

INCONTRO DI CIVILTÀ

The complexities of teaching aims in Holocaust education

Danilo Kovac

1. Introduction

It goes without saying that the construction of effective and meaningful teaching aims significantly conditions other pedagogical choices, such as methodology and content. In regard to a rationale for teaching about the Holocaust, I will include several recommendations and guidelines by the International Holocaust Remembrance Association (the IHRA) reflecting essential aims, in my opinion, for the meaningful and effective teaching of the Holocaust. As a reputable inter-governmental body, the IHRA gained a substantial input from professionals from more than thirty countries, whilst the committee in charge of writing the guidelines included expertise from the leading Holocaust education institutions, such as the United State Holocaust Memorial Museum (the USHMM), Yad Vashem, and the Imperial War Museum in London. The IHRA guidelines stipulate that learning about the Holocaust helps young people with developing knowledge of the ramifications of antisemitism, prejudices and stereotyping in society. I believe that this recommendation could be classified into the transformative aims of history education which are particularly relevant according to Lee (1992) and Barnett (1997). I will further divide this aim into two distinctive parts in order to analyse them in greater detail. The first part relates to combatting antisemitism while the second probes into dealing with prejudice and stereotyping in society. Having examined these two aims in the context of a rationale for teaching about the Holocaust, I will touch upon the third purpose for teaching about the topic that is particularly important for the context

within which I am teaching. From the point of view of a post-conflict society teacher of the Holocaust, I will look at the reasons for teaching the Holocaust for the purpose of genocide prevention. After a brief discussion of these three “non-historical” (Pettigrew 2010) aims, I will also tackle one of the strictly historical aims in the context of a critically informed rationale for teaching about the topic.

2. Aims of Holocaust education

2.1. *Combatting antisemitism*

Maitles and Cowan (2007) suggest there is evidence that Holocaust education has a potential for combating antisemitism. As I believe that one of the purposes of Holocaust education ought to be challenging unwanted ideologies, I am in agreement with the authors. However, findings by Pettigrew *et al.* (2009) indicate that combating antisemitism is not a pressing educational priority in teaching about the Holocaust. In the next two paragraphs I will focus on assessing the reliability of these findings, as well as the Community Security Trust, in order to argue for the opposite.

The findings of Pettigrew *et al.* (2009) are in contrast to the expectations that antisemitism was a noteworthy problem in British schools. Nonetheless, the likelihood of students’ inclination to anti-Semitic ideologies going unnoticed by schoolteachers, should not be altogether dismissed given that the research has not included students but only the Holocaust teachers. Succinctly, the fact that the teachers within the study did not notice any anti-Semitic views of their students does not necessarily mean that such views did not exist, and more importantly, that unwanted ideologies should not be challenged within the classroom walls.

By means of observing a few Holocaust lessons and interviewing schoolteachers from London, apart from acquiring valuable data I have also learned about the Community Security Trust tasked to record anti-Semitic incidents in the United Kingdom. The Trust deserves full appreciation; however, I believe that in the increasingly digitalised world the potential inclination of students to lean towards anti-Semitic ideologies do not necessarily result in incidents,

which would be dutifully recorded by the body. Instead, I argue that existence of passive anti-Semitic stances is what should be more thoroughly researched and based on these, emerging issues subsequently addressed and challenged in the classroom.

Apropos of socially and economically less developed countries, the role of Holocaust education in prevention of antisemitism is increasingly gaining importance, I reason. Having taught in several former Yugoslav countries, I am quite confident stating that there is no governmental body or institution in existence focusing on the prevention of anti-Semitism. The role of education to mitigate the lack of care on the side of governments proves crucial in this sense. Even though the Balkan countries are lagging behind a systematic reform of educational theory and practice, as a teacher and an observant, I hold the view that Holocaust education in this region is still in a more favourable position against this general education sector's background. I base my argument on the fact that Holocaust education has increasingly become a subject of interest of various international and transnational organisations as part of the world-wide tendency, including the Balkans. Furthermore, a pressure exerted by the European Union on the candidate-countries to adopt comprehensive educational reforms influenced the modernisation of *curricula* and tackling the areas pertinent to the European educational standards.

2.2. Dealing with prejudices and stereotyping in society

I believe that in an increasingly migrant and globalised world, the care for the 'other' should gain primary importance. It might be sensible to assume that education has the potential to play a very significant role in this aspect. In line with argument by Reiss and White (2014), the purpose of education lies in helping young people achieve a fulfilling, flourishing life. One of the elements of the concept of a flourishing life is regard for all other human beings, irrespective of background differences that seem to pull them apart (Reiss and White 2014). In my opinion, history education is particularly important and a powerful subject in this area. This assumption is in line with Barton and Levick's (2004: 36) argument who deem the purpose of history education is in «thinking of people different than ourselves». In a similar vein, Kitson *et al.* (2011) argue that history education should devel-

op «understanding of the difference of others» (p. 127). Accordingly, by means of learning about different nations and cultures, young people are less likely to perceive them as alien and strange. The reluctance to understand and accept differences leads to prejudices and stereotyping, which are negative social phenomena that might be addressed through teaching about the Nazi ideology and the Holocaust.

The importance of this educational aim appears to be recognised by British teachers. The teachers participating in the study by Pettigrew *et al.* (2009) were tasked with prioritising three out of thirty-one listed aims of the Holocaust education. More than 67% of the teachers opted for the aim of developing an understanding of the roots and ramifications of prejudice, racism, and stereotyping in any society. In light of this fact, namely, the revealed teachers' stances on the importance of the above-stated aim, I disagree with Pettigrew and the authors' (2010: 51) «concern about the survey data» on behalf of the Institute of Education. It goes without saying that with the development of new technologies and social network platforms young people are increasingly connected and interacting with peers from different milieus and cultures. Accordingly, understanding how to rectify prejudices and stereotyping among children and youth and how they can be changed is urgent. Pettigrew (2010) doubted this particular potential of Holocaust education. The author sees the unwanted social phenomena, such as prejudice and stereotyping, inseparably linked with particular social and historical contexts stating that «racism, prejudices and intolerance are not fixed and consistent social phenomena that can be used to explain events such as the Holocaust», and that there are «different racisms and expressions of prejudice and intolerance in need of explanation and investigation themselves» (Pettigrew 2010: 53).

I am of the view that addressing prejudices and stereotyping within certain social and historical contexts is not irreconcilable with using the benefits of historical messages for younger generations. Drawing on Young and Muller (2014), I argue that learning and acquiring as many as possible historical examples of prejudices and stereotyping is extremely useful for students to recognise and challenge these unwanted social phenomena in any given form and/or social/historical context. Young and Muller (2014) explain that students should be taught

to make generalisations based on academic examples. In other words, acquiring as many historical examples as possible on a certain topic increases students' generalisation skill about it and enables them to infer its implications in any other contexts and forms they are encountered with. On the question of learning about prejudices and stereotyping in the context of Nazism, coupled with other historical examples of racial and ethnic discrimination, students are enabled to recognise similarities and patterns between unwanted social phenomena and challenge them, principally, in their inception. Accordingly, learning about the Holocaust should not be the only subject matter upon which students should be taught how to deal with prejudice and stereotyping albeit the fact that it holds a high authority in this respect.

2.3. Prevention of genocide

Adorno (1998) argued that prevention of another Auschwitz should be the main purpose of Holocaust education. In line with his argument, Bauer (2001) makes an assumption that a catastrophe of similar proportions may happen again considering the past occurrences as well as a likelihood of adherence to the similar pattern. Humanity, therefore, should make every effort to prevent it (Bauer 2001). As the Latin and Cicero's *de Oratore* expression goes – *Historia est magistra vitae* – so do I believe that history education is playing an extremely important role in this aspect. In line with a statement by Lee and Shemilt's (2009) that one of the purposes of history education is to steer young people away from undesirable future, I firmly believe that the history of the Holocaust as unprecedented historical event has an enormous potential to convey tremendously powerful educational messages with lasting impact that cuts across all spheres of life. Statistically, this assumption is supported by the stances of 55.1% of history teachers included in the Pettigrew *et al.*'s study (2009). They prioritised the aim: «To learn the lesson of the Holocaust and to ensure that a similar human atrocity never happens again».

2.4. Developing understanding of the unprecedented historical event

In this chapter I will examine the three underlying reasons of why developing historical understanding of the Holocaust should be taught in schools. Firstly, a sophisticated historical understanding is an es-

stantial precondition for achieving the 'unhistorical' objectives. Secondly, it enables young people to navigate through a sea of information about the Holocaust. Lastly, the academic knowledge about this unprecedented historical event contributes constructively to students' intellectual curiosity and development.

Pettigrew (2010) explains that a failure to adequately address historical contexts may result in, not only ineffective teaching of the past, but also inadequate citizenship education. Pettigrew's (2010) statement corresponds with Welker's (1996) argument, which states that by being predominantly exposed to historical complexity, students may learn to avoid easy stereotyping. The importance of avoiding simplified answers to a complex history topic is emphasised in the Guidelines for Teaching about the Holocaust, developed by United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Instead, consideration of numerous factors and events that contributed to the genocide and had made decision making rather difficult and uncertain should be factored in the scheme of work for the Holocaust teaching.

Apart from combatting stereotyping, the importance of historical knowledge appears to be an essential precondition for another «non-historical» aim – combating antisemitism. In this context, Gray (2015) explained that «ignorant antisemitism» is a form of antisemitism based on students' misinformation that is at the same time the most common form of undesirable ideology in schools.

The importance of the developed contextual understanding of the unique historical event is emphasised in the study by Maitles, Cowan and Butler (2006) which cross-referenced attitudes of Scottish students towards Jews on the basis of their substantive knowledge of the Holocaust. The study revealed a direct correlation between the lack of knowledge on the Holocaust and the predispositions towards antisemitism. These data, however, do not allow for any general conclusions because the authors applied a low threshold with regard to the measurability of students' knowledge about the Holocaust – a simple understanding being deemed satisfactory. This small case study, encompassing 133 students, gained attention because it established a correlation between the knowledge gaps on the Holocaust and the inclination towards antisemitism which otherwise has not been tackled by the large-scale project conducted by Pettigrew *et al.* (2009). Ac-

Accordingly, a conclusion could be drawn that developing historical understanding of the Holocaust plays an important role for achieving the ‘non-historical’ aim of combatting «ignorant antisemitism».

Apart from being the basis upon which the non-historical aims should be achieved, historical understanding of the topic also enables young people to critically assess widespread and extensive information on the Holocaust. Given the raised awareness about the Holocaust in social media and public discourses as well as conflicting information about it, being able to navigate through the sea of information and make intelligent distinctions about sources of information becomes part of educational literacy (Salmons 2010). Accordingly, Salmons (2010) sees historical knowledge as the main tool which has the potential to help students discern, understand and use information in this respect. Salmons’ (2010) argument is in line with the Guidelines of United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, which emphasise the importance of students’ ability to discern between reliable and non-reliable sources of information.

The third advantage of studying the Holocaust is reflected in its effectiveness as a complex subject matter to serve as a vehicle for strengthening intellectual curiosity and development of students. Novick (1999), Hebert (2000) and Kinloch (1998, 2001) argue for studying about the Holocaust for the purpose of acquisition of knowledge of this unprecedented event in human history. Salmons (2010) agrees with their points made and addresses another benefit of studying the Holocaust, namely, its potential to contribute to young peoples’ intellectual development. He concludes that acquiring a complex and nuanced knowledge through a sophisticated connection between facts is far more beneficial for students’ intellectual development than focusing on their feelings upon learning a certain historical event (Salmons 2010).

It might be sensible to assume that Salmons (2010) argument fulfils the criteria of Young’s theory of «powerful knowledge» (2015, 2013a, 2013b).

Succinctly, Young and Muller (2014) see the role of schools in conveying academic or the so-called powerful knowledge. This knowledge is developed in a systematic and specialised way and subsequently adopted for the purposes of presenting it to students (Young and

Muller 2014). The powerful knowledge is superior to students' everyday experiences and its 'power' is mirrored in the fact that it influences students' intellectual development (Young and Muller 2014).

From this point of view, I support the argument of Salmons (2010) and believe that acquiring academic knowledge about the Holocaust, in all its nuances and complexities, has a strong potential for contribution to students' intellectual development and critical thinking.

Envisaging and discussing likelihood of different historical scenarios in the context of the Holocaust events corresponds to the overarching purposes of history education (Barton and Levstik 2004), as well as the concept of powerful knowledge. Young and Muller (2014) unambiguously explained that one of the assets of 'powerful knowledge' is enabling students to envisage alternatives. Furthermore, the benefits of studying the Holocaust could be strengthened by applying the sophisticated causal analysis developed by Chapman (2003), Chapman and Woodcock (2006), and Lee and Shemilt (2009) on the causes of the Holocaust, and the endeavour for precision of language (Woodcock 2011, Woodcock 2005). Accumulatively, these are the key contributors to influencing students' intellectual development and critical thinking and stimulating personal growth.

3. Challenges for Holocaust educators in regards with their aims

3.1. *Combatting antisemitism*

In this chapter I will address three interconnected challenges which I consider the biggest hindrances to the effective teaching of anti-Semitism through Holocaust education. These are: the poor understanding of the historical context of the long-lasting Jewish history, failure to consider the Holocaust from the Jewish perspective, and the inadequate use of emotions.

I hold the view that the lack of general academic knowledge about the Jews could be a serious obstacle to conveying any educational message related to the Holocaust. This assumption is in line with Short's (1994) argument that humans are more attracted to people who are similar to themselves, than strange individuals or groups about whom they have limited or no existing knowledge. The same author clar-

ified that one of the reasons young people might perceive the Jews as a distant group is their lack of knowledge about Jewish religion, culture and rituals, which, in turn, might be perceived as alien and strange. Short (1994) concludes that poor understanding of Jewish history and culture makes students in a media-driven world more likely to succumb to anti-Semitic stereotypes. In that vein, the study by Pettigrew *et al.* (2009) reveal that Jewish social and cultural life before 1933 is included in teaching by only 26% of the teachers encompassed by the study. Accordingly, it might be concluded that the lack of teachers' attention for teaching the Jewish social and cultural history, coupled with the absence of these topics in most of the Holocaust textbooks (Foster and Burgess 2013), might result in serious misconceptions about Jewish identity and the circumstances of their predicament. One of these consequences is visible in the findings by Foster *et al.* (2016), reporting that as many as 41.6% of students were taught that the Jews could have avoided prosecutions if they had abandoned their religion. These types of misconceptions developed by the students of the Holocaust represent a serious challenge in education to combat antisemitism.

Besides the knowledge gap about Jewish culture and identity, I believe that the failure to understand the position of the Jews during the Holocaust, and their reactions and responses to it, also stands in the way of combating antisemitism as an educational aim. Gray (2015) emphasised that students are less likely to comprehend the circumstances in which the ordinary, prosecuted people had found themselves if they are purely statistically represented as well as the objects on which the genocide was inflicted. In that framework, the study by Foster and Burgess (2013) reveals that many British textbooks do not address the Holocaust from the Jewish perspective, rendering them as pure objects. Furthermore, the same study reveals that most of the history textbooks' sources stem from those complicit in the genocide. Having in mind the possible impact of individuals' stories on students' reasoning (Totten and Feinberg 2016), I hold the view that the absence of the Jewish perspective in Holocaust teaching is a missed opportunity to meaningfully develop students' understanding of the position in which the Jews as ordinary people were unjustly put. In this context, the findings of Pettigrew's study (2009) showing that lit-

tle attention was given by the teachers to the Jewish responses to the genocide is noteworthy for future improvements to the Holocaust *curricula*.

The third hindrance to the combatting of antisemitism through Holocaust education lies in an inadequate use of emotions. The study by Foster and Burgess (2013) revealed that some history textbooks contain disturbing accounts of life in the camps as well as disturbing images devoid of comprehensive explanations of the proper historical background as well as the context. As explained by Salmons (2000; 2010), by provoking emotions without in-depth historical understanding the real learning is disabled. The consequences of provoking emotions of students are also discussed by Heyl (1996) explaining that teachers often shift attention from victims to their own emotions when dealing with disturbing aspects of the event. Given the central role of emotions for transformative aims of education (Lee *et al.* 1992), it goes without saying that their misuse reflects negatively on the potential of education for challenging antisemitism.

3.2. Dealing with prejudices and stereotyping in society

In this section I will address two types of challenges for combatting prejudices and stereotyping in society through Holocaust education, in the view of given school environments and wider society *per se*.

My view is that teaching about stereotyping and prejudices is only meaningful and effective if it is supported by overarching school policies. For instance, if cases of peer discrimination on ethnic, racial or any basis are not dealt with in a serious manner then related lessons will also be less meaningful in that sense. Furthermore, addressing unwanted social beliefs through Holocaust education requires an inter-curricular approach and coordinated actions of school departments. Nonetheless, in my experience, an inter-curricular approach to the Holocaust teaching exists neither in the majority of schools in the Balkans, with just one class to the Holocaust devoted, nor in a number of British schools, whose work I observed.

The situation within the wider society represents another teaching challenge for combating stereotyping and prejudices through Holocaust education. My teaching experience says that, when taught about certain moral questions students often make comparisons to the situa-

tions in wider society. Principally, raising moral questions in the classrooms of divided countries, such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, remains a significant teaching challenge as the national, political and cultural scene regularly employs language riddled with prejudices and stereotyping. In other words, teaching about values which are not supported by or to a certain extent inherent within the values of the given social environment, may become meaningless itself.

In line with my notion is the argument by Brina (2003). In her article, Brina (2003) described the shocking incident of the Castlemont students who laughed during the *Schindler's List* scene, specifically when the Nazi, Goeth, was shooting inmates from his balcony. Brina (2003) further explained that the Castlemont students originate from an urban ghetto where poverty and violence is widespread. Furthermore, students' request to have the Black Rights activist, Mumia Abu-Jamal, as a graduation speaker at their graduation ceremony was refused on two occasions by the school administration. The decision was made despite the majority of students' votes revealing their wish to have the activist's video-taped address played at their graduation ceremony (Brina 2003). Brina (2003) concluded that the reaction of students during the *Schindler's List* scene should not be perceived as unreasonable given the gap between them being taken to deepen their understanding of the past oppression through film and the existing context they found themselves. The Castlemont students like many other, including Bosnians, live under the social circumstances which do not correspond to moral and social messages of Holocaust education; therefore, combating prejudices and stereotyping through teaching about the cruel event remains a serious issue, to be tackled through curricular decisions.

3.3. *Prevention of future genocides*

In this section I will touch upon doubts expressed by Novick (1999) and Kinloch (1998), among other academics, about the potential of Holocaust education to contribute to the prevention of future genocides. Both of them stated that the circumstances in which the Holocaust occurred were too extreme to be repeated in the future, and thus they doubt the benefits of studying the Holocaust for the purpose of averting future genocides. In a similar manner, Salmons (2000) explained that genocides did occur after the Holocaust.

Weak measurability of the outcomes of Holocaust teaching for the purpose of genocide prevention represents another teaching challenge addressed by Pettigrew (2010). Many British teachers who opted for non-historical aims struggled to develop any system of how to measure their learning outcomes (Pettigrew *et al.* 2009). In her study, Pettigrew (2010) drew on these findings expressing her doubts about the potential of Holocaust education to contribute in the context of non-historical aims. I disagree with Pettigrew's argument (2010) as the author underscores all non-historical aims on the grounds of their measurability. Because of the nature of human psychology, the possibility that some messages will resonate with students in the future, should not be completely dismissed on the grounds of their weak measurability in the present. However, the precise and reliable measuring of the educational aim of the future genocide prevention remains an outstanding challenge in Holocaust teaching.

3.4. Developing understanding of the unprecedented historical event

This section looks at the teaching challenges which could impede developing students' contextual knowledge of the Holocaust. There are numerous misconceptions among students as a result of being exposed to inadequate media information, time-constraint and disturbing nature of the teaching content.

In my opinion, one of the main challenges to developing students' historical understanding lies in misconceptions of the Holocaust gained in non-academic settings. Given that Young and Muller (2014) consider the academic knowledge superior to the everyday experiences of students, one of the principal purposes of education would be to challenge students' possible misconceptions developed outside of the classroom walls. In this respect, Kitson *et al.* (2011) explained that students learn about the past not only in the school settings, but in the family circles, on the streets and through media, too. When it comes to the Holocaust education, both, Salmons (2010) and Short (1994), explained that students' misconceptions stem from oversaturation of the Holocaust in social media where historical accuracy of the event is hardly preserved. In view of this, Bruchfeld (2008) emphasised that various groups try to gain benefits by comparing their circumstances with the Holocaust event and stripping it, in that manner, of its his-

torical context. In a similar vein, many popular films on the Holocaust contain and portray historical inaccuracies as well (Levy and Sznajder 2004). Levy and Sznajder (2004) explain the background behind *Schindler's List* to be a powerful moral story to be told about the good versus evil but not a historically accurate account of the prosecution of the Jews. The film appears to be «de-contextualised from history» (p. 152), according to the authors, while many teachers reported relying on and utilising the film as a pedagogical resource (Pittgrew *et al.* 2009). This corresponds with the results of the more recent findings by Marcus and Mills (2017) emphasising the common use of the same film in the classrooms. Nonetheless, there are numerous methods of how historically inaccurate films still may be meaningfully used in the classroom (Butler, Zaromb and Roediger, 2009; Stoddard and Marcus 2010). Given that neither Pittgrew *et al.* (2009) nor Marcus and Mills (2017) have used observational methods for the purposes of their study, they could not produce data on the methodologies used by the teachers when utilising the film. Accordingly, the possibility that the teachers used *Schindler's List* or other similar films meaningfully cannot be altogether dismissed. Students' misconceptions of the Holocaust developed as a result of the exposure to the social media with the overpresent Holocaust-related contents will remain a serious challenge to developing accurate understanding of the unprecedented event.

I would say that a more serious challenge has been noted by Salmons (2010) regarding students' misconceptions about the underlying reasons for which people were involved in mass killings. Namely, young people appear to lack understanding of the accounts of the collaborators, rescuers and victims' actions (Salmons 2010). The author (2010) explained that students often mentally simplify the events and see rescuers as heroes and killers as villains. Many students hold the view that people involved in killing ultimately had no choice – had they refused to kill they would have been killed themselves (Salmons 2010). The same misconceptions are discovered by the findings by Foster *et al.* (2016) revealing that young people often do not understand that the killings chiefly took place for other reasons – as a result of the Nazi ideology, peer pressure, ambition or others. Furthermore, the findings by Foster *et al.* (2016) revealed gaps in students' knowl-

edge of different policies towards different prosecuted groups, the Nazi-collaborating regimes, the support for the Nazi party enjoyed amongst the German population, the key Nazi leaders, as well as limited understanding of where and when the Holocaust took place. It goes without saying that addressing all of these, and many other topics and developing students' nuanced understanding of the Holocaust is a time-consuming task. Nonetheless, many *curricula* designate only one lesson/class for teaching the Holocaust. On the question of the British Holocaust education, as much as 42.8 % of teachers involved in the study by Pettigrew *et al.* (2009) reported not having enough time to teach the Holocaust effectively. Even though assigned homework activities and various projects might maximise the use of valuable classroom time to teach the Holocaust, my teaching experience says that the time-constraint and the pressure thereof remains a serious teaching challenge in this respect.

Schweber (2008) discussed a learning challenge prevalent for younger rather than more mature age students. Given that the Holocaust is taught to progressively younger generations in terms of age (Schweber 2008), the need of carefully dealing with the disturbing contents of the event is of paramount importance. Drawing on Totten (1999), Schweber (2008) explained that the Holocaust taught in its full historicity is too traumatising for students. An experienced and reputable teacher, whose work Schweber (2008) closely observed, gradually presented some of the Holocaust atrocities to the class of the fourth graders. Many of the observed students reported nightmares or depression as a consequence of the particular classroom activity. To this may be added the fact that teacher who was observed by Schweber in his study (2008), was an educator whose skills exceeded the average teaching skills. One of the conclusions which can be drawn from the Schweber's (2008) study is that the traumatising aspect of the Holocaust should be factored in as an impediment to teaching the topic in its full historicity. On the other hand, should the teacher choose to omit disturbing contents, there is a risk of watering the topic down, and the Holocaust might become too general and even historically inaccurate.

4. Conclusion

I believe that moving beyond the dichotomy in the on-going academic debates between historical and non-historical reasons for teaching the Holocaust would be beneficial to the greatest extent; a well-thought-of rationale for teaching the Holocaust in school should be constructed on the basis of the results of a research to be conducted on how these two strands of separate educational aims should be merged and integrated so that a clear, but sophisticated educational message to students is transmitted.

Historical aims – or the proper understanding of relevant historical context – is the ground basis upon which all other aims are to be built. If students do not possess a proper understanding of the past, addressing any other question arising from the Holocaust events, might lead to wrong deductions and inaccuracies. On the other hand, the potential of education is not fulfilled if the learning content remains purely academic and does not in any way transform the way in which young people perceive the world. There lies the reason of why ‘non-historical aims’ or discussing various moral, social, and theological questions, inevitably raised by the Holocaust, should complement a grounded historical understanding.

I deem historical aims the building basis for all other aims so in my opinion they should be the first to be addressed by the Holocaust *curricula* and particularly owing to contribution by history education. On the other hand, philosophy, sociology, religious education and arts should tackle the subject from different other angles. Drawing on students’ sound historical understanding of the topic, the above-mentioned subjects shall raise questions related to their own disciplines in order to achieve students’ nuanced understanding of the Holocaust and their moral development as well.

A concerted effort should be taken to ensure favourable circumstances for these aims to be achieved. *Curriculum* designers should make enough room to enable reflections and considerations of the Holocaust from various angles. Teachers should be encouraged to perfect their own understanding of the Holocaust as well as methodology for teaching the topic. Equally important, funding and organising Holocaust related school trips and field visits should be one of the educational priorities.

References:

- Adorno T., *Critical Models: Interventions and Catchwords*, Columbia University Press, New York 1998.
- Barnett R., *Higher Education: a critical business*, Society for Research into Higher Education and Open University Press, Buckingham 1997.
- Barton K. – Levstik L., *Teaching History for the Common Good*, Routledge, London 2004.
- Bauer Y., *Rethinking the Holocaust*, Yale University Press, London 2002, pp. 1-13.
- Brina C., «Not crying, but laughing: the ethics of horrifying students», in *Teaching in Higher Education*, 8 (4), 2003, pp. 517-528.
- Bruchfeld S., *Is it time to get rid of "the Holocaust"? Reflections on a concept*, in Andersson L.M. – Geverts K.K. (eds.), *Problematic relations? The Refugee policy and Jewish refugees in Sweden 1920-1950*, Swedish Science Press, Uppsala 2008.
- Butler A.C. – Zaromb F.C. – Lyle K.B. – Roediger H.L., «Using Popular Films to Enhance Classroom Learning the Good, the Bad, and the Interesting», in *Psychological Science*, 20 (9), 2009, pp. 1161-1168.
- Chapman A., «Camels, diamonds and counterfactuals: a model for teaching causal reasoning», in *Teaching History*, 112, 2003, pp. 46-53.
- Chapman A. – Woodcock J., «Mussolini's missing marbles: simulating history at GCSE», *Teaching History*, 124, 2006, pp. 17-26.
- Fea J., *Why Study History: Reflecting on the Importance of the Past*, Baker Academic, Michigan 2013.
- Hebert U., *Extermination Policy: New Answers and Questions about the History of the "Holocaust" in German Historiography*, in Hebert U. (ed.), *National Socialist Extermination Policies: Contemporary German Perspectives and Controversies*, Berghahn Books, New York 2000, p. 44.
- Heyl M., *Education after Auschwitz: Teaching the Holocaust*, in Millen R.L. – Bennett T.A. (eds.), *Germany in New perspectives on the Holocaust: a guide for teachers and scholars*, New York University Press, New York 1996, pp. 275-286.
- Kinloch N., «Learning about the Holocaust: Moral or historical question?», in *Teaching History*, 93, 1998, pp. 44-46.
- Kinloch N., «Parallel catastrophies? Uniqueness, redemption and the Shoah», in *Teaching History*, 104, 2001, pp. 1-14.
- Kitson A. – Husbans C. – Steward S., *Teaching learning history 11-18 understanding the past*, McGraw-Hill, Maidenhead 2011.
- Lee P. – Shemilt D., «Is any explanation better than none? Over-determined narratives, senseless agencies and one-way streets in students' learning about cause and consequence in history», in *Teaching History*, 137, 2009, pp. 42-49.
- Levy D. – Sznajda N., «The institutionalisation of cosmopolitan morality: The Holocaust and human rights», in *Journal of Human Rights*, 3 (2), 2004, pp. 143-157.
- Maitles H. – Cowan P., *Making the Links: The relationship Between Learning About the Holocaust and Contemporary Anti-Semitism*, in Ross A. (ed.), *Citizenship Education in Society*, CiCe, London 2007, pp. 431-444.

- Maitles H. – Cowan P. – Butler E., «Never Again! Does Holocaust Education have an Effect on Pupils' Citizenship Values and Attitudes?», in *Scottish Executive Social Research*, 2006, pp. 1-72.
- Marcus A.S. – Mills G.D., *Teaching Difficult History with Film: Multiple Perspectives on the Holocaust*, in Stoddard J. – Marcus A.S. – Hicks H. (eds.), *Teaching Difficult History through Film*, Routledge, New York 2017, pp. 178-197.
- Pettigrew A., «Limited Lessons from the Holocaust?», in *Teaching History*, 141, 2010, pp. 49-55.
- Pettigrew A. – Foster S. – Howson J. – Salmons P. – Lenga R.-A., – Andrews K., *Teaching about the holocaust in English Secondary Schools: An Empirical Study of National Trends, Perspectives and Practice*, Holocaust Education Development Programme, Institute of Education, University of London, London 2009.
- Reiss M.J. – White J., «An aims-based curriculum illustrated by the teaching of science in schools», in *The Curriculum Journal*, 25, 2014, pp. 76-89.
- Salmons P., *Torn Apart: A Student's guide to the Holocaust Exhibition*, Imperial War Museum, London 2000.
- Salmons P., «Universal meaning or historical understanding? The Holocaust in history and history in the curriculum», in *Teaching History*, 141, 2010, pp. 57-63.
- Schweber S., «What Happened to Their Pets? Third Graders Encounter the Holocaust», in *Teachers College Record*, 110 (10), 2008, pp. 2073-2115.
- Short G., «Teaching the Holocaust: The Relevance of Children's Perceptions of Jewish Culture and Identity», in *British Educational Research Journal*, 20 (4), 1994, pp. 393-405.
- Stoddard J. – Marcus A., «More Than "Showing What Happened": Exploring the Potential of Teaching History with Film», in *The High School Journal*, January/February 2010, pp. 83-90.
- Totten S. – Feinberg S. (eds.), *Essentials of Holocaust Education: fundamental issues and approaches*, Routledge, New York 2016.
- US Holocaust Memorial Museum, *Teaching About the Holocaust: A Resource Book*, Washington DC 2001, retrieved from www.ushmm.org/educators.
- Welker R.P. – Millen R.L. – Bennett T.A. – Mann J.D. – O'Connor J.E. (eds.), *Searching for the Educational Imperative in Holocaust Curricula in New Perspectives of the Holocaust: A Guide for Teachers and Scholars*, New York University Press, New York and London 1996, pp. 99-122.
- Woodcock J., «Does the linguistic release the conceptual? Helping Year 10 to improve their causal reasoning», in *Teaching History*, 119, 2005, pp. 5-14.
- Woodcock J., *Causal explanation*, in Davies I. (ed.), *Debates in History Teaching*, Routledge, London 2011, pp. 124-136.
- Young M. – Muller J., *On the Powers of Powerful Knowledge*, in Barrett B. – Rata E. (eds), *Knowledge and the future of the curriculum: international studies in social realism*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York 2014.
- Young M., «Overcoming the Crisis in Curriculum Theory: A Knowledge-Based Approach», in *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 45 (2), 2013a, pp. 101-118.

Young M., «Powerful Knowledge: An Analytically Useful Concept or Just a ‘Sexy Sounding Term’? A Response to John Beck’s ‘Powerful Knowledge, Esoteric Knowledge, Curriculum Knowledge’», in *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 43 (2), 2013b, pp. 195-198.

Young M., *What are schools for?*, in Young M. – Muller J. (eds.), *Curriculum and the Specialisation of Knowledge: Studies in the Sociology of Education*, Routledge, London 2016.