chappine
Drew University

In 1985, Israel Charny attempted to uncover the psychology of genocide denial. He wrote that his study treated denials as "acts of bitter and malevolent psychological aggression, certainly against the victims, but really against all of human society, for such denials literally celebrate genocidal violence and in the process suggestively call for renewed massacres"[1] Other proposed explanations include denial as a defense mechanism, denial as a form of nationalistic pride, anti-Semitic attitudes as a prime motivation, and the self-exhibitionist needs of the individual denier. Since all deniers do not fit neatly into categories, Holocaust denial is often unique to the individual and thus defies a sweeping general theory applicable in every case. However, certain indicators and warning signs are evident in many cases. Anti-Semitism, personal grandiosity, paranoia, a lean towards conspiracy theories, nationalism, a narcissistic personality, and historical naiveté are all possible psychological and ideological motivations for Holocaust denial. The central thesis of this research is that forming a working framework to combat Holocaust denial is possible with a closer look at the psychological and ideological aspects of those who engage in denial. Mostly, a more complete understanding of Holocaust denial can help to combat the historical denial of other known genocides.

On April 12, 1945, General Dwight D. Eisenhower wrote the following words in a letter to Chief of Staff George C. Marshall, "I made the visit deliberately, in order to be in a position to give firsthand evidence of these things if ever, in the future, there develops a tendency to charge these allegations as mere propaganda."[2] This was a reference to Eisenhower's visit to the Ohrdruf concentration camp in Germany. Yet, decades later, Holocaust denial persists. While

Holocaust denials vary, they contain several common themes including: that the event itself never occurred; that the Nazi regime had no official policy geared towards the deliberate murder of the Jewish population; and that the gas chambers in Auschwitz-Birkenau were a fabrication. More recently, deniers have shifted to a distortion of the facts concerning the number of people killed.

During the 1950s, Holocaust denial reached America in earnest, spurred by several academics. Harry Elmer Barnes, a professor of history at Columbia University from 1918 to 1929, published his first denial literature in 1966, entitled "Revisionism: A Key to Peace."[3] Within this work, he referred to the gas chamber deaths as "alleged" and stated that the atrocities committed by the Allies were far worse than those carried out by the Axis powers.[4] He intentionally minimized the genocide, referring to the deaths as casualties of war. In 1973, Austin J. App, a Nazi sympathizer, wrote the book *The Six Million Swindle: Blackmailing the German People for Hard Marks with Fabricated Corpses*. Within this book, masked as academic inquiry, he wrote that the number of Jews killed during the Holocaust was not six million but around three hundred thousand. He also claimed that gas chambers did not exist and that the Jewish casualties were legitimate war acts. A cursory look at his writings reveals a paranoid mindset and receptivity to conspiracy theories. According to App, Jewish control of the media perpetuated this lie.[5]

During the late 1970s, Holocaust deniers began to publish more and hold meetings to drive their agenda. The denial push of the 1970s and 1980s involved groups claiming to promote historical inquiry. James E. Waller wrote the following about perpetrators of the Holocaust, "Increasingly, contemporary scholars recognize that most sustained evildoing in the world is the product of potent social sources generated by situations and organizations."[6] While the original

context of this statement was in reference to Nazi perpetrators during the Holocaust, it can also be applied to those groups deliberately disseminating hateful and anti-Semitic denial literature in modern times.

Many modern blatant and militaristic deniers are motivated by inciting public hatred. In 1979, the Institute for Historical Review (IHR), a Los Angeles, California revisionist organization, held its first official convention promoting Holocaust denial as a legitimate form of academic inquiry. Funded by Willis Carto and led by William David McCalden, the IHR started its own publication called the *Journal for Historical Review*. The IHR utilized media outlets to run advertisements lauding the Holocaust as a hoax and offering a $50,000 reward to "anyone able to prove, through the offering of tangible evidence, that a single Jew was ever gassed by the government of the Third Reich."[7]

The IHR did not stop with media blitzes and publications. The organization also engaged in the defense of known Holocaust denier and Nazi sympathizer Ernst Zündel. In 1984, he was charged for spreading false news in Canada. The IHR provided a defense attorney for Zündel and brought in Holocaust deniers Robert Faurisson and David Irving as expert witnesses.[8] Upon retrial in 1988, supposed engineer Fred A. Leuchter offered a report concerning the gas chambers at Auschwitz-Birkenau and Majdanek. The report concluded that it was "chemically and physically impossible for the Germans to have conducted 'gassings' in those camps."[9] The Canadian court quickly discredited Leuchter for having no credentials in engineering. In actuality, his only education was a Bachelor's degree in history from Boston University. Despite this, the IHR used the Leuchter Report to launch media announcements in college newspapers claiming the legitimacy of the findings.[10]

The claims of the deniers offer a glimpse at the psychology of denial. Mainly, deniers claim that either the Holocaust did not happen because it was a Jewish hoax or conspiracy or that it was a historical exaggeration. This is evidence of paranoid thinking, willingness to accept conspiracy theories, and belief in the stereotypes pushed by the Nazis. According to Kenneth Lasson, the psychological aspects of Holocaust denial blend anti-Semitism and conspiracy theory. People who promote denial generally have a very inflated view of themselves. They see themselves as messengers who are merely making the public aware of the conspiracy. To them, their unique intellectual ability allows them to see the truth while the majority of the population does not.[11]

According to George Victor, "feelings of inferiority are the main source of striving for superiority and for believing that one is superior. The lower one feels, the more desperate the need for superiority."[12] With this in mind, there is a certain element of personal pathology in individual deniers. Their own experiences of inferiority mix with the need to feel superior by denigrating others and form the catalyst for engaging in denial. Lasson believes that the psychological aspects of Holocaust deniers also include feelings of self-importance and intellectual superiority. He writes, "Those who become attached to such conspiratorial views are said to be driven by a personality that makes them susceptible to the conspiracy mind-set. This personality/mind-set is consistent with Holocaust denial."[13] The acceptance of the forgery the *Protocols of the Elders of Zion* is one example of this conspiracy mind-set and, according to Lasson, an example of "collective psycho-pathology."[14]

Charny prefers to divide deniers into two distinct categories with separate psychological motivations. For him, innocent denial takes place when a person is not aware of the facts surrounding the Holocaust and may not be conscious of the psychological reasons behind their

stance. These people are either unaware of the historical facts of the Holocaust or "are seeking to picture our universe as more decent and secure for human beings than it really is; and in the process to project themselves as fine, justice-seeking, reconciliation-advancing 'good' people."[15] This categorization of deniers is not meant to trivialize the innocent deniers. Charny writes that, despite their naiveté, innocent deniers present a threat to memory and truth just as dangerous as those generated by virulent anti-Semites. His thesis is that by looking at the innocent deniers, it is possible to form a psychological framework that will foster an increased understanding of other ordinary people who deny the Holocaust.[16] However, the concept of innocent denial proves problematic because it assumes that we can ever know the true motives of a denier.

Charny also identified the category of "malevolent deniers" in his research. He places well-known Holocaust denier David Irving firmly within this category. Irving's ideology includes claims that Auschwitz contained no gas chambers during WWII; that the Poles built gas chambers after the war to smear the Nazis; that the train transports to the camps were stocked with food and comforts for the victims; and that Auschwitz was not a death camp. Irving also demonstrated adoration for Hitler and the Nazis. His remarks have indicated an anti-Semitic mindset and a lean towards violence, especially when speaking about the future destruction of Israel.[17]

Another suggested motivation for Holocaust denial is individual narcissism. According to the American Psychiatric Association, "Narcissistic Personality Disorder involves arrogant behavior, a lack of empathy for other people, and a need for admiration-all of which must be consistently evident at work and in relationships."[18] Deniers who have placed themselves in the spotlight display these characteristics along with, what Anthony Long described as, a mix of

right wing political ideology and propaganda. He contends that during the 1980s and 1990s, many prominent German Holocaust deniers were members of the political far right.[19]

Holocaust denier David Irving's libel lawsuit against Deborah Lipstadt and subsequent courtroom behavior provides some key insight. In 1995, Irving capitalized on media attention when he sued Deborah Lipstadt for identifying him as a Holocaust denier in her book *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory.* Lipstadt charged Irving with deliberate historical misrepresentation and sympathizing with Hitler. She also believed that he was an extremely dangerous form of denier because he masked his anti-Semitism as legitimate scholarship. In 1977, he published a book called *Hitler's War*, where he argued that Hitler was unaware of the Final Solution and attempted to stop it once he found out. He has also authored several other books on World War II and the Third Reich. Because his other books were discussed in well-known periodicals, his denial was given more credibility.[20]

Until the lawsuit, Lipstadt did not consider her comments about Irving to be controversial. After all, he had publicly engaged in Holocaust denial several times. For example, he was a witness in the trial of Holocaust denier Ernst *Zündel* in 1988. Irving testified that there was no evidence to support an "overall Reich policy to kill the Jews" and that "no documents whatsoever show that a Holocaust ever happened."[21] He denied the existence of the gas chambers and called Hitler "the biggest friend the Jews had in the Third Reich."[22] Lipstadt was incredulous. Was it possible that Irving could claim that he was not a Holocaust denier? The British court system where he filed suit against Lipstadt took the matter quite seriously. Lipstadt faced a very different legal system than she could have expected in the United States. In the British legal system, the burden of proof was placed on the defendant. In the British courts, the American legal concept of innocent until proven guilty was reversed.[23]

Why did Irving pursue this lawsuit when all the evidence pointed to him as a Holocaust denier? The trial fed Irving's need for publicity. As a published author, the media frenzy surrounding the trial placed him in the public eye even more. This was not the first time Irving intentionally threw himself into the spotlight. In 1983, he created a scene when he snuck into a press conference and ran to the microphone to question the historical accuracy of formerly unknown diaries written by Hitler. *Der Stern*, the German periodical who had purchased the documents, promptly shut the conference down. He continued to provide interviews throughout the day and was invited onto NBC's *Today Show*.[24]

His paranoid statements about Lipstadt were in tune with the psychology of other deniers who displayed receptivity towards conspiracy theories. Irving said that Lipstadt had, "pursued a sustained malicious, vigorous, well-funded, and reckless world-wide campaign of personal defamation."[25] Irving's trial statements were clearly in line with Charny's "innocence and self-righteousness" psychology, where the denier proclaims himself a seeker of truth who has been unfairly persecuted. According to Irving, "If we were to seek a title for this libel action, I would venture to suggest, *Pictures at an Execution*- my execution."[26] He went on to state that he should be commended for "selflessly" bringing the truth to light.[27] Kenneth Stern pointed out that the rhetoric of deniers often echoed the anti-Semitic ideology used in Nazi propaganda. He wrote, "Denial, or 'revisionism,' as the deniers cynically call it, plays on classical anti-Semitic stereotypes: Jewish conspiracy and the Jewish control of the media."[28]

Holocaust denial is deeply interwoven into other racist ideologies; "The majority of deniers are fanatically anti-Semitic, and they are not interested in the truth but in a platform for the propaganda of their phobias and the inevitable scandals that will follow."[29] For instance, David Duke, a neo-Nazi, former Ku Klux Klan leader, and Holocaust denier, became a member

of the Louisiana legislature in 1980. He ran for the U.S. Senate in 1982 and Louisiana governor in 1991. Duke even attempted a run for U.S. president in 1992. He described the Holocaust as "a historical hoax." perpetrated by a worldwide Jewish conspiracy. [30] He also denied that the gas chambers were used to kill Jews. Significantly, as with David Irving, Duke's rhetoric expressed the belief in a Jewish world conspiracy which involved Hollywood and the press.[31] In a more recent example, Larry Darby, a 2007 Democratic nominee for Alabama Attorney-General, has openly stated that the death figure of six million Jewish people was an exaggeration. He claimed that one hundred and forty thousand were killed at the most and that the majority of those deaths were caused by typhus.[32]

Perhaps most disturbing about these academic attacks on the memory of the Holocaust is the effect on students. Lasson sums this up writing, "What should be the most receptive place for honest intellectual inquiry and discourse has instead become one where all assumptions are open to debate-even documented historical facts."[33] Kenneth Stern echoed this point in his book *Holocaust Denial*, published in 1993, where he wrote about the new trend in the Holocaust denial of the 1990s. Instead of being the work of people on the racist fringes of society, the new denial was being pushed by supposed historians, intertwined with political platforms, and disseminated in universities.[34] These so-called revisionist historians were a strange blend of "prejudice and bitter personal experience."[35]

One of the most imminent dangers of Holocaust denial is the threat to the memory of the victims. Lasson questions, "As the generation of survivors dwindles, whose words will win? Who decides what is to appear in the vast and burgeoning marketplace of ideas?"[36] Or did the sheer enormity of the situation help modern deniers by casting doubt? Primo Levi reported being told by the SS guards, "People will say that the events you describe are too monstrous to

be believed; they will say that they are the exaggerations of Allied propaganda and will believe us, who will deny everything, and not you."[37] In 1979, Levi commented that, "The very enormity of genocide nudges us toward incredulity, toward denial and refusal."[38] Responsible historians cannot allow the inability to comprehend such evil to lead to denial.

In closing, Holocaust denials are not merely the products of racist groups on the fringes of society. Evidence indicates that denials have been found in public schools, major universities, libraries, politics, and in the general public. Deniers disguised as academics have utilized the media to promulgate their revisionism to a naïve public. People such as David Irving have used the court system to further their misinformation. Disturbingly, Holocaust denial has moved from Neo-Nazi groups to mainstream society at an alarming rate. However, a better understanding of the psychology of deniers can provide a framework to combat this ideology. Charny's work points towards the importance of the many "innocent deniers." According to Charny, those people, "who may not really be aware of the genocide they are helping to deny, and are not necessarily in touch with why it is important to them," are significant to turning back the tide of denial. [39]

The examples of denial presented here point to a psychology of denial that is not easily pinpointed and does not lend itself to one general explanatory theory. Rather, denial is a combination of many factors, including the background of the individual denier. Psychological and ideological factors which may contribute to the denial of known genocides include: a narcissistic personality, political ambitions, anti-Semitism, receptivity to conspiracy theories, egotism, nationalism, paranoia, self-interest, and simple historical ignorance. Charny believes that:

> We must fight denials because the denial of genocide is a crucial symbolic and ideological process which not only follows every genocide after it has taken place, but is

> a process which is intended to desensitize and make possible the emergence of new forms of genocidal violence to peoples in the future. [40]

Genocide denial negates the significance of the event and represents a second victimization.

A more comprehensive study of the motivations behind the denial of the Holocaust could potentially shed light on the denial of other genocides. Taner Akçam, a Turkish historian, believes that the continued denial of the Armenian genocide still drives a wedge into relations between the Turks and the Armenians. Akçam writes that, "…all studies of large-scale atrocities teach us one core principle: To prevent the recurrence of such events, people must first consider their own responsibility, discuss it, debate it, and recognize it."[41] An attempt to understand the motivations behind Holocaust denial can lead to better ways to combat it in the future and better preserve the memory of the victims and the survivors.

Notes

1. Charny, “The Psychology of Denial,” 3.
2. Eisenhower, *The Papers of Eisenhower*, 2616.
3. Kokh and Polian, *Denial of the Denial,* 11.
4. Stern, *Holocaust Denial*, 7.
5. Evans, *Lying About Hitler*, 106.
6. Waller, “Perpetrators of the Holocaust,” 11.
7. Churchill, *A Little Matter of Genocide*, 23.
8. Ibid., 23.
9. Ibid., 24.
10. Ibid.
11. Ibid., 257.
12. Victor, *Hitler: The Pathology of Evil*, 89.
13. Lasson, “Defending the truth,” 257.
14. Ibid.
15. Charny, “The Psychological Satisfaction of Denials.”
16. Ibid.
17. Ibid.
18. American Psychiatric Association*. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual*, 866.
19. Long, “Forgetting the Fuhrer,” 73.
20. Lipstadt, *History on Trial*, 20.
21. Ibid., xviii.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid., xix.
24. Ibid., 19.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid.
27. Ibid., 80.
28. Stern, *Holocaust Denial*, 2.
29. Kokh and Pavel, *Denial of the denial*, 3.
30. Lipstadt, *Denying the Holocaust*, 5.
31. Stern, *Holocaust Denial*, 19.
32. Lasson, “Defending the truth,” 228.
33. Ibid., 225.
34. Stern, *Holocaust Denial*, 2.
35. Evans, *Lying about Hitler*, 105.
36. Lasson, “Defending the truth,” 224.
37. Ibid., 226.
38. Lang, “Six Questions,” 157.
39. Charny, “The Psychological Satisfaction of Denials.”
40. Ibid.
41. Akçam, *A Shameful Act,* 2.

Bibliography

American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*: *DSM-IV*. 4th ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association, 1994.

Akçam, Taner. *A Shameful Act: The Armenian Genocide and the Question of Turkish Responsibility*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2006.

App, Austin. *The Six Million Swindle: Blackmailing the German People for Hard marks with Fabricated Corpses*. Tacoma Park, MD: Boniface Press, 1973.

Charny, Israel W. "The Psychology of Denial of Known Genocides." In *Genocide: A Critical Bibliographic Review, Volume 2*, edited by Israel W. Charny, London: Mansell Publishing, (1991): 3-37.

_____. "The Psychological Satisfaction of Denials of the Holocaust and other Genocides by Non-Extremists or Bigots, and even Known Scholars." *IDEA: A Journal of Social Issues* 6, no. 1 (2001): http://www.ideajournal.com/articles.php?id=27 (accessed November 15, 2013).

Churchill, Ward. *A Little Matter of Genocide: Holocaust and Denial in the Americas 1492 to the Present.* San Francisco: City Lights Publishers, 2001.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *The Papers of Dwight David Eisenhower: The War Years,* edited by Alfred D. Chandler Jr. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1970.

Evans, Richard J. *Lying About Hitler: History, Holocaust, and the David Irving Trial*. New York: Basic Books, 2001.

Lang, Berel. "Six Questions on (or about) Holocaust Denial." *History and Theory* 49 (May 2010): 157-168.

Lasson, Kenneth. "Defending the Truth: Legal and Psychological Aspects of Holocaust Denial." *Current Psychology* 26 (2007): 223-266.

Lipstadt, Deborah. *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory*. New York: Free Press, 1993.

_____. *History on Trial: My Day in Court with David Irving.* New York: Harper Perennial, 2005.

Long, Anthony. "Forgetting the Fuhrer: The Recent History of the Holocaust Denial Movement in Germany." *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 48, no. 1 (2002): 72-84.

Victor, George. *Hitler: The Pathology of Evil.* Washington, D.C.: Potomac Books, 2007.

Waller, James E. "Perpetrators of the Holocaust: Divided and Self-Conceptions of Evildoing" *Holocaust and Genocide Studies* 10, no. 1 (1996): 11-33.

Tainted Blood: Nazi "Scientific" Propaganda

Marc Sorondo
Drew University

Propaganda was an important and widely used tool of the Nazi party. In its various guises, it served to convey Nazi ideology, to justify Nazi practices, and to advance the unification of the German people under Hitler's rule. One main focus of Nazi propaganda was the furtherance of anti-Semitism, as hatred of the Jews was a foundation of Nazi ideology. While many forms of anti-Semitism were common in Nazi propaganda, there was a strong focus on the use of science to label the Jews—and other groups—as distinct and inferior. This reliance on scientific theory to convey and validate the Nazis' racial ideology arises from the nature of science as a field of study, the history of scientific ideas about race and genetics, and frequently similar concepts of racial hygiene and inferiority held concurrently in other countries. At the same time, the use of science as propaganda was quite effective in classifying certain groups as not only inferior but dangerous.

Science lends itself to abuse as propaganda largely because the nature of the two is so very similar. Even when practiced correctly, science is, in a way, merely a form of propaganda. As T. Swann Harding noted in his examination of the two,

> Science is propaganda at the core. Its entire structure depends on the necessity for assuming the truth of postulates which cannot be proved. But it differs from other systems of belief, such as magic and religion, in adopting its basic assumptions consciously as working postulates, and in knowing that they are not full portrayals of real reality…But once a position is held so tenaciously that the individual is emotionally conditioned to its acceptance by himself and others as the be-all and end-all, science steps out.[1]

As Harding points out, science and propaganda differ in terms of self-awareness more than in practice. Once that self-awareness is lost, true science is bent into something else entirely, and yet that is so often what one finds instead of science. As Thomas Kuhn noted in his seminal work on scientific revolutions, "Normal science, the activity in which most scientists inevitably spend almost all their time, is predicated on the assumption that the scientific community knows what the world is like."[2]

This assumption that scientific fact is the same as truth is powerful, especially amongst laymen, though even scientists themselves can get caught up in the idea that science is "empirical reality."[3] Although there is no such thing as scientific truth—instead there is only a gradually evolving understanding of the world, which changes, sometimes drastically, over time[4]—current scientific understanding serves as a stand-in for the way the world really works.

This identification of science with truth gives it a power over people infrequently attributed to other areas of study. Science, especially to the majority of people who do not feel qualified to question it, functions as a sort of authority through what Stanley Milgram called "counteranthropomorphism,"[5] which makes science into something greater than a human system of understanding. The fact that *Science*—as an authority figure, a sort of agent of the truth rather than a mere system of understanding developed by human beings—has such power is especially clear in some of Milgram's experiments on the nature of obedience to authority. When, in follow-up interviews, participants admitted that they went ahead with experiments when they believed them to be harmful to others "in the interest of science"[6] it becomes frighteningly obvious that science can be used to make people do things that are against their moral code and that make them uncomfortable.

In reality, not only is scientific knowledge not revelatory of any unchanging truths and thus greater than a human system, it is also influenced by processes other than the scientific method that is supposed to drive it. Science is skewed by social relations. Funding, which can determine the focus and direction of research, is hardly separate from the greater economic and political system. Similarly, the way current scientific understanding is accepted and spread by the scientific community and by society in general can alter its influence. In his *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact*—which, significantly, was published in 1935, before much of the Nazi scientific propagandization even happened—Ludwick Fleck said,

> This social character inherent in the very nature of scientific activity is not without its substantive consequences. Words which formerly were simple terms become slogans; sentences which once were simple statements become calls to battle. This completely alters their socio-cognitive value. They no longer influence the mind through their logical meaning—indeed, they often act against it—but rather they acquire a magical power and exert a mental influence simply by being used.[7]

As Fleck notes, science is not a separate entity at any stage, especially once it has come to be accepted. It is easily manipulated itself and subsequently can be used to manipulate.

To be specific to Nazi Germany, the science most easily bent to Hitler's ideology was that of "racial hygiene"—a discipline that brought together race, genetics, eugenics, criminology, sociology, biology, and other theories and areas of study. This science was foundational in the formation of Nazi ideology but was also directed by Nazi policies once the party came to power. As Alyson Polsky notes in her work on scientific and popular discourse in relation to blood and race, "Nazi racial discourse, including medical discourse, synthesized false cultural beliefs about Jews which were undoubtedly used to justify Nazi racial policies. While anti-Semitism corrupted science and medicine, I would also argue that this does not exclude the truth that science and medicine also corrupted humanist values and helped to justify anti-Semitism. In every historical era and among every culture, a continuum between bioscientific and popular

beliefs always has a strong mutually reinforcing impact on scientific and popular discourses and practices alike."[8] Through this idea of racial hygiene, Hitler's message of anti-Semitism was tied to a long history of scientific knowledge as well as the practices and theories of scientists around the world, with which it gained an air of respectability.

Nazi scientific propaganda was based on concepts of race and genetics that were anything but new to Hitler's followers. The idea that races were biologically distinct went back to at least the eighteenth century, where it evolved out of Enlightenment attempts to classify the natural world.[9] The social Darwinism of the nineteenth century helped spawn the eugenics movements that fed directly into Nazi racial hygiene.[10] Alan Steinweis, in a study of scholarly anti-Semitism in Nazi Germany, explained that this tendency to racialize Jews, so that they were biologically different based on race, rather than of a different culture or religion, began in the nineteenth century as well.[11] He points out a few specific examples: "In 1879 Wilhelm Marr had promoted the concept of 'anti-Semitism' as a way of underlining the racial, rather than religious, characteristics of the Jews. Theodor Fritsch had reinforced this racist anti-Semitism in his *Handbook of the Jewish Question*, which had first appeared in 1887."[12]

Without these much earlier ideas about racial differences, Nazism would not have existed, let alone become so powerful. As Francois Haas points out, "Central to the Nazi philosophy was the paradigm—broadly accepted as fact by scientists and community—that the Nordic race was not only superior to the 'lower' races, notably Blacks and Jews, but involved in a terminal struggle with them for survival of the fittest. It is little recognized that this scientific framework did not rise *de novo* with the Nazis but had evolved over the previous 80 years from the related notions of eugenics and Social Darwinism."[13] These mid-nineteenth century beliefs evolved leading up to the First World War due to German experiences with colonies abroad and

declining birthrates and perceived degeneration at home.[14] This evolution continued under the Weimar government, which sponsored a research institute focused on "anthropology, human heredity, and eugenics."[15] By the 1930s, the idea of biologically distinct races had existed for well over a hundred years. Eric Ehnrenreich attributes much of the success of Nazi ideology to this long history: "One significant reason that racist eugenic ideology proved an effective rationalization for Nazi racist policies was because, to a large degree, most of the intellectual strands comprising the ideology had already achieved mainstream status in German society in the decades prior to the Third Reich. Pre-Nazi genealogical literature shows that through a variety of means, proponents of racist ideas alleged, with little contradiction, that they were 'scientifically proven.'"[16]

Nazi racist ideology gained additional strength by association with a broader scientific community that often seemed to concur with it and which, at the very least, failed to adequately respond to Nazi racial hygiene in any concerted way before the start of the Second World War. For example, similar racist laws existed in America prior to those put in place in Germany under the Third Reich—some of which remained in place until long after the end of World War II, into the late 1970s.[17] Along with the aforementioned American laws, similar laws were also established in Norway, Sweden, Finland, Estonia, and Canada.[18] In fact, as Stefan Kuhl has pointed out, "Nazi eugenics measures—including sterilization, marriage restrictions for unwanted members of society, and their exclusion from government subsidies, which were reserved for people defined as 'valuable'—corresponded with the goals of eugenicists all over the world. Eugenicists understood Nazi policies as the direct realization of their scientific goals and political demands."[19] One scientific body was put together with the explicit, though

unofficial, purpose of attacking Nazi racial science—a group of British anthropologists called the Race and Culture Committee—but failed to do so before the start of the war.[20]

Nazi propagandists seized on the existence of outside support for racial policies. As Kuhl notes, "The Nazis believed that favorable statements by well-known scientists from other countries would give the German people the impression that scientific communities abroad favored Nazi race policy and viewed it as compatible with scientific knowledge."[21] This appeal to the idea that the broad scientific community recognized racial hygiene as beneficial is clear in much Nazi propaganda. For example, a booklet written for Hitler Youth leaders—providing them with information that should be passed on to the boys in the Hitler youth—proudly claimed, "racial thinking is constantly winning ground. Truth is gradually winning. We need only think of the growing number of countries that are resisting the destructive influence of Jewry. And we recall the immigration laws of many countries that ban Jews or unwanted groups."[22] The use of the word *truth*, loaded with meaning and connotations of scientific and objective reality, was certainly not an accident. Similarly, a pamphlet aimed at members of the SS, which may also have been used in some schools, proclaimed that Europe as a whole was coming to agree with Nazi policy: "In recent years, most European peoples have found the will to protect their racial purity against mixing. The Jews are increasingly excluded from economic life, and marriages with Jew are forbidden. Examples are Slovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Croatia, and Bulgaria...European nations are increasingly coming to the realization that the Jewish question can be solved only as a racial question, and that only racial thinking consistent with natural laws can guarantee the life and characteristics of the individual peoples."[23] Again, the words are chosen carefully here. All of Europe, by implication even those fighting against the

Nazis, were coming to see the truth of racial hygiene, which is in accordance with "natural laws."

Nazi racial policies also gained an air of respectability due to their associations with scientific knowledge and the scholars that produced it. Steinweis found that

> The anti-Semitic discourse of the Nazi era can best be viewed as a three-tiered phenomenon. The bottom tier consisted of the crasser forms of anti-Jewish propaganda, designed to appeal to the less intellectually discerning among the masses of the German population…A notch above this lowbrow propaganda was a middlebrow discourse designed to secure social and intellectual respectability for anti-Semitism among educated Germans, or at least among those with higher intellectual standards. This genre usually took the form of nonfiction books aimed at a general readership, and political-cultural periodicals…Textbooks designed for classroom use in primary and secondary schools might also be included in this category. Finally, the products of Nazi Jewish studies constituted a top tier of Nazi anti-Semitism, one based ostensibly on scientific and factual knowledge. This tier was by no means isolated from the tiers below it but rather funneled ideas down to them… trickling down to a mass readership and providing "scientific" legitimization for Nazi anti-Semitism and anti-Jewish policies. For example, the organ of Wilhelm Grau's Research Department for the Jewish Question, the Forschungen zur Judenfrage, contained abstruse language and a dense academic apparatus that made it inaccessible to the vast majority of the German reading public. But the content of these volumes (and the lectures on which they had been based) received frequent coverage in mass-circulation newspapers.[24]

Thus scientific anti-Semitism was middle- and highbrow, something for the intelligent and well educated. The details and specifics of what made Jews or Blacks inferior was too complicated for most, but that only added to the respectability of those ideas. Several scholars have noted the role played by experts and academics who, by their very involvement, gave Nazi racial science a level of prestige and respectability it likely could not have attained were it solely a political idea.[25]

The actual content of the Nazi's scientific propaganda focused on blood as symbolic of racial and genetic purity or degeneration. As has already been mentioned, inherent in ideas of racial hygiene was the belief that races were biologically distinct and that certain races—namely the Nordic—were superior, while others—Jews and Blacks in particular—were inferior.

German scientists tried, and failed, to find a test that clearly distinguished Jewish blood from Aryan.[26] It was determined, however, that there had once been a strong correlation between blood types and races—with type A being associated with Western Europeans, B with Asians, and O with pre-Columbian Americans—which was lost due to past interbreeding.[27] Regardless of the inability to accurately determine the race of a person using any sort of valid test, racial purity and the corresponding crime of racial defilement became a major focus of Nazi propaganda efforts.[28]

According to racial hygiene, inferior or impure blood carried innumerable dangerous traits. These could potentially be transmitted to genetically pure Aryans in three ways. The most obvious method of blood contamination was that of inheritance. The offspring of the racially inferior always inherited the weaknesses associated with their race. Perhaps less obvious, was the idea that a person could be permanently tainted by an infusion of inferior blood. At least one case was noted in which a Jewish doctor used his own blood to give a life-saving transfusion to a German. The doctor was sent to a concentration camp as punishment for polluting the blood of a German.[29] Last, and perhaps most obscure, was the possibility that a German, specifically a German woman, could be permanently corrupted by even a single sexual act with a man of an inferior race.[30] A passage from a pamphlet called *The Jewish Question in Education*, which was aimed at teachers, illustrates this belief: "The sin against the blood passes its curse not only to the mixed race offspring, but rather the curse also sticks to the defiled mother, never leaving her for the rest of her life. Racial defilement is racial death. Racial defilement is bloodless murder. A woman defiled by the Jew can never rid her body of the poison she has absorbed. She is lost to her people."[31]

Though it refers to a defiled woman, the quotation is applicable to all three methods of transmission. Once German blood is contaminated, that person is ruined permanently. They are no longer truly German and can never again produce German offspring. Once exposed to inferior blood, a person is corrupted beyond rescue.

According to Nazi sources, the Jew is singled out as especially dangerous because the Jewish race is not actually a race at all, but a mixture of inferior races, making them that much more awful and corrupt.[32] A newsletter for leaders of Nazi youth groups for girls, for example, states, "We know that the Jew does not belong racially to us or other European peoples. He is also not a separate race as such, but rather a mixing of races that occurred a long time ago, long before our era. This racial mixture includes characteristics of the Middle Eastern and Asian race, but also Negro characteristics and various other elements."[33] A guide for teachers clarifies exactly what such a mixture means for Germans who encounter Jews: "The Jews are not a race, as is often thought. The Jewish people are a racial mixture from parts of the Near Eastern and Asian races. The genetic, physical, and spiritual characteristics of the Jew are so foreign and different to us that any association with a Jew must be rejected by any German with sound instincts, even by the smallest, simplest child."[34] In this way, in the hierarchy of races, the Jew is forced to the very bottom, as dehumanized as possible without actually being called another species.

Though those with sound instincts were expected to avoid the Jews at all costs, that was not always the case. There are, according to Nazi concepts of racial hygiene, consequences of racial defilement, both at the individual level and the societal. The mixing of blood led only to ruin: physical, mental, and spiritual ruin for the person of mixed blood, and complete collapse for the society that could not sufficiently maintain pure blood of its population.

Nazi propaganda is full of references to the negative consequences of impure blood. A guide intended to help teachers with racial instruction for students in the fourth through eighth grades explained, "Humans are not equal, but rather are of differing races. The drives and strengths that create cultures are rooted in a race's genes…The result of racial mixing, in brief, is always: a) the lowering of the quality of the higher race, b) a physical and spiritual decline, and therefore the beginning, however slowly, of ever-increasing infirmity."[35] Another pamphlet noted, "Racial differences are physical, spiritual, and intellectual. The most important differences are in the spiritual and intellectual areas, in life styles."[36] While another explained, "Only inferior members of various races mix with each other, the bad mixes with the bad. It is thus clear that the bastard always gets the worst of it, that is, he unites only the bad characteristics of the races he comes from."[37] Thus, in each individual case, the mixing of blood leads to a vastly inferior offspring, one in which the worst of both races is represented. On the small scale, the products of such mixing are tragic; on the larger scale, they can prove disastrous.

As noted in the earlier examples, inferior and mixed blood was associated not only with physical and mental deterioration; it was also associated with moral decay. One of the many sciences turned toward racial hygiene was that of criminology, which took on a distinctly biological slant in the Third Reich. Nicole Rafter, in her study of Nazi biocriminology, explained, "It was based on two fundamental assumptions: that biology determines criminal behavior, with environment having little significant effect; and that the biological factors are genetic and inevitably passed to the next generation."[38] This biocriminology attributed hereditary factors rather than sociological ones and included "malevolence," "uncontrolled sexuality," and "predatory criminality" as Jewish racial traits that were genetically inherited and thus unavoidable.[39] This belief escalates things quite a bit. On the one hand, pure Aryans no

longer have to worry only about being contaminated somehow, but also have to fear the inferior races' criminal tendencies. At the same time, society itself is in danger, as greater numbers of people of inferior or mixed races lead invariably to increases in crime.

The ultimate result of such racial defilement stems from the individual issues associated with impure blood. Eventually, when the overall racial health of a society becomes contaminated it is doomed to collapse. One guide for teachers quotes Hitler's *Mein Kampf*: "Racial mixing, the resulting decline in racial quality, is the single cause for the death of ancient cultures; people do not perish because of lost wars, but rather because of the loss of strength to resist that comes only from pure blood."[40] A booklet given to all German children once they completed their compulsory education echoes Hitler's belief and emphasizes that racial defilement is the greatest danger facing a pure race: "Each people has its own law of life within it. And this law says: a people ages and dies only when its racial value continually diminishes. A people ages and dies when its genetically ill and racially inferior elements grow more rapidly than its genetically healthy and racially valuable elements do. Genetic and racial decline is a daily, hidden, creeping danger. It is thus more dangerous for a people than even the bloodiest war."[41]

In this way, Nazi propaganda plays on several fears at the same time. There is the omnipresent fear of contamination. One could be tainted or could discover that some distant ancestor was of an inferior race, which would damn them to a life as an inferior as well. There is also the fear for personal safety, as every person of inferior or mixed race is a violent and perverse criminal waiting to prey on the genetically pure. Lastly, there is the fear that these elements will eventually overpower the physical, moral, and mental health of the Aryan state to

such an extent that the entire society would descend into chaos. Thus, inferior races—and Jews in particular—were seen not only as different, not only as lesser, but also as dangerous.

Because these fears were tied to "scientific" understanding, they were easily disseminated to the population, notably through German schools. On the one hand, scientific propaganda was incorporated in all levels and subjects and aimed at students. In a way that blended the low, middle, and highbrow anti-Semitism, "textbooks and curricula targeted at students in primary and secondary schools resonated with messages about the racial otherness of the Jews. In many cases they drew heavily from the standard works of scholarship in race science, yet they also transmitted simplistic and mean-spirited anti-Jewish stereotypes that were designed to instill in students a visceral revulsion toward the Jews."[42] In her study of education in Nazi Germany, Lisa Pine found that the subject of biology became a channel for anti-Semitic propaganda in German schools:

> Biology lessons became vehicles for Nazi racial doctrine, emphasizing themes such as race, heredity and the "selection of the fittest." Pupils were instructed in the classification of racial types and craniology. Films and slides were produced as teaching aids. Visual presentations were deemed to be particularly useful in showing the distinctions between examples of "racially pure" and "inferior" or "hereditarily diseased" individuals. Biology was "assigned a central function in education" with "two hours of teaching a week in all grades."[43]

This incorporation of scientific propaganda into the curriculum was no accident. In *The Jewish Question in Education*, aimed at helping teachers incorporate anti-Semitism into their teaching, Fritz Fink stressed that "No one among our people should or may grow up without learning the true depravity and danger of the Jew," and noted that the best subject for conveying such information is science.[44] In the same document, Fink insisted, "racial science and the Jewish question must run like a red threat through education at every level. There is no subject in our schools from which valuable knowledge of the Jewish Question cannot be drawn in unexpected

fullness."[45] The imagery used by Fink, especially the color red, is striking and revealing. While modern readers likely think of blood and the murder of millions in the Holocaust, Fink may have intended to call blood to mind as well, though for different purposes. The focus on blood purity and fears of contamination would have made that "red thread" running through the curriculum supremely important.

Propaganda incorporated into the curriculum would also have been aimed at the teachers working with children. To properly teach the German youth, one had to become an expert in racial hygiene, to—as Fink put it—"master the racial and Jewish Question."[46] In this way, the propaganda incorporated into schools served a dual role. It ensured that an entire generation of German students was thoroughly indoctrinated in Nazi racial ideology by the time they reached graduation; it also ensured that the country's teachers, a respected group in most cultures, were well versed in racial hygiene and comfortable teaching it.

While it is clear that scientific ideas became Nazi propaganda as race, genetics, biocriminology, and other concepts were focused on the Jews and other Nazi targets, the actual role of such propaganda in the overall system of German propaganda is not quite as easy to pin down. Several scholars have noted that racial hygiene did not necessitate the Final Solution, as interbreeding can be prevented without the complete annihilation of one group.[47] This propaganda was quite useful to Hitler in implementing the final solution, however. It served to justify the "disenfranchisement, expropriation, and removal of Jews from German society" that made it much easier to implement the Final Solution.[48] It also helped to legitimize the policy of genocide—even if not presenting it as the only option—as the Jews were considered a danger to the German people.

Z.A.B. Zeman has argued that the great value of this propaganda was "the manner in which it was manipulated to satisfy the psychological needs of the Germans."[49] Ehnrenreich agrees, suggesting that "the regime almost invariably justified the racial laws and the ancestral proof on the alleged need to maintain racial purity…[because] the Nazi leadership recognized that many in Germany felt uncomfortable with the more intemperate forms of anti-Semitism."[50] In this way, scientific propaganda was used to free the bystander and perpetrator from guilt when other forms of anti-Semitism failed to do so.

"Scientific" anti-Semitism was easy for the German public to deal with because it was less emotional, seemingly less violent. In a way, it was almost apologetic, a necessary evil that had to be done in order to protect the pure Aryan race. One document, for example, laments the "frequent misunderstandings of the National Socialist racial worldview. Some see racial arrogance and intolerance. That is absolutely false…We also believe that the races received their various characteristics to develop, not to mix. We thus do not see value distinctions in racial differences, but rather differences in kind. We therefore want to preserve the German people in its true nature and preserve it from racial mixing."[51] Another document explains, "the fundamental reason for excluding foreign-raced groups from a people's body is not discrimination or contempt, but rather the realization of otherness. Only through such thinking will the peoples again become healthy and able to respect each other."[52]

While the ideas are certainly devious, this language used to convey them seems so much more reasonable, rational, and peaceful than the more venomous anti-Semitism that played a role in the Final Solution. It is so much less violent to suggest that there are no hard feelings, no sense of hate or arrogance, but rather that people of different races must be separated for there to be any chance of mutual respect between them. For those people who were a bit too delicate to

advocate for violence against the Jewish conspiracy of world domination, a scientific premise that necessitated separation was much more palatable.

The insidious nature of propaganda comes into play where science can be used to claim "respect" while also dehumanizing and belittling millions of people, to advocate for separation while also justifying genocide. Nazi scientific propaganda was so successful because it was so versatile. It played on a number of different fears, utilizing the authority of science to seem infallible as well as prestigious. It incorporated traditional ideas and international trends, springing from them but also using them as justification for its own existence. From the highbrow, seemingly peaceful articles on differences in blood types and behavioral tendencies that practically apologized for those differences, it filtered down to the lowbrow where it merged with stereotypes and conspiracy theories to create fear, revulsion, and hate.

Notes

1. Harding, “Science and Propaganda,” 478-479.
2. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 5.
3. Fairhead and Leach, *Misreading the African Landscape*, 14; Ehnrenreich, *The Nazi Ancestral Proof*, xii.
4. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 170-172.
5. Milgram, *Obedience to Authority*, 8.
6. Ibid., 54.
7. Fleck, *Genesis and Development of a Scientific Fact* quoted in Haas, “German Science and Black Racism,” 337.
8. Polsky, “Blood, Race, and National Identity,” 177.
9. Ehnrenreich, *The Nazi Ancestral Proof*, 16; Kitson, *Romantic Literature,* 15.
10. Haas, “German Science and Black Racism,” 332.
11. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew*, 24.
12. Ibid., 9.
13. Haas, “German Science and Black Racism,” 336.
14. Ibid., 333; Bachrach, “In the Name of Public Health,” 417.
15. Bachrach, “In the Name of Public Health,” 417.
16. Ehnrenreich, *The Nazi Ancestral Proof*, 16.
17. Polsky, “Blood, Race, and National Identity,” 177-178.
18. Kuhl, *The Nazi Connection*, 90.
19. Ibid., 36.
20. Hart, “Science, Politics, and Prejudice,” 301-325.
21. Kuhl, *The Nazi Connection*, 88.
22. Bennecke, “On the German People.”
23. Bytwerk, “Racial Policy.”
24. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew*, 14-15.
25. Beisel, “Building the Nazi Mindset,” 371; Herf, *The Jewish Enemy*, 27-28.
26. Victor, *Hitler: The Pathology of Evil*, 168.
27. Polsky, “Blood, Race, and National Identity,” 174-175; Ehnrenreich, *The Nazi Ancestral Proof*, 4.
28. Bachrach, “In the Name of Public Health,” 419.
29. Victor, *Hitler: The Pathology of Evil*, 169; Polsky, “Blood, Race, and National Identity,” 176.
30. Victor, *Hitler: The Pathology of Evil*, 139.
31. Fink, “The Jewish Question in Education.”
32. Bytwerk, “You and Your People.”
33. Bytwerk, “Germany Overcomes Jewry.”
34. Bareth and Vogel, “Hereditary and Racial Science.”
35. Ibid.
36. Bytwerk, “Racial Policy.”
37. Fink, “The Jewish Question in Education.”
38. Rafter, “Criminology’s Darkest Hour,” 294.
39. Ibid., 294; Ehnrenreich, *The Nazi Ancestral Proof*, xvii; Steinweis, *Studying the Jew*, 137-138.
40. Bareth and Vogel, “Hereditary and Racial Science.”
41. Bytwerk, “You and Your People.”
42. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew*, 17.
43. Pine, *Education in Nazi Germany,* 42.
44. Fink, “The Jewish Question in Education.”
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid.
47. Herf, *The Jewish Enemy*, 151; Pine, *Education in Nazi Germany*, 44.
48. Steinweis, *Studying the Jew*, 19.
49. Zeman, *Nazi Propaganda*, 77.
50. Ehnrenreich, *The Nazi Ancestral Proof*, 168.
51. Bennecke, “On the German People.”

52. Bareth and Vogel, “Hereditary and Racial Science.”

Bibliography

Bachrach, Susan. "In the Name of Public Health – Nazi Racial Hygiene." *The New England Journal of Medicine* 351, no. 5 (2004): 417-420.

Bareth, Karl and Alfred Vogel. "Hereditary and Racial Science for Elementary and Secondary Schools." *German Propaganda Archive*. Accessed November 24, 2013. http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/erblehre.htm.

Beisel, David R. "Building the Nazi Mindset." *The Journal of Psychohistory* 37, no. 4 (2010): 367-374.

Bennecke, Fritz, ed. "On the German People and Its Territory." *German Propaganda Archive*. Accessed November 24, 2013. http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/hjhandbuch.htm.

Bytwerk, Randall. "Germany Overcomes Jewry." *German Propaganda Archive*. Accessed November 24, 2013. http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/mainfranken-1944.htm.

Bytwerk, Randall. "Racial Policy." *German Propaganda Archive*. Accessed November 24, 2013. http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/rassenpo.htm.

Bytwerk, Randall. "You and Your People." *German Propaganda Archive*. Accessed November 24, 2013. http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/du.htm.

Ehnrenreich, Eric. *The Nazi Ancestral Proof: Genealogy, Racial Science, and the Final Solution*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 2007.

Fairhead, James and Melissa Leach. *Misreading the African Landscape: Society and Ecology in a Forest-Savanna Mosaic*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Fink, Fritz. "The Jewish Question in Education." *German Propaganda Archive*. Accessed November 24, 2013. http://www.calvin.edu/academic/cas/gpa/fink.htm.

Haas, Francois. "German Science and Black Racism—Roots of the Nazi Holocaust." *The Journal of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology* 22, no. 2 (2008): 332-337. doi: 10.1096/fj.08-0202ufm.

Harding, T. Swan. "Science and Propaganda." *American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 7, no. 4 (1948): 475-486.

Hart, Bradley W. "Science, Politics, and Prejudice: The Dynamics and Significance of British Anthropology's Failure to Confront Nazi Racial Ideology." *European History Quarterly* 43, no. 301 (2013): 301-325. doi: 10.1177/0265691413477069.

Herf, Jeffrey. *The Jewish Enemy: Nazi Propaganda During World War II and the Holocaust*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Kitson, Peter J. *Romantic Literature, Race, and Colonial Encounter*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Kuhl, Stefan. *The Nazi Connection: Eugenics, American Racism, and German National Socialism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.

Milgram, Stanley. *Obedience to Authority: The Experiment that Challenged Human Nature*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1974.

Pine, Lisa. *Education in Nazi Germany*. Oxford: Berg Publishers, 2010.

Polsky, Allyson D. "Blood, Race, and National Identity: Scientific and Popular Discourse." *Journal of Medical Humanities* 23, no. 3/4 (2002): 171-186.

Rafter, Nicole. "Criminology's Darkest Hour: Biocriminology in Nazi Germany." *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 41, no. 2 (2008): 287-306. doi: 10.1375/acri.41.2.287.

Steinweis, Alan E. *Studying the Jew: Scholarly Antisemitism in Nazi Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

Victor, George. *Hitler: The Pathology of Evil*. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, 2000.

Zeman, Z.A.B. *Nazi Propaganda*. London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

Hope and Religion

Rebecca Posna
Kean University

Survival during the Holocaust occurred for any number of reasons. For some it was a matter of being in the right place at the right time. For others, the idea that someone might be waiting for them was reason enough to fight for their life. Faith, be it in a religious capacity or in the goodness of some faction, would lead some to believe that it was a matter of time until someone came to their aid. That someone might have been another nation sending troops to perform a rescue effort or even the Catholic Church and the Pope's intervention. Unfortunately, the latter did not ever come to fruition. Before I could pursue this issue further I had to figure out the basis of my own hope. I had not stopped to consider my personal motivation prior to exploring the driving force of a few survivors with whom I have spoken. Once thought through, I determined that purpose is at the center of hope for everyone. For myself, my family and my goals provide me with the purpose I need to remain hopeful. "Memory, solidarity, hope, and mystical faith, however, embody compelling, contextual faith modes that can help assure survival and resistance."[1] This article uses three interviews with Holocaust survivors to navigate the importance of hope; the concept of blame will also be addressed. Who do we look to to resolve the matter of blame for the Holocaust? Was it just the Nazis? What about the bystanders? Where was God? Some survived the Holocaust but their religious beliefs did not.

First and foremost, the Nazis played the biggest role in the Holocaust and therefore are accountable for their actions. Despite their rigid uniformity, not all Nazi soldiers were willing participants. In fact, there are countless stories of an occasional act of kindness being shown to a Jew by a hesitant member of the Nazi party. Helen Rothschild is a survivor of nine camps in addition to the ghetto where she first lived with her parents and younger brother when the war

broke out.[2] While in one of the camps Helen's friend became the focus of one soldier. He was in love with her and offered to get her out of the camp and off to safety. The girl did not want to leave the others behind so she declined his offer. Helen explained that he was a good man and she would later give written testimony in an attempt to have him spared from whatever punishment was to come. The outcome is unknown. No matter the end result, this encounter taught Helen that there were still some good people around her and helped to keep her hope intact.

Another survivor, Helena Flaum, worked in a factory for over a year.[3] The German foreman in her department took pity on her. When no one was looking he would give her extra bread or a piece of fruit to put in her pocket and eat later. On numerous other occasions the foreman would allow Helena to sneak away and sleep for awhile on a desk in one of the offices at the factory. He told her that he would come and get her if he detected any danger of her being caught. When hungry and exhausted from twelve hour shifts, standing in one place at the factory, it was the "enemy" who came to her aid. To date, Helena has never forgotten the kindness this German man showed her.

Hope wavered for some when they witnessed the inaction of bystanders. A bystander is "one who stands near; a chance looker-on; hence one who has no concern with the business being transacted. One present but not taking part, looker-on, spectator, beholder, observer."[4] Why did bystanders keep quiet? There are a number of reasons people stayed quiet. It is my opinion that there is one main reason—fear. Those who knew enough of the conditions in concentration camps would likely know that their lives would be in grave danger if they attempted to defy the system. For that matter, those who did go ahead and rebel, whether by

hiding Jews or acting in a resistance movement, knew that those actions could potentially cost them their lives if caught. Many were unwilling to gamble with such high stakes.

Throughout the Holocaust, desperate pleas poured into the Catholic Church from all over. "In the spring of 1940, the Chief Rabbi of Palestine, Isaac Herzog, asked the papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Luigi Maglione to intercede to keep Jews in Spain from being deported to Germany. He later made a similar request for Jews in Lithuania. The papacy did nothing."[5] In 1941, Cardinal Theodor Innitzer of Vienna went to Pius XII and told him about the Jewish deportations. Later that year, "the Assistant Chief of the U.S. delegation to the Vatican, Harold Tittman, asked the Pope to condemn the atrocities. The response came that the Holy See wanted to remain 'neutral,' and that condemning the atrocities would have a negative influence on Catholics in German-held lands."[6]

Monsignor Giovanni Battista Montini wrote in 1942 to the Pope explaining that his silence would have a negative impact on his moral standing. To this the Secretary of the State responded, on Pius XII's behalf, that the rumors about the Jews were impossible to verify. The president of the Polish government-in-exile, as well as a Bishop from Berlin, asked a collective three times for the Pope to denounce Nazi violence. "The Pope finally gave a reason for his consistent refusals to make a public statement in December 1942…the staunchly anti-communist Pope felt he could not denounce the Nazis without including the Communists; therefore, Pius XII would only condemn general atrocities."[7] It is hard to believe that the Pope was unwilling to comply with the numerous frantic requests to simply denounce Nazism.

As a result of the events involved in the Holocaust, droves of people lost their faith in a higher power. Many had difficulty believing that someone who was watching over them would allow such horrific things to happen. One shining example of this situation is Elie Wiesel. His

book *Night* speaks explicitly about his early years, before the war, and his thirst for knowledge about the Kabbalah. When Elie's enthusiasm grew beyond what his father was willing to teach him he sought further information from a man in town known as Moshe the Beadle. Moshe disappeared and later returned having escaped time in a concentration camp; he was a changed man. A short time later, Elie's family would be on the train en route to a concentration camp as well. Upon arrival, his mother and youngest sister were killed immediately. Elie and his father stayed together throughout a myriad of obstacles. Soon after arriving at the camp he began questioning his faith. Ultimately, he would renounce his trust in God. Despite being so close to death a number of times during the Holocaust and watching his father die in Auschwitz, Elie's perseverance helped him survive the war. Today he is eighty-five years old and still attends speaking engagements and has been a symbol of hope and strength for several decades.

Hope, motivation, and purpose do not all come from a uniform place. For each individual, there is a unique driving force within them, as can be seen in survivors of genocide. Passion falls into the category purpose. For a character named Juliek in Elie Wiesel's *Night*, music was his life for as long as he could hold on. Juliek, likely based on a real person Wiesel met during the Holocaust, clung to his violin like it was a companion. While waiting for transport to Buchenwald, he is literally piled in a heap of human beings. At some point he frees himself enough to play Beethoven on his violin one final time. He did not make it to morning.

Two survivors and authors have told their stories about how music saved their lives. The first is Wladyslaw Szpilman in his book, *The Pianist*. Before the war, Szpilman played the piano professionally. When he manages to escape into hiding and is discovered by a Nazi, he is saved solely based on his ability to play the piano. The Nazi officer takes an interest in him and brings him food during the remainder of the war until Szpilman is liberated. He sees the Nazi officer

detained and tries to get to him in time to save the man's life, but when he arrives, the camp is completely gone. Once the war is over, the pianist returns to his passion and once again, plays professionally.

The second book is *Alice's Piano*, the story of Alice Herz-Sommer. Alice was an accomplished pianist before the war. When the war arrived, Alice's mother was transported to Theresienstadt. Shortly after, she, her husband, and their six-year-old son were also sent to Theresienstadt. Because that camp was used as a model when the Germans intended to show what the camps were doing there were flowers and nicer bunkers than at other camps. Behind closed doors the camp was vicious. As part of the façade, the camp put on instrumental performances. That was Alice's key to survival. She played over a hundred "concerts" at the camp; she managed to instill hope during an impossible time.[8] For the three aforementioned prisoners of the Holocaust, music was the answer to the question, "How will I get through this?" However, when it comes to purpose and reason to go on, there is a different light at the end of each individual's tunnel.

Three remarkable women with three very different stories agreed to interviews in which they would tell their individual stories. Each of these Holocaust survivors went through years of uncertain and terrifying times. Two of the three would come out of the war with no surviving members of their immediate family. Also, as is so common with survivors, there was a religious shift in two of these three women. Elie Wiesel's loss of religious faith was the extreme example of feeling a sense of betrayal by God. In most cases, one of two things happened. Either the survivors or victims were able to cling to their faith as a means of hope, or they denounced God altogether and were unable to cope with His absence during the Holocaust.

Helena Flaum was raised in a Polish town called Rawa Ruska. Born in 1927, she was the oldest of five children and the only girl. Helena attended Hebrew school and had a strong sense of her religion as a child. Growing up in a predominately Christian neighborhood, Helena fit in well with children outside of the Jewish community in addition to those within. Her father had a close friend who lived nearby who would later go to work with the Germans. When the war broke out, Helena was about fifteen years old. As life became increasingly difficult for Jews, her father's friend would bring news of advancements in the war. His niece, roughly Helena's age, had passed away a short while before. He offered to retrieve her records from the church and to help Helena's father forge the documents to portray his daughter as a Christian child in response to a call for teenaged Christian girls in a work factory.

Her father gave her the option to accept this offer and go or stay with her family. Before she had decided, her father told her that he would like for her to live on so she might tell the world what happened to their family. In an extraordinary act of bravery, Helena took the offer and left for work at the factory. She was able to continue communications with her father who would write to her under the name of his Christian friend who would be posing as her uncle. She was able to recognize her father's handwriting in the notes until one day when it had changed. Her father's friend wrote the note himself this time and using a code told her that her family was gone. While at the factory she got permission to use the restroom where she cried hysterically for a few moments in private. Then after cleaning up her face, she returned to work. She knew she could not afford to attract any attention. Helena was immensely brave and mature beyond her years. Her bravery, which she kept through many more obstacles later in her life, stems from the sense of purpose instilled in her by her father. Roughly seventy years later, Helena still has not been able to restore her religious beliefs fully. When asked about her faith she replied, "My

relationship with God? We're working on it."[9] She still lights candles for Shabbat every Friday evening and prays for those who were lost and that it should never happen again. Today she is as optimistic as ever and is happily married with two sons and seven grandchildren and only recently retired from a regular speaking engagement about her experiences.

Helen Rothschild was born near Vilna, Poland. She had one younger brother. She came from a reformed Jewish home. When the war broke out Helen was about thirteen years old. Initially she and her family were taken to the Vilna ghetto, where they would stay for two years from 1942-1944. After that point all were deported. Shortly after arriving at the first camp Helen's mother and younger brother were killed. She and her father managed to stay at the same camps for awhile until there was a call for young girls to work at another camp. Her father was working near the train and she saw him as she boarded. This would be the last time she saw him alive. A few months before the end of the war he was shot and killed.

In total, Helen would survive one ghetto and nine camps. One of those camps was Mühldorf, the killing center which was a satellite location of Dachau. During one winter in the camp a German, Jewish prisoner saw Helen's shoes and told her she would not make it through the winter with those. He took it upon himself to use his contact person to obtain a pair of quality shoes for her. He came through and Helen never forgot the kindness of this man, who she would never see again. Later, she came across a notebook and pencil at some point and began recording dates and events in Polish, which she still has today. After the war Helen met her future husband in a displaced persons camp. The couple married and had two children together. After the Holocaust Helen's religious involvement did not change very much. She still participates in the traditions on holidays with her family. When asked if she ever had a feeling that she would not survive the war, Helen enthusiastically responded, "No, we were hopeful."[10]

Adele Rapaport was born near Lodz, Poland. Adele was the second oldest in a family of six children, four girls and two boys. She came from a relatively religious family. She attended Hebrew school and was able to speak "Jewish." She was about seventeen years old when the war broke out. In the Lodz ghetto she and eight others shared a one-room apartment until they were able to switch to a three-room apartment. In 1944, her family was transported to Birkenau. Almost immediately, all of her family except one sister were taken away and never seen again. Adele and her sister were moved to Auschwitz and then Bergen Belsen. After yet another selection, the sisters were moved to Magdeburg, Germany where they worked in an ammunition factory. When her sister became ill she was taken away. Adele was considering suicide believing that her sister was killed. With the advancement of opposition, the workers ran for their lives. She and a few other women stayed in a hand-built shelter for several days without food. They went together into a small German town thereafter where they were given shelter and were able to work for food.

Once liberated by the Russians, Adele was unsure what to do next. She was without any family and trying to survive on her own when she met her husband. The two moved to Italy and stayed there for three years. From Italy, Adele sent a letter to a society that helped to locate relatives she had in New York. Shortly after, she received a telegram from her sister who had made it to the United States in 1946. Naturally, she was bursting with excitement now knowing that her sister was alive after having been sure she perished with the rest of the family in the war. When asked, Adele attributes her survival to two things: one of those things is her bravery and the other is resilience. She swears by the sentiment that what is going to happen will happen, you should always make the best of it and continue on. Her religious views are still strong today. She

keeps kosher, celebrates the holidays, and has a daughter living in Israel. Today Adele's family spans four generations.

For survivors of the Holocaust as well as those who were not fortunate enough to survive, life purpose was a driving factor in the ability to keep moving and live as long as possible. Countless challenges in every conceivable mental, emotional, and physical capacity were faced daily during the Holocaust. For some, all religious faith left them as a result of what they saw and experienced. For others, it was what kept them alive. Despite Pope Pius XII's refusal to become involved, countless efforts were made by those within the Catholic Church and it is important to recognize their attempts. The two most important lessons to take away are that no group was uniform. Be it Nazis, the Catholic Church, or the Jews, there were a variety of personalities, intentions and actions coming from each. Secondly, purpose is what allows a person to wake up in the morning and keep moving forward, no matter what they are facing.

Notes

1. Barnett, *Bystanders: conscience and complicity*.
2. Rapaport, Adele. Interview by author. Personal interview. Cults Neck, NJ, March, 9, 2014.
3. Flaum, Helena. Interview by author. Personal interview. Farmingdale, NJ, March 6, 2014.
4. Barnett, *Bystanders: conscience and complicity*.
5. "The Vatican & the Holocaust: Pope Pius XII & the Holocaust." Pope Pius XII & the Holocaust. Accessed April 27, 2014. http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/anti-semitism/pius.html.
6. Ibid.
7. Ibid.
8. Müller and Piechocki, *Alice's piano*.
9. Flaum, Helena. Interview by author. Personal interview. Farmingdale, NJ, March 6, 2014.
10. Rothschild, Helen. Interview by author. Personal interview. Brooklyn, NY, July 22, 2013.

Bibliography

Barnett, Victoria. *Bystanders: conscience and complicity during the Holocaust*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2000.

Jewish Virtual Library. "The Vatican & the Holocaust: Pope Pius XII & the Holocaust." Accessed on April 27, 2014. http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsource/anti-semitism/pius.html.

Müller, Melissa, and Reinhard Piechocki. *Alice's piano: The life of Alice Herz-Sommer*. New York, N.Y.: St. Martin's Press, 2012.

Szpilman, Wladyslaw. *The pianist: The extraordinary story of one man's survival in Warsaw, 1939-45*. New York: Picador USA, 1999.

Wiesel, Elie. *Night*. New York, NY: Hill and Wang, 2006.

Studying Genocide:
Integrating Criminology and other Disciplines

William R. Pruitt
Elmira College

INTRODUCTION

Genocide is a topic that cuts across many different fields of study. Scholars from law, psychology, political science, sociology, and criminology have analyzed genocide. These various fields offer distinct views of genocide as a phenomenon. The legal field is concerned with enforcement of the United Nations Convention on Genocide and finding justice after genocide. Psychology has offered some ways to analyze individual behavior during genocide. Political scientists are concerned with the effect of genocide on a state's political structure. Sociologists' main objective is to analyze genocide as a social event and to understand the structural and cultural factors involved in genocide. No one field can claim dominion over genocide; there are too many prisms that can be used to study the topic. Every scholar from every field has the capability to increase the understanding of genocide and its prevention. Taken separately these fields offer new information on a single dimension of genocide. Taken together these studies greatly expand the global understanding and possible response to genocide. This article focuses on the different disciplinary approaches to the study of genocide with a hope to show that there is room for the field of criminology to add its own unique contribution to the field of genocide study.

LAW

The United Nations Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide created a legal responsibility to stop and to punish genocide. Since the passage of the

UN Convention there have been only two courts to ever consider genocide cases. In the mid-1990s the United Nations established the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR). These tribunals have been tasked with interpreting the Convention and applying it in prosecutions of génocidaires. Several legal scholars have tried to assist the ICTY and ICTR by offering their interpretation of the Genocide Convention.

Lawyers and legal scholars approach genocide as a violation of international law. The signatories to the UN Convention agreed to prevent genocide when possible and to punish those responsible for committing genocide. As part of adopting the UN Convention, each nation had to add genocide as a criminal offense in their respective legal codes.[1] From this, an international prohibition against genocide emerged rather quickly following passage of the UN Convention. Unfortunately, in most instances of genocide there is no punishment for the atrocity. Legal scholars have focused their research on three main issues in the prosecution and enforcement of genocide statutes—intent, sovereign immunity, and universal jurisdiction. The intent element of the UN Convention has caused some concern that it is too restrictive. The issue of sovereign immunity had to be dealt with before prosecutions were possible, and the claim of universal jurisdiction causes some concerns within the legal field. Each of these issues will be discussed in the next few paragraphs.

Like many crimes, the UN Convention requires that genocide be committed with intent, not through negligence or recklessness. It has been argued that requiring specific intent for genocide is too strict. A general knowledge requirement has been offered to replace specific intent.[2] Fournet argues that if the perpetrators have knowledge that their act is in pursuit of genocide as a whole then criminal liability should attach.[3] The reason for Fournet's concern is

that génocidaires will be able to avoid punishment by claiming that they did not have the intent to destroy an entire group. While it would be possible to make a defense of lack of intent, there is no assurance that it would be successful. The ICTR in the Akayesu case stated that "intent can be inferred from a certain number of presumptions of fact".[4] The court further explained that intent can be inferred from words and actions. Evidence to be considered in regard to intent includes the physical targeting of a specific group or their property; the use of derogatory language towards members of the target group; the weapons used and the extent of bodily injury inflicted; the methodical planning and systematic manner of the killing.[5] Finally, the number of victims from the targeted group can also be considered.

The ICTY in the Sikirica case abandoned most of these considerations and applied a definition of intent based solely on the number of victims killed.[6] The court stated that the "ordinary meaning" of "in part" in the UN Convention requires that "a reasonably significant number, relative to the total of the group as a whole, or else a significant section of a group as its leadership" be killed before intent for genocide can be satisfied.[7] The court failed to articulate any specific number of victims where intent can be reasonably inferred. There has not been another court decision focusing on the precision of the intent element since the Sikirica decision. There is reason to believe that the ICTR's definition and inference standard is considered a more accurate interpretation of the UN Convention than the Sikirica analysis. The Genocide Convention was passed upon the idea that the destruction of any group harms humanity as a whole. Therefore, it is irrelevant if genocide is part of a larger plan (i.e., war strategy), perpetrated by the state or private individuals, whether it is successful or not, or how large in scope it is.[8]

While the intent element is a concern for the International Criminal Tribunals currently trying génocidaires, another perceived problem was that—because of the concept of sovereign immunity—no state official could ever be tried for genocide. Prior to 1945 the notion of sovereign immunity was very powerful. There was an unspoken agreement that one nation would not intervene into another nation's domestic affairs.[9] Since most genocides occur within the borders of one nation, it could be considered a domestic affair. While this issue has not been a problem for the ICTY or the ICTR, it was an obstacle to the Nuremberg trials following World War II. The lack of response to the Armenian genocide during World War I was based on sovereign immunity.[10] Other nations believed that they could not intervene even if they desired to do so because domestic affairs must be handled by the home nation. Only when the world saw the horrific atrocities committed by Germany during the Second World War and believed that the perpetrators might not be punished for their acts did the doctrine of sovereign immunity come under serious attack. Sheldon Glueck, the well-known criminologist,[11] attacked the doctrine of sovereign immunity and quickly dismissed it. Sovereign immunity is based on the idea of national comity and courtesy with the expectation that the sovereign will act in a law-abiding and trustworthy manner.[12] If a sovereign nation violates these expectations it has abrogated its immunity. When a sovereign willfully orders his people to commit flagrant violations of law, he has clearly voided his immunity and made himself liable.[13] Some sovereigns may still claim immunity but no court is willing to accept that defense anymore.

Another main concern related to the legal response to genocide is the concept of universal jurisdiction. The UN Convention says that génocidaires can be tried by any nation regardless of where the actual acts occurred.[14] Universal jurisdiction is assumed[15]; for example, the International Criminal Tribunal for the genocidal crimes in Yugoslavia sits in the Netherlands,

and the ICT for the Rwandan genocide meets in Tanzania. Even though the Nuremberg trial and the International Criminal Tribunals are based on universal jurisdiction, there are still arguments raised against the practice.

The history of international crime has no basis for universal jurisdiction. Early treaties recognized that there should be international cooperation for the punishment of criminals—mostly pirates.[16] These treaties though were entered into by independent nations who agreed to prosecute pirates on behalf of each other. These treaties did not advocate universal jurisdiction.[17] Currently, one of the complaints that the United States has against the International Criminal Court (ICC) is the universal jurisdiction that the ICC can exercise.[18] The United States has raised the issue of universal jurisdiction again making it a possible argument against international courts prosecuting genocide. The legal dimension of genocide focuses on the appropriate response following genocide as defined by the UN. Legal scholars are not concerned with the causes of genocide, but instead with the legal response to address genocide and punish génocidaires.

PSYCHOLOGY

Psychology—the study of human thought and behavior—has a role to play in the study of genocide and the field has produced several works on genocide. Ervin Staub has studied genocide for several years. In his 1989 book The Roots of Evil, Staub proposes a basis for the origins of genocide. He states that genocide is more likely to occur when a person or society is faced with difficult life conditions and adheres to certain cultural characteristics that generate psychological processes that lead to one group turning against another group.[19] The individual is

considered susceptible to supporting genocide because of his/her own personal characteristics and cultural beliefs.

Some psychologists root their analysis of genocide in the studies of Milgram. In the 1950s Milgram conducted studies where one person was asked to deliver what they believed to be electric shocks to another person.[20] There was an authority figure with the person asked to do the shocking who would have no response when participants began to express pain from the shocks. Milgram found that people were willing to override their inhibition to harm others when there was an authority figure present.[21] Obedience to power had a strong influence on people's behavior. This obedience to authority left little room for a person to oppose what they believed to be legitimate orders. Brannigan evaluates the events of the Holocaust in light of Milgram's studies.[22] It appears plausible that some people may have participated in the Holocaust because of orders they perceived to be legitimate, but Brannigan believes that this does not explain why some people waited several months before participating. Also, Brannigan finds this explanation lacking when it was clear that some génocidaires in Germany enjoyed their work.

Another application of Milgram's study to genocide found that the obedience to authority discovered by Milgram fit well with the banality of evil argument.[23] The banality of evil argument was developed by Hannah Arendt in her study of the Adolf Eichmann trial in Israel.[24] She found Eichmann to be relatively free of hatred, but an obedient soldier in following orders. Arendt claimed that genocide was perpetrated, not by hate-filled evil monsters, but by the average German. The obedience to orders claim has also been made by génocidaires in Cambodia, Rwanda, and Bosnia.[25] There is no evidence though, that this obedience to authority claim is truly what Milgram found in his study. People may choose to obey an order for any variety of reasons including fear, hatred of the victim, desire for promotion, or agreement with

the order.[26] Milgram never examined these external forces in his studies. While the obedience to authority claim may explain the involvement in genocide of some individuals, it fails to offer a significant reason for the resort to genocide as a policy.

Other psychologists have turned to the psychology of hate as the basis for genocide and other mass atrocities. Hatred of an out-group can arise rationally if that group is seen as taking resources away from the in-group.[27] This hatred can also arise irrationally based on long-lasting prejudices against the out-group.[28] If this hate leads to distancing and dehumanization of the out-group, then genocide is much more likely to occur. Individuals can have their feelings of hate validated if the out-group is labeled as a legitimate enemy by superiors. This leads the individual members of the in-group to believe that their feelings of hate and animosity are right and the only response one can have toward the out-group.[29] Once these feelings have been justified, it becomes easier to use violence against the out-group because they "deserve" such treatment.

Alexander Alvarez has applied the techniques of neutralization, created by Sykes and Matza, to the Holocaust as an explanation for individuals' involvement.[30] While the techniques of neutralization can be considered a criminological tool, its application by Alvarez to the Holocaust appears to support the idea that the techniques are more of a psychological explanation of genocide. The Holocaust was bureaucratized in many ways and participation was so pervasive that it would not be considered deviant to participate.[31] Before the Holocaust began and after the Holocaust ended, the many perpetrators lived law-abiding lives.[32] There is some evidence from perpetrators that they viewed their "work" as unpleasant and traumatic.[33] If the perpetrators of the Holocaust were not inhuman, there must be an explanation for why they participated in such atrocities. Applying the techniques of neutralization, Alvarez examines the psychological process that may have contributed to some génocidaires participation. First, denial

of responsibility allows the perpetrator to believe that their actions are outside of their own control. They are not responsible; there is a greater force at work. Denial of injury allows the perpetrator to classify their behavior in a more socially acceptable manner. They claim no one was really hurt by their actions—killing was referred to as "special treatment" or "cleansing".[34]

Denial of victim occurs when the perpetrator is able to claim that the victim is responsible for their situation. The victim is to blame for their own victimization. By casting the Jews as the enemy, the Germans were allowed to make a claim of self-defense and attempt to place their actions in a more tolerable position.[35] Condemning the condemners eases moral responsibility by stating that everyone is corrupt and they have no right to pass judgment on us. During the Holocaust, no major Western power allowed an increase in immigration quotas to accept more Jews, nor did they attempt to stop the killings by bombing the concentration camps. The Germans could cite this lack of action as wrong in its own right, thereby reducing any moral superiority that the Western nations claimed to have over Germany.[36]

The final technique, that of appeal to higher loyalty, permits the génocidaire to claim that they are not acting selfishly, but to please a higher power. That power can be human or supernatural. Hitler used devotion to patriotism to claim that the génocidaires were supporting Germany by their actions.[37] The techniques of neutralization seem to offer an explanation for why people participated and how they were able to justify their behavior. Psychological explanations of genocide are micro-level. Psychologists are mostly concerned with why and how people can commit such mass killings. Rarely does psychology offer an explanation for genocide; it is more likely to offer an explanation for why individuals or groups participate in genocide.

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Political scientists have attempted to analyze genocide within the sphere of politics and power. Rummel hypothesized that democide (his word for any state-sponsored mass killing) was less likely to occur in a democratic state.[38] Essentially, while power kills, absolute power kills absolutely.[39] In his analysis of democide and political structure, Rummel found that as one progresses from a democratic state to a totalitarian state, the likelihood of democide increases rapidly.[40] The more a nation's power structure controls the social, economic, and cultural groups and institutions within their borders, the greater the ability to rule arbitrarily becomes. An arbitrary government accounted for the magnitude and intensity of genocide.[41] The nature of power becomes the explanation of genocide.

Verdeja offers five factors that contribute to genocide[42]; these factors revolve around the government and its structure. First, a segmented society can more easily accept an 'us-versus-them' ideology.[43] Totalitarian governments can create and maintain a segmented society through their complete control over all state institutions. Rapid and profound social change is the second factor Verdeja identifies. Many times totalitarian governments have ascended to power through war or are facing a threat from other political powers. This creates a scene where social change is possible depending on how the people respond to the government.

Thirdly, an exclusivist political ideology that reinforces the social differences between groups can lead to genocide.[44] Most totalitarian governments will not share power with "others" and will promote the causes of their own people over others. The state's capacity to organize and carry out mass atrocities will directly affect the success of genocide.[45] A totalitarian regime controls all social institutions within the state easily adapting the state's existing structure to the evil ends of genocide. The final causal factor of genocide for Verdeja is an international

component that affects the duration of the genocide. Verdeja recognizes that genocide is only stopped by some form of international response.[46] This last factor has less of an effect on the process leading to genocide and more on the ability of the international community to stop the killing once it has begun. The international community usually chooses not to intervene for many reasons, but the power of the perpetrators' government is a concern. For example, it has been claimed that the United States has refused to end the genocide in Darfur because the government in Sudan has offered some useful information on the "war on terror".[47] In this way, political relationships can have a negative effect for the victims of genocide.

In 2003, Barbara Harff made a complete list of all genocides since 1945. Harff's definition of genocide was extended to include mass killings based on political belief (a group not covered by the United Nations Convention on Genocide). Based on her findings, she believed that genocide was more probable during or after an internal war, regime collapse, or revolution—all political events.[48] Harff focused on the ideology of the regimes involved and found that they tended to have an exclusive ideology that justified their elimination of the out-group. These leaders also tended to be from isolated nations with little international trade or responsibilities.[49] This may have led some leaders to feel insulated from any international repercussions for their actions. Analyzing the episodes of genocide since 1945 and the state in which they occurred, Harff was able to calculate the probability of genocide. If a state had none of the risk factors (internal war, regime collapse, revolution, past genocide, exclusive ideology) the probability of genocide was .028. An autocratic nation with no other risk factors had a .090 probability of genocide.[50] If all risk factors were present in a state, there was a .90 probability of genocide.[51] Harff's work is one of the few empirical studies of genocide offering support to certain causal factors behind genocide.

Not all political scientists though, are willing to adopt the premise that totalitarian governments are the only states that will resort to genocide. For many years in the field of political science there was the democratic peace theory, which states that "democracies rarely fight one another because they share common norms of live-and-let-live and domestic institutions that constrain the recourse to war".[52] When applied to genocide studies, many scholars focused solely on totalitarian states ignoring democratic regimes. Conversi disagrees with the democratic peace theory in genocide study, using the genocides in Yugoslavia and Rwanda as examples of non-totalitarian states involved in murdering their own citizens.

Rummel stated that absolute power kills absolutely and the only response to that is democracy. On the other side of the argument, Mann believes that democracy will not stop genocide, but can actually encourage it.[53] Mann's hypothesis states that genocide has its roots in failed democratization or in the face of increasing political parties attempting to create democracy.[54] Mann's ideology requires that genocide studies focus not just on authoritarian states, but also on democratic nations. Yugoslavia disintegrated into genocide after the fall of communism and the beginning of a more democratic government. Rwanda became enveloped in genocide soon after a power-sharing treaty was signed whereby the controlling elites were required to share power with the minority Tutsis. In both cases, it can be argued that these states were in a process of becoming more democratic when genocide occurred.

Political science studies genocide in to answer the question why some states resort to genocide and others do not. Political scientists have analyzed and supported the idea that genocide is a state crime. The political structure of the state is a contributing factor to genocide worldwide; the political nature of genocide cannot be ignored.

SOCIOLOGY

The field of sociology has studied genocide as a social fact[55] produced by the particular cultural and structural composition of society. Sociologists have focused their attention on the concepts of ethnic conflict, groupthink, and social norm to examine genocide. Ethnic conflicts can lead to collective violence expressed as terrorism, civil war, or genocide.[56] Since the end of the Second World War, the number of ethnic conflicts has been increasing due to new multi-ethnic states, nation building activities, and the spread of new ideology.[57] Williams found that the level of division between ethnic groups, their concentration in one geographic location, inequality, and fear of exclusion all increased the possibility of ethnic conflict.

Another crucial element in ethnic conflicts is the relationship between the ethnic groups and the state. This relationship becomes even more important if the state claims sole sovereignty over all ethnicities within their borders.[58] If there is disagreement concerning collective goods of society the likelihood of ethnic conflict increases. These collective goods include language, religion, political rights, and parity in the economy.[59] If an ethnic group challenges the state on these grounds, the state may feel force is an appropriate response, including elimination of the group in severe cases.

Aside from ethnic strife, other sociologists have attempted to explain why genocide flourishes as a social activity. Once genocide, or any group behavior, has begun society tends to develop an acceptance of the violence.[60] Social norms and institutions begin to change in a manner that supports the violence. Violence breeds more violence in societies like this. Eventually, killing and participation in genocide becomes the "right" thing to do. Societies also can become involved in "groupthink".[61] This groupthink can create an illusion of invincibility, which often leads to excessive optimism and risk-taking behavior.[62] Groupthink also allows the

society to rationalize their actions and their position on violence. Since groupthink creates a shared illusion of unanimity, it becomes even more difficult to dissent.[63] Once the ability to dissent is silenced there is little hope of stopping the violence. As such, the society has become complicit in the genocide even if there are some who refrain from participating.

Stone is not surprised that society engages in genocide because he argues that violence is a social norm in society.[64] This norm can be manipulated and mobilized under certain circumstances.[65] If violence is a norm, then the truly deviant behavior is not committing violence. If people are given permission to kill or feel safe to commit such violence, they will.[66] By transgressing in this manner, an ecstatic community is formed where perpetrators feel a heightened sense of belonging to society since everyone has transgressed together.[67] The ecstatic community creates a new level of bonding among society members. From this solidarity can emerge personal release and a social revival.[68] This social revival allows people to participate in acts that they otherwise would have considered wrong. According to Stone, génocidaires are more often than not, regular citizens—"all civilized men are capable of savagery".[69]

While some sociologists have focused on the social causes of genocide, the genocidal event itself has also been the object of sociological investigation. For sociologists, the concept of genocide includes more than the mass murder of an entire population. One example of the study of the genocidal event is the work done by Dadrian.[70] Dadrian has offered several different types of genocide categorized based on three factors: the intent of the perpetrator; the level of victimization; and the scale of the casualties.[71] The four types of genocide that he distinguishes are cultural genocide, latent genocide, retributive genocide, and optimal genocide.

Cultural genocide occurs when assimilation has been taken to the extreme. Often the victim group is excluded from the power structure and violence is used to secure compliance.[72]

Cultural genocide seeks to eradicate the unique identity of the victim group while at the same time reinforcing the culture of the dominant group. Latent genocide is the unintended consequence of the pursuit of certain goals.[73] The perpetrators here focus not only on the target group but specifically the power base of that group. Retributive genocide is a limited form of genocide with the objective of meting out punishment to a minority population that is challenging the dominant group.[74] The sole rationale here is the punishment of the minority group. Optimal genocide is massive in scope and indiscriminate in application. Optimal genocide has the goal of the complete obliteration of the target group.[75] The victim group is viewed as a threat to the dominant party and the power to destroy them lies in the hand of the dominant group.

For logical reasons, the field of sociology has focused on genocide as a product of society. Sociology views genocide much like criminology since the field of criminology is a sub-field within the field of sociology. However, the field of criminology, as will be seen, is a multi-disciplinary area which includes elements of sociology in its foundation as well as several other disciplines.

CRIMINOLOGY

At its core, according to Edwin Sutherland, criminology is concerned with the study of law-making, law-breaking and law enforcement.[76] As a field, criminology is different from the previously examined academic arenas. Criminology is an interdisciplinary field by design. From its inception criminology in the United States has been very closely linked with sociology,[77] while criminology in Europe maintains closer ties with law than sociology.[78] While criminology has benefited greatly from its close relationship with sociology, the field touches on

many other disciplines as well. The field of criminology is where scholars from diverse backgrounds can come together to study a single, yet important, social phenomenon.[79] For example, Laub consciously designed his life-course paradigm to accommodate scholars from the fields of sociology, economics, biology, psychology, and history.[80] The early work of Eleanor and Sheldon Glueck on juvenile delinquency was an interdisciplinary analysis culled from the fields of sociology, social work, and psychology.[81]

This diverse background should encourage the study of genocide from an interdisciplinary approach. However, as a discipline, criminology has ignored genocide as an area of study. This seems patently contradictory when genocide has been called "the crime of crimes." As the crime of crimes, it is essential that the field devoted to studying crime finally break its silence on genocide. The lack of criminological attention to genocide has been noted by several scholars in the field.[82] In one study examining presentations made at the American Society of Criminology meetings from 1990 to 1998, only twelve presentations involved genocide.[83] This amounted to a scant .001% of all presentations in the nine years examined. During the same years, only six presentations made at the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences involved genocide.[84] An informal analysis of ASC presentations from 1999 to 2008 reveals twenty presentations on the issue of genocide. While nearly double the number of presentations from the previous ten years, the number of genocide presentations still pales in comparison to other issues. Yacoubian also looked at the number of articles published on genocide in several mainstream criminology journals. He found only one article on genocide out of 3,138 articles published between 1990 and 1998.[85] As will be seen, this acts as only one internal barrier to the study of genocide within criminology.

In a similar study, Rothe and Ross examined the coverage of state crime in popular undergraduate criminology textbooks.[86] Genocide is an act of a state and would appear under state crime when and if covered. However, of the eight most popular criminology textbooks, three texts did not cover state crime at all and two texts gave only brief coverage under the topic of state-sponsored terrorism.[87] Only one text covered state crime as an act of a nation and not as a political action or as occupational crime (like white-collar crime). None of the textbooks offered a comprehensive review of the literature on state crime or a theory of state crime. The absence of state crime from criminology textbooks is another barrier within the field to the study of non-traditional crime.

Internal barriers to the study of genocide in criminology begin with the marginalization of the topic at the undergraduate level. This marginalization continues into the graduate level of criminology and beyond. It is difficult to obtain funding in the United States to study a topic that occurs mostly outside of our country.[88] The focus on quantitative methods and the pressure to publish or perish also influence one's choice of mainstream topics over more esoteric ones.[89] In order to survive in academia, one needs to avoid the study of genocide because of its more qualitative methodology and difficulties in publishing in major journals.[90] As a result of these barriers the field of criminology now suffers from a paucity of literature and theory on genocide. As William Laufer said in his chapter "The Forgotten Criminology of Genocide,"

> It is all too easy to say that criminology's neglect of genocide suggests a disciplinary denial; that our failure to recognize genocide implicitly contributes to the evil of revisionism; and that we should know better than to have the boundaries of our field permanently fixed by the criminal law—especially where extant law is so frail and uncertain. It is all too easy to say these things, because they are true.[91]

This quote sums up the inadequacy of the criminology of genocide perfectly. And in order to reverse this course, it must become more acceptable for genocide to be viewed and analyzed as a crime. Scholars must pay heed to the gap that currently exists, not only in criminology, but in the study of genocide as a whole.

There are few pieces of criminological analysis on genocide. What does exist, often speaks about the absence of a criminology of genocide. Some articles offer explanations for why criminology has not studied genocide,[92] but they do not continue to offer a critical assessment of genocide or a theory of genocide. Other contributors offer their ideas on what a criminology of genocide should include, including how to organize a theory of genocide.[93] Again, though, these works fail to execute their ideas and put them into practice.

One of the few pieces on genocide in criminology is Brannigan and Hardwick's analysis of genocide using Gottfredson and Hirschi's general theory of crime. Brannigan and Hardwick attempt to structure genocide as a crime that can fit within the general theory of crime.[94] While the rationalization of genocide under the general theory of crime is difficult to accept fully, it is a first step toward a theory of genocide. In fact the authors themselves note that the general theory of crime is not truly appropriate for genocide, but they believe it is the only current criminological theory that could be applied to genocide.[95] Thus, they advocate for the inclusion of genocide in the field of criminology in order to develop a theory of genocide.

Recently, John Hagan of Northwestern University received the prestigious Stockholm Prize in Criminology for his research on genocide.[96] In 2002, Hagan and Greer wrote an article explaining the important roles played by criminologists Austin Turk and Sheldon Glueck on developing international law.[97] In an analysis of the International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia, Hagan and Levi explained how interest in international law is growing within

criminology and the effects that has on the understanding of crime.[98] Hagan then began to study the genocide in Darfur in depth. In 2006, Hagan, Schoenfeld, and Palloni examined how crime victimization surveys can affect the work of humanitarian agencies during emergencies.[99] In an article in the American Sociological Review, Hagan and Rymond-Richmond used survey data from the United States government to detail how the government of Sudan contributed to the racial division that led to genocide in Darfur.[100] The authors continue this analysis in their book Darfur and the crime of genocide.[101]

Hagan and Rymond-Richmond use quantitative analysis to prove that the genocide in Darfur is based on race and encouraged by the government.[102] Utilizing the work of Coleman, Gamson, and Matsueda, the authors devise a collective action theory of genocide. The theory explains that macro-level constructs of competition and ideology led to meso-level interest groups (Arabs and black Africans). Then individuals in the Arab group, having internalized racial ideology, began violent acts rising to the level of genocide against black Africans.[103] While Hagan and Rymond-Richmond's work is exceptional and hopefully a step forward in the criminology of genocide, their theory seems to be so narrow that it may only apply to genocide based on racial divides. Hagan and Rymond-Richmond also posit that the genocidal state is the result of a progression from state level ideology to individual racial distrust. Then this individual racial animosity causes a collectivized racial intent which then leads to the execution of genocide at the state level. This approach begins at the state level but the ultimate genocide is the result of individual action. While it is true that individuals commit genocide, the state plays a crucial role. Hagan and Rymond-Richmond acknowledge the importance of the state as the initiator of the racial animosity but the actual genocidal events seem to be the result of individual hatred. The link between the state and the individual in initiating genocide is vital. Hagan and Rymond-

Richmond posit that this link is collective racial animosity; yet there may be a stronger meso-level link between the state and the individual, which is one aspect of the criminological theory of genocide proposed later. So there still exists a need for a theory incorporating criminological and other disciplinary ideas to assist us in understanding genocide in all locations[104] (Hoffman, 2009).

CONCLUSION

Genocide is a topic that has numerous angles from which one can approach it. Each field offers it own theories and explanations of genocide which can be contradictory in application. Criminology may be best suited to integrate these diverse fields of study and their contributions on genocide into a cohesive theory on the crime of genocide. As an outgrowth of sociology, criminology is designed to study law making (a concept of study for political scientists), law breaking (a field that sociology and psychology have contributed to) and law enforcement (a legal paradigm). By definition criminology is interdisciplinary and should incorporate the best from these fields in order to answer our own questions on crime. Genocide is a perfect example of how criminology can learn from other fields and produce new and relevant work on crime.

The law treats genocide as a crime—a paradigm that criminology can easily adopt. Critical criminologists, especially state crime scholars, would find much agreement with political scientists on treating the state as a criminal actor. The criminal nature of genocide has been on the periphery of most other fields. Criminology should be the field to focus the previous research on genocide through the lens of state crime. New work is being produced in the area of genocide as a crime, but there is still a need for a unifying theory of genocide in criminology.

Notes

[1] Power, *A problem from hell.*
[2] Fournet, *The crime of destruction.*
[3] Ibid.
[4] Alonzo-Maizlish, "In whole or in part," 1373.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Ibid., 1395.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Beres, "Justice and realpolitik," 123-159.
[10] Power, *A problem from hell*.
[11] Sheldon Glueck is best remembered in the field of criminology for his work on juvenile delinquency conducted with his wife Eleanor. See Sheldon Glueck and Eleanor T. Glueck, *Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency* (New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950).
[12] Glueck, *War criminals*.
[13] Glueck, "The Nuernberg trial," 396-456; Glueck, *The Nuremberg trial and aggressive war.*
[14] Beres, "Justice and realpolitik."
[15] Beres, "Justice and realpolitik."
[16] Clark, "Countering transnational and international crime," 20-29.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Bishai, "Leaving Nuremberg," 425-443.
[19] Staub, *The roots of evil,* 13.
[20] Brannigan, "Criminology and the Holocaust," 257-277.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid.
[23] Kressel, *Mass hate.*
[24] Ibid., 148.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid.
[27] Sternberg, "A duplex theory of hate," 299-328.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Ibid.
[30] Alvarez, "Adjusting to genocide," 139-178.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Ibid.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Rummel, "Democracy, power, genocide," 3-26.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Verdeja, "On genocide," 37-54.
[43] Ibid.
[44] Ibid.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid.
[47] Hoffman, "Mobilizing criminology," 481-485.
[48] Harff, "No lessons learned," 57-73.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.
[51] Ibid.

[52] Conversi, "Demo-skepticism," 247.
[53] Ibid.
[54] Ibid.
[55] "What constitutes social facts are the beliefs, tendencies and practices of the group taken collectively". Emile Durkheim, *The rules of sociological method* (Free Press, [1895] 1982) p. 54.
[56] Williams, Jr., "The sociology of ethnic conflicts," 49-79.
[57] Ibid.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Dutton, Boyanowsky and Bond, "Extreme mass homicide," 437-473.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Stone, "Genocide as transgression," 45-65.
[65] Ibid.
[66] Ibid.
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Ibid., 59.
[70] Dadrian, "A typology of genocide," 201-212.
[71] Ibid.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Ibid.
[74] Ibid.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Sutherland, *Principles of Criminology*.
[77] Ibid.
[78] LaFree, "Expanding criminology's domain," 1-31.
[79] Laub, "Edwin H. Sutherland and the Michael-Adler report," 235-285.
[80] Laub, "Searching for the soul."
[81] Glueck and Glueck, *Unraveling.*; See also John H. Laub and Robert J. Sampson, 'The Sutherland-Glueck debate: On the sociology of criminological knowledge', *The American Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 96, No. 6, 1991, pp. 1402-1440.
[82] Day and Vandiver, "Criminology and genocide studies," 43-59; Yacoubian, Jr, "The (in)significance of genocidal behavior," 7-19; Rothe and Ross, "The marginalization of state crime," 741-752; Laufer, "The forgotten criminology of genocide," 71-82; Maier-Kitkan, Mears and Bernard, "Towards a criminology of crimes against humanity," 227-255.
[83] Yacoubian, "The (in)significance of genocidal behavior."
[84] Ibid.
[85] Ibid.
[86] Rothe and Ross, "The marginalization of state crime,"
[87] Ibid.
[88] Rothe and Friedrichs, "The state of the criminology," 147-161.
[89] Maier-Kitkan, Mears and Bernard, "Towards a criminology."
[90] Rothe and Friedrichs, "The state of the criminology."
[91] Laufer, "The forgotten criminology," 80.
[92] Morrison, "Criminology, genocide, and modernity," 68-88; Laufer, "The forgotten criminology."
[93] Woolford, "Making genocide unthinkable," 87-106.
[94] Brannigan and Hardwick, "Genocide and general theory," 109-131.
[95] Ibid.
[96] The Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2009: Program and Abstract. Retrieved on July 16, 2009 from http://www.criminologyprize.com/dynamaster/file_archive/090629/ded57792efe97e90297173515e710da4/Programbok_2009.pdf.
[97] Hagan and Greer, "Making war criminal," 231-264.
[98] Hagan and Levi, "Crimes of war," 1499-1534.

[99] Hagan, Schoenfled and Palloni, "The science of human rights," 29-49.
[100] Hagan and Rymond-Richmond, "The collective dynamics of racial dehumanization," 875-902.
[101] Hagan and Rymond-Richmond, *Darfur and the crime of genocide*.
[102] Ibid.
[103] Ibid.; Matsueda, "Toward a new criminology of genocide," 495-502.
[104] Hoffman, "Mobilizing criminology," 481-485.

Bibliography

Alonzo-Maizlish, D. "In whole or in part: Group rights, the intent element of genocide, and the 'quantitative criterion.'" New York University Law Review 77, (2002): 1369-1403.

Alvarez, A. "Adjusting to genocide: The techniques of neutralization and the Holocaust." Social Science History 21, no. 2 (1997): 139-178.

Beres, L.R. "Justice and realpolitik: International law and the prevention of genocide." American Journal of Jurisprudence 33, (1988): 123-159.

Bishai, L.S. "Leaving Nuremberg: America's love/hate relationship with international law." Review of International Studies 34, no. 3 (2008): 425-443.

Brannigan, A. "Criminology and the Holocaust: Xenophobia, evolution and genocide." Crime and Delinquency 44, no. 2 (1998): 257-277.

Brannigan, A. and K. Hardwick. "Genocide and general theory." In Control Theories of Crime and Delinquency, edited by Chester L. Britt and Michael R. Gottfredson, 109-131. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction, 2003.

Clark, R.S. "Countering transnational and international crime: Defining the agenda." Hume Papers on Public Policy 6, (2001): 20-29.

Conversi, D. "Demo-skepticism and Genocide." Political Studies Review 4, (2006): 247–262.

Dadrian, V.N. "A typology of genocide." International Review of Modern Sociology 5, (1975): 201-212.

Day, L. E. and M. Vandiver. "Criminology and genocide studies: Notes on what might have been and what still could be." Crime, Law, & Social Change 34, (2000): 43-59.

Durkheim, E. ([1895] 1982). The rules of the sociological method. Steven Lukes, (Ed.). (W.D. Halls, Trans.). New York: Free Press.

Dutton, D.G., E.O. Boyanowsky, and M.H. Bond. "Extreme mass homicide: From military massacre to genocide." Aggression and Violent Behavior 10, (2005): 437-473.

Fournet, C. The crime of destruction and the law of genocide: Their impact on collective memory. Hampshire, UK: Ashgate, 2007.

Freeman, M. "The theory and prevention of genocide." Holocaust and Genocide Studies 6, no. 2 (1991): 185-199.

Glueck, S. War criminals: Their prosecution and punishment. New York: Knopf, 1944.

_____. "The Nuernberg [sic] trial and aggressive war." Harvard Law Review 59, (1946): 396-456.

_____. The Nuremberg trial and aggressive war. New York: Knopf, 1946.

Glueck, S. and E. Glueck. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency. New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1950.

Hagan, J. and S. Greer. "Making war criminal." *Criminology* 40, no. 2 (2002): 231-264.

Hagan, J. and R. Levi. "Crimes of war and the force of law." *Social Forces* 83, no. 4 (2005): 1499-1534.

Hagan, J., H. Schoenfled, and A. Palloni. "The science of human rights, war crimes, and humanitarian emergencies." Annual Review of Sociology 32, no. 3 (2006): 29-49.

Hagan, J. and W. Rymond-Richmond. "The collective dynamics of racial dehumanization and genocidal victimization in Darfur." American Sociological Review 73, (2008): 875-902.

_____. Darfur and the crime of genocide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Harff, B. "No lessons learned from the Holocaust? Assessing risks of genocide and political mass murder since 1945." American Political Science Review 97, no 1 (2003): 57-73.

Hoffman, B. "Mobilizing criminology: The boundaries of criminological science and the politics of genocide." Theoretical Criminology 13, no. 4 (2009): 481-485.

Kolin, A. State structure and genocide. University Press of America, 2008.

Kressel, N.J. Mass hate: The global rise of genocide and terror. New York: Westview Press, 2002.

LaFree, G. "Expanding criminology's domain: The American Society of Criminology 2006 Presidential Address." Criminology 45, no. 1 (2007): 1-31.

Laub, J.H. "Edwin H. Sutherland and the Michael-Adler report: Searching for the soul of criminology seventy years later." Criminology 44, no. 2 (2006): 235-285.

Laub, J.H. and R.J. Sampson. "The Sutherland-Glueck debate: On the sociology of criminological knowledge." The American Journal of Sociology 96, no. 6 (1991): 1402-1440.

Laufer, W.S. "The forgotten criminology of genocide." In The criminology of criminal law, edited by Freda Adler and Gerhard O. W. Mueller, 71-82. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 1999.

Maier-Kitkan, D., Mears, D.P. and T.J. Bernard. "Towards a criminology of crimes against humanity." Theoretical Criminology 13, no. 2 (2009): 227-255.

Martel, J., B. Hogeveen, and A. Woolford. "The state of critical scholarship in criminology and socio-legal studies in Canada." Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice (2006): 633-646.

Matsueda, R.L. "Toward a new criminology of genocide: Theory, method, and politics." Theoretical Criminology 13, no. 4 (2009): 495-502.

Morrison, W. "Criminology, genocide, and modernity: Remarks on the companion that criminology ignored." In *T*he Blackwell Companion to Criminology, edited by Colin Summer, 68-88. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.

Power, S. "A problem from hell": America and the age of genocide. New York: Harper Perennial, 2002.

Rothe, D.L. and D.O. Friedrichs. "The state of the criminology of crimes of the state." Social Justice 33, no. 1 (2006): 147-161.

Rothe, D.L. and J.I. Ross. "The marginalization of state crime in introductory textbooks on criminology." Critical Sociology 34, no. 5 (2008): 741-752.

Rummel, R. J. "Democracy, power, genocide, and mass murder." Journal of Conflict Resolution 39, no. 1 (1995): 3-26.

Savelsberg, J.J. "Genocide, criminology, and Darfur." Theoretical Criminology 13, no. 4 (2009): 477-480.

Staub, E. The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Sternberg, R.J. "A duplex theory of hate: Development and application to terrorism, massacres, and genocide." Review of General Psychology 7, no. 3 (2003): 299-328.

Stone, D. "Genocide as transgression." European Journal of Social Theory 7, no. 1 (2004): 45-65.

Sutherland, E.H. Principles of Criminology (4th Ed.). Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott, 1947.

The Stockholm Criminology Symposium 2009: Program and Abstract. Retrieved on July 16, 2009 from http://www.criminologyprize.com/dynamaster/file_archive/090629/ded57792efe97e90297173515e710da4/Programbok_2009.pdf.

Verdeja, E. "On genocide: Five contributing factors." Contemporary Politics 8, no. 1 (2002): 37-54.

Williams, Jr., R.W. "The sociology of ethnic conflicts: Comparative international perspectives." Annual Review of Sociology 20, (1994): 49-79.

Woolford, A. "Making genocide unthinkable: Three guidelines for a critical criminology of genocide." Critical Criminology 14, (2006): 87-106.

Yacoubian, Jr. G.S. "The (in)significance of genocidal behavior to the discipline of criminology." Crime, Law & Social Change 34, (2000): 7-19.

Contributors

Patricia Chappine is an adjunct professor at Atlantic Cape Community College and the Richard Stockton College of New Jersey. She is currently a Ph.D. candidate in Drew University's History and Culture program.

Alison Dobrick is Associate Professor and Assistant Chairperson, Department of Elementary and Early Childhood Education and Director, William Paterson University Center for Holocaust and Genocide Studies at William Paterson University of New Jersey

Melissa Mikel is Director of Education at the Goodwin Learning Centre in Trenton, ON, Canada.

Rebecca Posna is a graduate student in the masters degree program in Holocaust and Genocide Studies at Kean University in Union, NJ.

William R. Pruitt is Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Elmira College in Elmira, NY. He holds a J.D. from Syracuse University School of Law and his Ph.D. in criminology and public policy from Northeastern University.

Marc Sorondo is a student in the History and Culture program at Drew University in Madison, NJ.

Calvin Tesler is currently working on his PhD in History at Lehigh University. He serves as an adjunct instructor for Chestnut Hill College, Strayer, SNHU, Immaculata University, Delaware County Community College, and Rutgers University.