

Touching distance: young people's reflections on hearing testimony from Holocaust survivors

Alasdair Richardson

This article explores young people's experiences of hearing first-hand testimony from a Holocaust survivor during a government-funded educational programme in the UK. The study considers Holocaust Education in the UK and the prevalence of survivor speakers in classrooms. It then presents findings from 14 semi-structured interviews and 44 online surveys exploring young people's experiences of hearing in-person testimony from a Holocaust survivor. Three themes emerge; that the experience of hearing from a survivor had been *concrete*, *connecting* and *current* for them. The article concludes with a consideration of the study's implications for educators more widely and concludes by offering ways in which they can better support their students in receiving and carrying survivor testimony in different educational settings.

Keywords: Holocaust, survivor, testimony, education.

Introduction

When the Second World War came to an end, survivors of the Holocaust focused their attention on the urgent matters of *where* and *how* to live. They had survived “the most shocking event of the Century”¹, yet outside of their own communities their stories were largely hidden from public discourse. It would be several decades before wider society would take an interest, and for the “aura of silence”² that encircled them to be lifted. This transition would be marked by events such as the public trial of Adolf Eichmann in 1961, the broadcast of the NBC mini-series *Holocaust* in 1978, and the release of *Schindler's List* in 1993. As “the era of the witness”³ dawned, those who found themselves newly labelled as *Holocaust survivors* were largely un-prepared for this role and for the weight of expectation that would come with it. The term *survivor* was socially constructed, “evoking not just sympathy but admiration, and even awe”⁴ in

others. In his reverential Best Picture acceptance speech at the 66th Academy Awards in 1993, Steven Spielberg (the director and co-producer of *Schindler's List*) made an impassioned speech in which he spoke of there being “three hundred and fifty thousand experts who just want to be useful with the remainder of their lives, please listen... and please teach this in your school”

(<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1HKTYX50hQ>). Speaking on this most public of stages, Spielberg's words embedded the survivors' new status as *experts* and first-person testimony swiftly became an established means through which educators engaged their students with the events of the Holocaust in their schools. The survivors and their stories were no longer hidden away in their own communities, now there was an expectation that they would bear witness to the whole of society, particularly to future generations in classrooms.

Today it is widely accepted that hearing from a survivor can “play a central role in the classroom”⁵ that “adds a new dimension to the learning process”.⁶ Hearing from an individual is thought to be far more meaningful for students than when their teachers speak of the six million in more general terms (see for example⁷). It is also generally agreed that testimony is most effective when young people actually meet and interact with a Holocaust survivor *in person* (see for example⁸). It is a *lived*, embodied and interactional encounter, rather than a passive activity such as reading from a textbook or memoir might be. However reasonable such assumptions (and the evidence they are based on) might be, it is important that we do not accept them uncritically. Hearing from a survivor is far from uncomplicated and must be viewed as a nuanced and mediated encounter. This is particularly the case in classrooms, where educators choose *which* testimonies to include (and consequently which to exclude), how they are framed and *where* they are placed within their curriculum planning. Amidst the “barrage of

memories”⁹ in the media, in school textbooks and online, teachers exercise an important (and potentially unacknowledged) editorial role in the selection of which testimonies are heard by young people, and which are not. As “the era of memory is ending”¹⁰ and the era of the witness becomes the era of the *postwitness*,¹¹ it is timely to critically consider the current and future role played by first-person survivor testimony in school classrooms, and how young people *receive* and *hold* these testimonies. This paper will attempt to do so by drawing from a specific case study from the United Kingdom (UK), exploring young people’s experiences of hearing from a survivor as part of the Holocaust Educational Trust’s *Lessons from Auschwitz* project (<https://www.het.org.uk/lessons-from-auschwitz-programme>).

Survivor testimony in UK schools – some context and complications

The UK is unique amongst its European neighbours in that the events of the Holocaust did not happen directly on British soil. When British children hear from survivors, therefore, they are hearing from people who came from somewhere else. Approximately 80,000 Jews from Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia resided in the UK at the outbreak of the Second World War,¹² but Britain’s policy at that time was not to be “a country of settlement, but of temporary refuge, that is, of transit”¹³ – so only around half of those refugees subsequently settled here in the years immediately following the war. Today, many of those who made the UK their home (immediately post-war, or later) talk regularly to school groups, including prominent speakers such as Kitty Hart-Moxon OBE (2007), Eva Clarke BEM (Holden, 2015), and Mala Tribich MBE (whose brother Sir Ben Helfgott MBE is Honorary President of the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust, and was knighted for his services to Holocaust remembrance and education in 2018).

The topic of the Holocaust was central to the National Curriculum in the UK from its inception in the late 1980s. Following the devolution of educational policymaking to the governments of each constituent country, the subject has remained the only compulsory topic in post-1901 History lessons for 11-14-year-old pupils in England only (and even this is dependent on a school's particular funding arrangement).¹⁴ In English schools, pupils tend to study the topic in Year 9 (13-14 years of age),¹⁵ while the picture in the other constituent countries is less clear due to there being no formal requirements to teach the topic. Evidence suggests that schools in England have engaged with the survivor community extensively for many years¹⁶ and continue to do so. The Centre for Holocaust Education (CfHE) reported in 2009 that 25% of teachers were "likely"¹⁷ to welcome a survivor into their classroom to speak about their experiences, while in their 2016 report 49% of school pupils recalled hearing a survivor's testimony.¹⁸ When students spoke about their classroom encounters with survivors, between 80-90% "agreed" or "strongly agreed" with statements that suggested the experience had made the Holocaust feel "more real" to them, that it had had been emotionally upsetting for them, and that it had helped their understanding of the origins of the Holocaust. Consequently, the authors noted that "young people spoke of listening to a survivor in person as a powerful, edifying, affective experience".¹⁹

It is not surprising, therefore, that teachers are keen to invite survivor speakers into their classrooms while they are still able to, "to preserve survivors' memories in the face of their imminent passing".²⁰ Pettigrew et al.'s earlier research in the UK²¹ found that 91% of teachers used individual testimony to help pupils engage with the topic empathetically, with 72% of respondents reporting wanting students "to have a deep emotional response to this topic". These findings raise important pedagogical issues for educators in terms of their underlying reasons and motivations for including testimony

in their teaching about the Holocaust, and how testimony is presented in classrooms. For example, they raise the question of what the intended role is of empathetic interactions with the testimony, and consequently how teachers select, edit and position survivor testimony accordingly in schemes of work in schools. Pettigrew et al.'s research highlighted a number of potential conflicts regarding such intentions and motivations when teaching about the Holocaust. They found that many teachers were teaching the topic to advance contemporary lessons, and that this was particularly so amongst Religious Education (RE) teachers. 71% of all teachers said they talked about the Holocaust to enable pupils to understand the roots and ramifications of racism, prejudice, and stereotyping in society, while 56% said they talked about it to prevent it from happening again.²² Imposing the events of the Holocaust on to the present in this way can be unhelpful, since “unfolding events are always contingent and made up of specific circumstances”.²³ There was also evidence from Pettigrew et al.’s study that the Holocaust was being taught more for its potentially transformative qualities than its historical intricacies, and that survivor visits to schools had a profound impact on pupils in these transformative ways. Such intentions may well dovetail with those of the survivors, who might be motivated by the Jewish concept of *tikkun olam* (in an effort to “heal the world”). This might reinforce the teacher’s transformative, contemporary learning intentions, but may also conflict with their more factual curriculum aims.²⁴ The scope of Pettigrew et al.’s study fell short of exploring what the impact was (or might be) from the pupils’ points of view, or to what extent educators exercised judgments selecting testimony based on intended transformative outcomes, however.²⁵ Consequently, the findings leave us considering whether there was an explicit agenda in UK classrooms (and potentially more widely) to present witness testimony through a planned transformative educational lens with the explicit aim of provoking an

emotional, actional response from the pupils. In response to this somewhat ambiguous picture, the following case study offers a reflection on young peoples' interactions with Holocaust survivors through one educational programme, in the hope of adding towards a more nuanced understanding of this educative moment and its impact on the listeners.

2. Young people's reflections on listening to a Holocaust survivor – a case study

Research context

This study focuses on young people's encounters with single in-person testimony, provided through a programme delivered by The Holocaust Education Trust (HET). The Trust was established in 1988, during the contentious passage of the War Crimes Act.²⁶ Around the same time proposals were being made for a National Curriculum in the UK, and one of HET's first achievements was ensuring that the Holocaust was part of the published Scheme of Work for History when it was introduced in schools in 1991. In 1998 HET established its ground-breaking *Lessons from Auschwitz* (LfA) programme (<https://www.het.org.uk/lessons-from-auschwitz-programme>). The programme is open to all 16-18 year-olds in state-funded schools and is financed by each of the devolved governments within the UK. Each programme comprises four parts: an orientation seminar (which includes an exploration of pre-war Jewish life in Europe), a one-day visit to Poland (which includes visiting a site of pre-war Jewish life, and the Auschwitz Birkenau State Museum), and a follow-up seminar at which plans are developed for a Next Steps project in their local school / community. Over 41,000 students and teachers have visited the Auschwitz Birkenau State Museum with the LfA programme since it began. Each programme has around 200 participants who work in groups of

approximately 20 students, usually with a few accompanying teachers or other adult guests in each group. At the orientation seminar participants hear from one of a number of Holocaust survivors who speak regularly for HET (not all of whom are survivors of Auschwitz Birkenau, reminding students of the diversity of victims' experiences). They give their testimony for around 60 minutes, followed by a question and answer session for a further 25 minutes approximately. The inclusion of testimony in the LfA project aims to illustrate how all of the victims were individual human beings. It is this experience of hearing in-person testimony that is the focus of this study.

I have worked as a freelance Educator on LfA projects for 9 years and during this time I have gathered evidence informally that hearing from survivors has been enormously impactful on the young participants in my groups (the term "Educator" with a capital letter will be used in this paper to denote HET freelance employees, as distinct from other educators and teachers). This paper aims to explore this encounter in further depth and with greater rigour, through a wider sample and a robust methodology. While I consider the LfA programme to be educationally sound and an example of good practice in Holocaust Education,²⁷ it is not being exemplified here as being flawless. The LfA educational programme that participants experience today is the result of years of development, based on international research and thinking around pedagogical approaches to teaching and learning about the Holocaust in classrooms and at sites. HET frequently review the content and structure in accordance with emerging research and practice (such as the revised IHRA Recommendations for Teaching and Learning About the Holocaust²⁸). Research projects commissioned by HET²⁹ and others carried out by their freelance Educators (for example, ³⁰) also feed into what is an ongoing conversation of research-informed professional development within their Educator community (exemplified in regular workshops and training for these staff). As such, the

programme each cohort of participants experiences is the result of research-informed pedagogy, operationalised within the external constraints of government funding and the practices and co-operation of partner organizations such as the Auschwitz Birkenau State Museum. While this research project was never intended to be evaluative of the LfA programme as a whole, it does provide an illustrative context in which survivor testimony is encountered in a structured educational scheme of work. At the orientation seminar, participants hear from a survivor speaker, within a series of educational inputs about pre-war Jewish life across Europe. The rationale here is that the survivor can both illustrate and illuminate the learning from the groupwork sessions, whilst also preemptively providing context for the visit to a site of pre-war Jewish life in Poland the following week. The positioning of testimony within a programme of learning in this way is a necessarily imperfect choice (which HET acknowledge). There are no international guidelines dictating where best to position survivor testimony in any educational programme. LfA is illustrative of a *particular* approach, for *particular* pedagogical reasons and circumstances (as any school would be, for example). It is hoped that the results of this study will offer HET and the wider educational community points for consideration when engaging young people with first-hand survivor testimony in their own various educational settings, and that the data will inform pedagogical choices in these diverse contexts.

Rationale

Data from an evaluative study undertaken for HET in 2010 suggested that “many student participants spoke of personal ‘transformations’ and life-changing effects”³¹ resulting from their involvement in a LfA project. These views are representative of opinions that HET staff regularly hear anecdotally from former participants. The findings presented in this paper are part of a larger study into young people’s

experiences on LfA projects, which came about from discussions with the organization around a desire to further explore these potentially “life-changing”³² impacts that LfA appeared to have on participants. It builds on previous work looking at how young people engage with the subject matter of the Holocaust,³³ how they engage with it emotionally,³⁴ and the nature of visiting the Auschwitz Birkenau State Museum site in particular.³⁵ When Chapman, Edwards, and Goldsmith asked participants what stood out for them as being “valuable”³⁶ during their LfA project, hearing from a survivor was the second most frequently mentioned aspect (and was the most frequently mentioned by teacher participants). The researchers recognised “that hearing a survivor speak made things “real” and “present” in a number of senses, and that voiced personal stories gave the students a powerful heuristic or template to use when trying to make manageable human sense of the enormities of Auschwitz”.³⁷ As such, I felt it was important to focus specifically on this aspect of the LfA programme in some detail in this paper.

Methodology

This study is rooted in a constructivist ontology³⁸ believing that “reality is neither objective nor singular, but multiple realities are constructed by individuals”.³⁹ The data presented here explores young people’s articulations of their experiences of hearing a much older person recall events from their past. Consequently, the study adopts an interpretivist epistemology since the social construction of language (and its reception / interpretation) by both parties is key,⁴⁰ as is the researcher’s interpretation and decision-making throughout the study.⁴¹ The research used a survey approach to elicit responses from a sample of 58 young people (who will be referred to as *participants*). They had all completed a LfA project within the previous 12 months (or had currently completed at least the first two parts of a project). They constituted a purposive sample, since they

had the experience necessary to provide the “valuable insights”⁴² the researcher wished to explore. Participants were self-selecting, having been provided with information about the project before being given the opportunity to give their written informed consent (in the researcher’s absence) if they wished to take part. The participants were all 16-18 years old, in full time education, living in regions across England and Northern Ireland. Although it is worth noting that HET’s internal data suggest that twice as many girls participate in LfA as boys, gender differences were not a key focus of this study.

Semi-structured interviews⁴³ were conducted with 14 participants, exploring a range of aspects of their LfA experience as part of a wider research project.⁴⁴ This paper concerns participants’ responses to a specific question about hearing survivor testimony, plus instances when participants mentioned the survivor in response to other questions. The particular interview item was phrased (intentionally loosely) as follows: *You heard from a survivor at the orientation seminar; what are your thoughts about hearing their testimony?* and was followed by prompts and probes as appropriate. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim, before being analysed alongside fieldnotes.⁴⁵ A further 44 respondents engaged with the research remotely through online surveys (via SurveyMonkey www.surveymonkey.co.uk), which are increasingly being used in social research,⁴⁶ and have the potential benefit of affording participants an additional layer of anonymity.⁴⁷ The online survey item broadly covered the same area, with a suggestive prompt included to enable the respondent to explore their answer further whilst minimising the risk of questionnaire fatigue.⁴⁸ The survey item was similarly loosely worded: *What are your thoughts about the survivor you heard from at the orientation seminar? Do you think it was useful to hear from a survivor?* The word “useful” was used intentionally ambiguously, as a consequence of the responses already

received in the interviews. The use of these multiple methods of data collection facilitated enhanced validity across different data sources.⁴⁹

All data was handled using NViVO data management software (<https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo/what-is-nvivo>) for expediency.⁵⁰ Thematic analysis (TA) was employed to explore it⁵¹ using Braun and Clarke's framework.⁵² Given the philosophical and practical considerations outlined already, TA was used as a flexible *method* within my constructivist methodology,⁵³ resulting in three themes, outlined below.

Findings and analysis

Three themes emerged from the data. These were that participants felt hearing from a Holocaust survivor had been:

1. A *concrete* encounter – it was an exceptional (often unique) experience, that had been distinctive for them from more passive activities (such as reading a testimony in a textbook).
2. A *connecting* encounter – it had been a positive and privileged experience, that had enabled them to connect with the survivor on a human and emotional level.
3. A *current* encounter – it had made the Holocaust have contemporary relevance and provoked an actional response in some.

These themes are explored below through further analysis of the data. While the majority of responses are positive and educationally beneficial, there is a small minority of responses that raise potentially significant issues for educators that will be discussed in the concluding section.

A concrete encounter

The majority of participants reported that this was the first time they had heard from a Holocaust survivor in person, and many commented on the perceived positive impact hearing the survivor had on their learning. They considered it to have been tangibly different seeing and hearing a survivor in this way, giving them “undoubtedly more of an insight than reading from a book or looking at pictures”. Beyond making their learning “more real”, participants spoke about how hearing a survivor “brings this event alive in such a different and more personal way than a book or a film could”. This in turn turned “the Holocaust into more than just something you learn” for them. Such comments are perhaps expected⁵⁴ – we can anticipate that personal contact feels materially different from accessing similar stories through secondary sources in classrooms, for example. What was surprising was the way in which this contact potentially impacted the participants’ ability to tell others about what they had heard. As one put it, they felt better prepared as a result because “it’s easier to talk about something that you saw, rather than... some facts from a textbook”. This comment introduced what would become a recurrent theme in the interviews and surveys – that the survivor had acted as an intermediary between past and present, leaving some participants feeling that by proxy they had *personally* witnessed events first-hand in some sense. Whilst this outcome echoes Elie Wiesel’s much cited decree that “listening to a witness makes you a witness”,⁵⁵ it is important that the new “witness” does not mistake *testimony* for *experience*.

Two of the participants had heard the particular survivor speaker before, via HET’s annual survivor webcast (which had been broadcast on Holocaust Memorial Day the previous year). While they agreed that their in-person

encounter had been a perceptibly different experience from the recording, it had also led them to reflect on the content of the testimony more critically as a result. One noted how the survivor's testimony had been slightly altered in person ("she did explain things differently") and how their interaction with the testimony had been distinctive this time ("I think I retained more knowledge the second time, like actually listening to her and understanding"). The other participant agreed that while they had found the recorded version "quite an interesting story", they had engaged very differently with the speaker in person (although it should be noted that one had seen another participant apparently disengage because she said she'd already watched the webcast). They felt that this time the speaker had "added bits in that weren't originally there [in the webcast] so there was new stuff to hear about", but they had also picked up on physical cues such as being able to "hear like a little hitch in her voice... you could hear how she really didn't want to say any more about certain topics. I think that really made a difference", which they had not detected online. Possibly the survivor spoke more emotionally in the orientation seminar, whereas they had spoken more formally in the televised setting for the webcast, but it was only by being able to compare the testimony at the seminar with the pre-recording that these participants began to question both the content and the *framing* of the testimony more critically.

This critical capacity was expanded upon by the few participants who had previously heard from *different* survivor speakers. While the general feeling was that different testimonies were each "very unique" (sic), they had also "added an extra element" to each prior understanding. In reflecting on the differences, one participant raised the relevance of the *age* of the different survivors they had heard, and how this might affect the different perspectives offered. The young

participant felt the speaker at their LfA seminar “was different [to the survivor they had heard before], because he was old enough to really be affected by it”. This response suggests that testimony from survivors *old* enough to remember more directly (or who they felt were more directly “affected” by the events) would be somehow more legitimate, or more informative than that of younger survivors who might only recount their parents’ experiences vicariously. This echoes Shandler’s observation that “the rise of survivors’ prestige correlated with their aging”.⁵⁶ However, there is a subtle difference evident in this participant’s comment – their words suggest that it is not the survivor’s age *per se* that lends authority to their story, rather it was their *relative* age to the other survivor(s) they had heard before. Judgments about the relative authority of different testimonies such as this could lead to implicit (and unhelpful) perceptions of a “hierarchy of suffering”⁵⁷ among survivors. The term “survivor” has a complicated history (see for example, ⁵⁸), which charts the transition of those perceived as “victims” to the role of “survivors”. The evidence from this participant suggests hearing more than one survivor might lead to a consequent reversing of this transition, in order to rank “survivors” by their comparative victimhood – possibly perceiving the authority of the survivor relative to their *victimhood*. If young people hear from more than one survivor, it might therefore be necessary to support their contextual understanding of where each testimony sits within the wider narrative (to prevent this being based on crude relativistic perceptions, such as age or comparative suffering). To fail in this might result in young people thinking an adult “suffered more” than a child, or a camp survivor more than a Kindertransportee (for example), and that their testimony can be (de)legitimised accordingly. While the majority of participants in this study reported their encounter with a survivor was

exceptional and “more real”, it is possible that hearing other testimonies in other contexts (before or after) might strip it of its exceptionality, and cause young people to become more judgmental in their perceptions of the different testimonies. They will need support here, if this critical capacity is to be beneficial and supportive of their developing understanding of the Holocaust, and not be to the detriment of the testimony and the speaker(s).

A connecting encounter

It was evident that almost all of the participants had connected emotionally with the survivor and their testimony. Their choice of words – that it had been “moving” or “touching” – indicated feelings of constructive unsettlement. They revealed that hearing from the survivor had evidently caused them to progress from one emotional state to another, and this emotional engagement had been in some way difficult (and in one case a “hard hitting experience”). Only one participant explicitly said that the testimony had left them feeling “happy” – explaining that this was because the survivor had been “so positive” about their story, particularly their survival and life post-war. The general feeling was that “despite how emotional it was to listen to, it was a vital learning experience”. Some participants felt it had been all the “more emotional” because they had been “able to connect a face to the events”. Connecting with the survivor was a common theme, with participants generally reporting that the testimony had enabled them to connect with a real person and to re-humanize the event. There was a general feeling that it “made the whole experience so much more tangible” and these connections appeared to remind them that “ultimately it was thousands of people who died, not statistics”. The testimony had helped them “realise that each person affected had their own individual experience” and that the victims were “just normal people who

didn't deserve to be treated the way they did". These comments revealed how their connection with the survivor acted as a conduit for the participants to focus on the *particularity* of the testimony – consequently they were struck by the everyday details the survivors spoke about; their daily routines, family details, etc. That participants were able to connect with the speaker as a person seemed key in these responses, and echoed Hirsch's assertion that the generation of post-memory needs the testimony to be familiar in these ways, for it to be relatable.⁵⁹ These connections allowed the participants to make links to better understand the survivor's particular experience and to relate this to their own world as an individual. As one put it, "no two schools are the same, no two educations are the same... that's sort of like to experience the Holocaust, everyone had a different experience, everyone lost something different and everyone was hurt in different ways". Potentially insights such as these present an opportunity for educators to help support young people as they encounter different survivor testimonies. A focus on their nascent understanding of the particular individualities of each testimony (shown here) might help inoculate those who have an inclination to *rank* different testimonies (suggested earlier).

The general impression that the experience had been more connecting and that it had been emotionally challenging to hear is not uncommon.⁶⁰ In terms of achieving the essential educative act (that someone teaches, and someone learns) the experience of hearing from a survivor in person appears to have been successful on LfA projects – certainly the "state of cognitive dissonance... which may mitigate against new learning"⁶¹ that Burke warned of was *not* evident in this study. It is clearly a good thing that testimony helped these young people better understand the event.⁶² However, the nature of this perceived understanding was evidently quite complicated. One participant said that hearing from the survivor

“enabled me to understand some of the feelings felt by some of the people who experienced the atrocity first-hand”, while another agreed that now “I understand what people went through and how terrible it was”. Another sensed that it was only after hearing the survivor “that I began to fully understand how each individual person was affected”. Educationally, this raises issues about whether it is desirable (or possible) for students to think they *understand* the experience of the Holocaust from hearing a survivor’s testimony (and what they mean by “understand” in the first place). Equally, if they recognize the individuality of each testimony (as evidenced, above), then we should also question how they can subsequently claim to understand the complexities of the Holocaust having heard from a single survivor in this way. Tellingly, this sense of comprehension was apparent throughout the sample (with only one participant acknowledging that although “I could sort of empathise... I can never truly understand”). These empathetic connections were particularly deeply felt by one of the participants, who had been struck by the survivor having said that after the war “he and so many others were very much closed... and didn’t talk about it”. He wondered whether this closure extended beyond their experiences to their aspirations and “dreams” post-war. The thought that someone’s dreams might be prematurely curtailed really concerned him and caused him to reflect on his own life and ambitions to try to understand the gravity of what happened to so many;

That really unsettles me, because I, as quite a young person, I have quite a lot of dreams. There's quite a lot of things I want to do, and I fear more than pretty much anything losing the ability to hold onto those dreams, and having your life taken away is the easiest way to get rid of those dreams, and... that happened to so many people, and that's just dreadful.

These personal (sometimes evidently quite profound) connections caused some

participants to start to reflect on the survivors in subjective, characteristic terms. They commented variously on what they perceived as the survivors' resilience, positivity, and inspirational virtues – with the quality most mentioned being that they must be “brave” people. This opinion was based mainly on interpretations of “what they’ve been through”, combined with the act of “having to relive it all” each time they spoke in public like this. Although most felt this must be hard for the survivor to do, one participant wondered whether “it gets easier to tell the story over a certain length of time if you keep telling it and telling it?” These responses illustrated participants’ awareness of the potential “emotional price”⁶³ paid by survivors when they speak, and they evidently felt somewhat protective towards them. This extended to their reflections about the question and answer session following the testimony, during which one recalled a particular question about Holocaust denial that had been asked. The survivor reportedly dismissed denial as “stupid”, prompting the participant to consider how “someone who’d been through that could ever listen to hearing a question like that?” – their indignation was apparent, and it seemed generally there was an awareness of the vulnerability of the survivors that enhanced their appreciation and regard for them. As one put it, “I thought it was incredible to meet somebody who had been through that and was still here to smile and speak”. Care for the survivor speakers is something HET are acutely aware of. For example, they insist there is a short break for them (and the participants) between their testimony and the question session to give them time to compose themselves if needed (and Educators are always on hand to support them while they speak).

The participants’ perceptions of the survivor further extended to an awareness of their societal “status” (echoing the “admiration” often inherent in the “honorific title” of “survivor”⁶⁴). A small number of participants illustrated this further in their comments

that it had been “an absolute privilege” to hear from the survivor in person. The language used here appears significant as it drew a distinction between utility, and privilege. Rather than it being simply a *useful* learning tool to hear from the survivor, the experience had left these participants feeling “profoundly honoured” and mindful that they were “so lucky to be growing up when there are still survivors here to share their stories”. All of these responses serve to further illustrate the complexity of the connections the participants were starting to make with the survivors. While they helped to develop the audience’s understanding of the individuality of the testimony, the elevation of the survivor’s status in the ways shown here might ultimately prove again to neutralize those benefits in some ways. Young people who feel it is (understandably) an “honour” and a “privilege” to hear from a speaker might be less likely to subsequently interrogate that source *critically*, in the way they might another historical text (for example). They might consider the source more authoritative as a consequence, but we need to support them in remaining vigilant to the particularity of the story and its place within the wider narrative, so that they can understand and defend this authority.

A current encounter

It was clear from their earlier responses that the majority of participants had connected with the survivor and their testimony in various, complicated ways. This provoked a few of the participants to start to reflect on the transitory nature of in-person testimony and to comment on its contemporaneous nature. As one participant said, “it puts it in perspective actually how recent in history it was”. The realisation that the Holocaust is edging out of living history⁶⁵ was a theme that participants were prompted to reflect on (although several considered it spontaneously). Of those who were asked about their thoughts on a post-survivor

world, some felt that they were now well placed to retell the testimony they had heard, sometimes even with a suggestion that it was their *responsibility* to do so; “I think it comes down to people like me to tell other people because I’ve had an experience with a survivor”. A couple phrased this as being able to pass on “the message” they had heard, and for a few this extended to a commitment to passing on what they had heard to their own (future) children – “when I have children one day... I’m the person who can pass on that message”. These were not universally held beliefs, however, with another participant thinking that the survivor’s own family would be better placed to tell the story than them (although they acknowledged that these relatives “might not want to” for a variety of reasons). Two participants explicitly said that it was *not* up to them to retell the story they had heard. One contended this was because “it’s not my story to tell... I wasn’t there”, with the other agreeing they did not feel it was “theirs” to tell. It is interesting that participants reacted in these very different ways regarding how they should (or should not) carry the testimony they had heard, for how long, and to what extent they felt obliged to do so. For some this was evidently an issue of imperative trans-generational responsibility, while for others there was a sense of amplified detachment from the narrative once received. Both reactions illustrate reverence towards it, just in different ways. Such responses echo Trezise’s concern that “the fate of Holocaust survivor testimony will depend entirely on its reception by those who ‘were not there’”.⁶⁶ Young people feeling a responsibility towards the testimony they have heard can be considered a good thing, so long as it does not further compound the process of sanctification mentioned earlier, hindering a more critical engagement. Similarly, we would not want them left

unnecessarily burdened with a responsibility we might not adequately have prepared them to cope with.

What happens to these testimonies in the face of the impending absence of survivors “poses a number of challenges for Holocaust Education”,⁶⁷ (and several of the participants reflected on this in their responses. Two of them mentioned that video recording testimonies might be an effective way of doing this, whilst another referred to having testimony accessible via online platforms such as YouTube. When asked about this further, one elaborated that they felt;

we should record the survivors speaking and then have a session where we ask them loads of questions so that we can play them to other generations, like have like holograms and stuff so that they can actually see what the person looked like and then play it.

It was unclear whether this participant was explicitly referencing contemporary endeavours such as *The Forever Project* at the National Holocaust Centre and Museum in Nottingham (www.foreverproject.co.uk) or the USC Shoah Foundation’s *Visual History Archive*[®] (www.sfi.usc.edu). Such projects are not uncontroversial however, and it remains to be seen in time whether these “ambitious transhuman experiments” will be effective in trying “to stem the tide of history and decelerate the historicization of Holocaust memory”.⁶⁸ In terms of the technology required it may be that what once seemed incredible is (to this younger generation) quite possible, and the most appropriate way to proceed in their opinion. Although this participant acknowledged that such recorded testimonies “won’t be the same as actually listening to them” in person, the availability of recorded testimony in more interactive ways might help future generations to bridge the gap between themselves and an absent past. To some extent this in turn might ease any burden felt by these participants and their

contemporaries (suggested in the data above), who are likely to be the last generation to hear from the survivors in person.

In extension to the various responses outlined so far, a few of the participants felt that the experience impelled them to some sort of future *action*. While such ‘actional’ responses are not uncommon amongst participants, they are not an explicit aim of the LfA programme (although they are encouraged to complete a Next Steps project to share their experiences in their schools / local communities within a specified timeframe upon their return). For some the utility of hearing the testimony lay in the subsequent parts of their LfA project. A few participants thought that hearing the testimony had been most useful in terms of their subsequent visit to Poland :—two participants commented that hearing testimony had helped them “prepare” for the visit, while another said that hearing the testimony had “made it all the more real to me once in Poland”. Particularly, one spoke about how “hearing from [the survivor] really helped to personalize the visit, helping to remind me that each person who suffered had their own personal life” (again, reinforcing perceptions of testimony as *particular*). Although such actional or practical responses were relatively few overall, they echoed earlier findings from LfA participants.⁶⁹ Testimony is a key aspect of the LfA programme and HET Educators use testimony extracts at the sites in Poland to continue to humanize the events that occurred there (in keeping with pedagogical guidance from IHRA⁷⁰). As such, it is perhaps surprising they were mentioned so infrequently by participants.

For some participants their actional response extended beyond the LfA project but could be fairly unsophisticated, such as a desire simply “to learn and find out more”. For others though, their actional response to hearing the testimony had been more universal, in terms of a belief “that we should never treat people – how they were

treated – again”. We cannot assume these responses were spontaneous, however, as it is not uncommon for survivors at LfA seminars (or elsewhere) to speak about their motivations for speaking⁷¹ and often these are explicitly expressed as a desire to make the world a better place (which these participants might simply be reiterating). The survivors’ intentions might perhaps be linked to the Jewish concept of *tikkun olam*,⁷² although only one participant explicitly evoked this themselves. They asserted that “still today resonates the moral of his [the survivor’s] speech, a plea to my generation to do away with hate, such a moral however simple, is to me, now an invaluable axiom”. Such a moral imperative is evidence again of burden some young people felt testimony placed upon them. It is something we, as educators, should perhaps consider more attentively as a possible consequence of Holocaust Education in any educational context, and plan support for our students accordingly.

3. Reflections and discussion

As has already been established, this research project was never intended to be evaluative of the LfA programme specifically. The research was facilitated by HET, with consent sought from key members of staff during the wider research project, and I remained mindful throughout that consideration for the institution or setting in which educational research takes place is imperative.⁷³ However, LfA is *one* example of the choices made by educators in their settings. HET recognize that all “testimony should be framed within a historical context” but acknowledge that “testimony is just one person’s story told from a specific and personal perspective” (www.het.org.uk). Their choice is that the best way to do this is by positioning the testimony in the orientation seminar during a study of pre-war Jewish life. Participants are told in advance that they will hear from a survivor at this seminar and they are sent the survivor’s biography, then time is built into the orientation seminar for participants to reflect and debrief on what

they have heard. The testimony is then drawn from during the subsequent site visit to Poland, during which further testimonies are introduced (and participants receive a booklet of testimonies during their journey home). Finally, participants are encouraged to include testimony in their Next Steps projects and are invited to future HET events at which testimony is a key feature (such as the Trust's annual Ambassador Conference, or their annual webcast for Holocaust Memorial Day). While I have acknowledged that I am not holding this up as the perfect way to incorporate testimony into a programme of learning (or that such a thing even exists), there is a clear pedagogical rationale evident here (whether you agree with it or not). In many respects LfA is similar to most classroom encounters with survivor testimony – they too will be constrained by external factors (such as timetabling, or the availability of the survivor to visit the school, for example). However, most classroom encounters are unlikely to benefit from the contact time participants have on LfA (around 20 hours of input throughout the seminars and visit), or from its delivery by a variety of educators and museum guides with specific expertise in teaching and learning about the Holocaust.⁷⁴ Perhaps, then, we might conclude that LfA and its presentation of in-person testimony is unrepresentative of other encounters with survivor testimony in educational settings, but in the absence of any internationally agreed guidance on what constitutes best practice in presenting testimony, I argue that LfA presents both a model and characteristic case, with much to offer practitioners in other settings. In this spirit, what follows discusses the findings presented in this paper thus far with a view to illuminating the practice of hosting survivor testimony in various educational contexts.

The students in this study overwhelmingly felt that hearing from a Holocaust survivor in person had been beneficial to their learning (and frequently also on a more personal level). It had been “100% useful”, “a really great opportunity”, and “a really

important experience”, that had made their learning more “real” and more meaningful in their opinion. However, some of the responses from individuals in this study have illustrated the complex ways in which these encounters were (and can be) experienced and demand further attention. Meetings between young people and Holocaust survivors in educational settings are complicated social interactions. The task for us as educators is to help better understand these interactions and to better support our students in assimilating their new knowledge into their developing (and necessarily incomplete) understandings of the Holocaust.

As much as hearing a survivor might add to a young person’s understanding, its complexity should also impede it. I have argued elsewhere that any individual testimony should be viewed as “orphan testimony”⁷⁵ – testimony that is innately personal to the teller (and a construct of their relative age and life experiences). The story of the Holocaust is a tapestry of these individual / orphan testimonies that between them make up the inconsistent whole. There is no single representative testimony, and so when students hear one it should *disrupt*, as much as it *complements* their understanding. If students don’t have the skills or knowledge to be able to (de)contextualize a single testimony, there is a risk they will iconify it – a practice that will innately subordinate their own ability to consider it more critically. Many participants in this study felt (erroneously) as though the single narrative they had heard enabled them to understand the event as a whole, or that they had consequently experienced it first-hand in some way. While the concept of “prosthetic memory”⁷⁶ is not new, interestingly those who had heard other testimonies were better equipped to begin to be more critical of their encounters (although this sometimes led them to inadvertent ranking survivors based on the specifics of their stories). As educators, our task is to frame individual testimony in a way that facilitates critical engagement, and in doing so we might need to provide

some of the context that hearing other testimonies provides (since very few of these young people had heard another testimony). We also need to consider how we present testimony from the outset. For example, if a teacher introduces a survivor speaker with words such as “it’s a great privilege for us to hear from...”, it might not necessarily be helpful for their students. Can we blame young people for iconifying something that we have already sanctified ourselves (albeit for entirely legitimate or understandable, well-intentioned motives)? We would perhaps do our students a better service if we concentrated our efforts more on helping them see the testimony as particular, but unexceptional; an individual’s story, but not the *only* story – and certainly not the *whole* story.⁷⁷

The students in the study had clear views about the perspective of the speaker (based on characteristics such as their age at the time of the Holocaust), and how this affected their perceptions of the authority of their story. It is important that again educators frame different narratives contextually, so students understand them on more than a superficial level like this. Only then can they begin to appreciate the particularities of a child survivor’s testimony when considered alongside that of an older camp survivor (for example), without being drawn to lazy comparisons or injudicious ordering. Participants were also acutely aware of the contemporaneous nature of their encounter. As schools increasingly look to “secondary witnesses”⁷⁸ and then to recorded testimony (something favoured by these participants), it is important they do not view survivors’ experiences hierarchically. Again, this falls to educators to frame testimony in their classrooms in such ways as to facilitate a critical understanding amongst their students that all testimony is *equally* significant.

4. Recommendations for teaching

While recognising that young people encounter Holocaust survivor testimony in various ways and in numerous contexts and settings, the following recommendations are suggested from the data presented in this paper:

1. *Young people should be specifically prepared before they hear testimony:* Adequate preparation is essential,⁷⁹ but this must extend beyond superficial context alone. Young people need to be supported towards some kind of initial “testimonial literacy”⁸⁰ if they are to receive the testimony with a sense of criticality and be able to understand and operationalize its various messages. This preparation might include historical context (such as LfA’s pre-war Jewish life session), and a consideration of the particularity of testimony (an appreciation that this is *one* testimony, and that it is an unrepresentative part of a complex whole).
2. *Young people should be supported in their understanding of their relationship with the testimony:* While many responses in this study appeared to suggest the students had become a “witness by adoption”,⁸¹ it is important that educators help young people mediate their place in relation to the testimony they have heard. It would be undesirable for them to overidentify or appropriate the survivor’s experiences,⁸² and it would certainly be unwelcome for the encounter to be twisted into some kind of bizarre *emotional selfie* where the listener appropriates the traumatic narrative for themselves. The generation of postmemory needs the survivor’s story to be familiar,⁸³ but that familiarity needs to remain to some extent distant. It must not become *their* memory (for it never can be), and they need to understand why not.

3. *Young people should be supported after hearing testimony:* It is as important that we support students *exiting* testimony, as it is that we have done so *before* and *during* the experience. Young people should have the opportunity to discuss what (if anything) they could or should do in response to hearing from the survivor. Actional responses are common, but it should not be seen as an obligation. To do so might risk relegating any positive action to being merely a passive, learned response. Worse still, any student who does not feel impelled to *act* on the testimony might view their own response as in some way deviant.

In educational settings, students sit and listen to testimony at an invisible intersection in which they are positioned between the various needs and constraints of the survivor, the school curriculum, and society more broadly. They receive the testimony largely unprepared for the demands it will place upon them, or that they subsequently place on themselves (as evidenced in this study). This study has highlighted some of the complex relationships that exists at the point where young people receive and interact with a single in-person testimony in an educational context. However, the findings leave us mindful of Greenspan's concern that too often "we mistake monologue for dialogue; hearing a 'story' for participating in a conversation".⁸⁴ The recommendations made here will hopefully go some way in enabling educators to redress this balance and to support young people in being equipped to navigate this interaction as more *critically* aware interlocutors. Only then can they engage with the survivors and their testimony in an increasingly authentic conversation.

Author biography:

Alasdair Richardson is a Senior Lecturer (Religious Education) at the University of Winchester. His research focuses on young people's emotional engagement with the topic of the Holocaust, and on the teaching of sensitive and controversial issues more widely. Correspondence should be addressed to: 107, St Gimbald's Court, University of Winchester, Winchester, Hampshire SO22 4NR. Email: alasdair.richardson@winchester.ac.uk

Acknowledgements:

This project was financed by a research fellowship award from the University of Winchester. The author would like to thank staff at the Holocaust Educational Trust for their support during this project. Thanks also go to the students who were interviewed and who completed the online survey.

Declaration of interest:

As stated in the text, the author is a freelance Educator with the Holocaust Educational Trust.

Article word count: 8,567

Notes

1. Goldhagen, *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, 4.
2. Gallant and Hartman, *Holocaust Education*, 3
3. Wieviorka, *The Witness in History*.
4. Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life*, 68.
5. Totten and Feinberg, *Essentials of Holocaust Education*, 13.
6. Cowan and Maitles, *Understanding and Teaching Holocaust Education*, 121.
7. Schwartz, *Who Will Tell Them*; Brown and Davies, *The Holocaust and Education*; Goldberg, *Holocaust Autobiography*; Short, Supple and Kilnger, *The Holocaust in the School Curriculum*; Misco, *Teaching the Holocaust*.
8. Cowan and Maitles, *Understanding and Teaching Holocaust Education*; Totten and Feinberg, *Essentials of Holocaust Education*; Hector, *Teaching the Holocaust*; Totten, *Holocaust Education*.
9. Culbertson, "A Reflection on the Use of Iconic Holocaust Resources," 131.
10. Hoffman, *After Such Knowledge*, 242.
11. Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory*.
12. London, *Whitehall and the Jews*, 12.
13. Brinson and Dove, *A Matter of Intelligence*, 23.
14. DfE, *History Programmes of Study*.
15. Pettigrew et al., *Teaching About the Holocaust*.
16. Short, *The Holocaust in the National Curriculum*.
17. Pettigrew et al., *Teaching About the Holocaust*, 44.
18. Foster et al., *What Do Students Know*.
19. Pettigrew et al., *Teaching About the Holocaust*, 88.
20. Shandler, *Holocaust Memory*, 2.

21. Pettigrew et al., *Teaching About the Holocaust*, 42.
22. Ibid., 72.
23. Hoffman, *After Such Knowledge*, 244.
24. Richardson, *Holocaust Education*.
25. Pettigrew et al., *Teaching About the Holocaust*.
26. Richardson, *War Crimes Act 1991*.
27. Richardson, *Site-seeing*.
28. IHRA, *Recommendations*.
29. Chapman, Edwards and Goldsmith, *Evaluation*, 9.
30. Nesfield, *Keeping Holocaust Education Relevant*; Richardson, *Site-seeing*.
31. Chapman, Edwards and Goldsmith, *Evaluation*, 9.
32. Richardson, *Site-seeing*, 4.
33. Foster et al., *What Do Students Know*.
34. Richardson, *Holocaust Education*.
35. Nesfield, *Keeping Holocaust Education Relevant*.
36. Chapman, Edwards and Goldsmith, *Evaluation*, 56.
37. Ibid., 59.
38. Denscombe, *Ground Rules*; Punch and Oancea, *Introduction to Research Methods*.
39. Waring, "Finding Your Theoretical Position," 16.
40. Gergen, *An Invitation to Social Construction*.
41. Taber, *Classroom-based Research*.
42. Denscombe, *Ground Rules*, 41.
43. Brinkmann and Kvale, *Doing Interviews*; Seidman, *Interviewing as Qualitative Research*.

44. Richardson, *Site-seeing*.
45. Denscombe, *Ground Rules*.
46. Tymms, "Questionnaires".
47. Cohen, Manion and Morrison, *Research Methods*.
48. Denscombe, *Ground Rules*.
49. Ibid; Flick, *Managing Quality*.
50. Parkinson et al., *Framework Analysis*.
51. Hayes, *Doing Psychological Research*.
52. Braun and Clarke, *Using Thematic Analysis*.
53. Braun and Clarke, *Reflecting on Reflexive Thematic Analysis*.
54. Cowan and Maitles, *Understanding and Teaching Holocaust Education*.
55. Burger, *Witness*, 32.
56. Shandler, *Holocaust Memory*, 2.
57. Helmreich, *Against All Odds*, 173.
58. Ibid; Berger, *Surviving the Holocaust*; Lipstadt, *Holocaust*.
59. Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory*.
60. Richardson, *Holocaust Education*.
61. Burke, *Death and the Holocaust*, 62.
62. Hector, *Teaching the Holocaust*.
63. Helmreich, *Against All Odds*, 133.
64. Novick, *The Holocaust in American Life*, 69.
65. Jilovsky, *Remembering the Holocaust*.
66. Trezise, *Witnessing Witnessing*, 1.
67. Gray, *Contemporary Debates*, 81.
68. Kansteiner, "Transnational Holocaust Memory," 320.

69. Chapman, Edwards and Goldsmith, *Evaluation*.
70. IHRA, *Recommendations*.
71. Helmreich, *Against All Odds*.
72. Gallant and Hartman, *Holocaust Education*.
73. BERA, *Ethical Guidelines*.
74. Pettigrew et al., *Teaching About the Holocaust*.
75. Richardson, *Holocaust Education*, 184.
76. Landsberg, *Prosthetic Memory*.
77. Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors*.
78. Apel, *Memory Effects*.
79. Totten, *Holocaust Education*; Burke, *Death and the Holocaust*.
80. Shenker, *Postmemory*.
81. Wolin, *Written in Memory*, 23.
82. Trezise, *Witnessing Witnessing*.
83. Hirsch, *The Generation of Postmemory*.
84. Greenspan, *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors*, 209.

Bibliography

Apel, D. *Memory Effects: The Holocaust and the Art of Secondary Witnessing*: Rutgers University Press, 2002.

BERA (British Educational Research Association). *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*, Fourth Edition. <https://www.bera.ac.uk/publication/ethical-guidelines-for-educational-research-2018-online> . 2018. Accessed 1 March 2020

- Berger, R. J. *Surviving the Holocaust. A Life Course Perspective*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2011.
- Braun, V., and V. Clarke. "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3, no. 2 (2006): 77-101.
- Braun, V., and V. Clarke. "Reflecting on Reflexive Thematic Analysis." *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health* 11, no. 4 (2019): 589-597.
- Brinkmann, S., and S. Kvale. *Doing Interviews*. Vol. 2. London: Sage, 2018.
- Brinson, Charmian, and Richard Dove. *A matter of Intelligence: MI5 and the Surveillance of Anti-Nazi Refugees, 1933–50*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Brown, M., and I. Davies. "The Holocaust and Education for Citizenship: The Teaching of History, Religion and Human Rights in England." *Educational Review* 50 no. 1 (1998): 75-83.
- Burger, Ariel. *Witness: Lessons from Elie Wiesel's Classroom*. New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2018.
- Burke, D. "Death and the Holocaust: The Challenge to Learners and the Need for Support." *Journal of Beliefs & Values* 24, no. 1(2003): 53-65.
- Chapman, A, C. Edwards, and E. Goldsmith. Evaluation of The Holocaust Educational Trust's Lessons from Auschwitz Project - Final Report. London: Institute of Education, University of London, 2010.

Cohen, L., L. Manion, and K. Morrison, eds. *Research Methods in Education*. 7th Edition.
Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2011.

Cowan, P., and H. Maitles. *Understanding and Teaching Holocaust Education*: Sage, 2016.

Culbertson, E. "A Reflection on the Use of Iconic Holocaust Resources." In *Essentials of Holocaust Education: Fundamental Issues and Approaches*, edited by Samuel Totten, 131-147. Abingdon, England: Routledge, 2016

Denscombe, M. *Ground Rules for Social Research - Guidelines for Good Practice*.
Maidenhead, England: Open University Press, 2010.

Denscombe, Martyn. *The Good Research Guide: For Small-scale Social Research Projects*:
Maidenhead, England: McGraw-Hill Education, 2014.

DfE (Department for Education). *History Programmes of Study: Key Stage 3 - National Curriculum in England*.

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/239075/SECONDARY_national_curriculum_-_History.pdf. 2013. Accessed

1 March 2020

Flick, U. *Managing Quality in Qualitative Research*: Sage, 2008.

- Foster, S., A. Pettigrew, A. Pearce, R. Hale, A. Burgess, P. Salmons, and R. Lenga. *What Do Students Know and Understand About the Holocaust? Evidence from English Secondary schools*. Centre for Holocaust Education. London: UCL, 2016.
- Gallant, M. J., and H. Hartman. "Holocaust Education for the New Millennium: Assessing Our Progress." *Journal of Holocaust Education* 10 no. 2 (2001):1-28.
- Gergen, K. J. *An Invitation to Social Construction*. 3rd Edition ed. London: Sage, 2015.
- Goldberg, M. "Holocaust Autobiography." *The Reference Librarian* 29 no. 61 (1998):157-163.
- Goldhagen, D. J. *Hitler's Willing Executioners: Ordinary Germans and the Holocaust*. London: Little Brown, 1996.
- Gray, M. *Contemporary Debates in Holocaust Education*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Pivot, 2014.
- Greenspan, H. *On Listening to Holocaust Survivors: Beyond Testimony*: Paragon House, 2010.
- Hart-Moxon, K. *Return to Auschwitz*. Newark: Quill Press, 2007.
- Hayes, N. *Doing Psychological Research*: Taylor & Francis Group Abingdon, UK, 2000.
- Hector, S. "Teaching the Holocaust in England." In *Teaching the Holocaust*, edited by Ian Davies, 105-115, London: Continuum, 2000.

Helmreich, W. B. *Against All Odds: Holocaust Survivors and the Successful Lives They Made in America*: Routledge, 1996.

Hirsch, M. *The Generation of Postmemory - Writing and Visual Culture After the Holocaust*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012

Hoffman, E. *After Such Knowledge: A Meditation on the Aftermath of the Holocaust*: Random House, 2005.

Holden, W. *Born Survivors*: London UK: Sphere, 2015

IHRA (International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance). 2019. *Recommendations for Teaching and Learning About The Holocaust*.

[https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/sites/default/files/inline-files/IHRA-](https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/sites/default/files/inline-files/IHRA-Recommendations-Teaching-and-Learning-about-Holocaust.pdf)

[Recommendations-Teaching-and-Learning-about-Holocaust.pdf](https://www.holocaustremembrance.com/sites/default/files/inline-files/IHRA-Recommendations-Teaching-and-Learning-about-Holocaust.pdf) . 2019. Last accessed 21st December 2020.

Jilovsky, S. *Remembering the Holocaust - Generations, Witnessing and Place*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.

Kansteiner, W. "Transnational Holocaust Memory, Digital Culture and the End of Reception Studies". In *The Twentieth Century in European Memory*, edited by Tea Sindbæk Anderson and Barbara Törnquist-Plewa. Leiden: Brill, 2017.

Landsberg, A. *Prosthetic Memory: The Transformation of American Remembrance in the Age of Mass Culture*: Columbia University Press, 2004.

London, Louise. *Whitehall and the Jews, 1933-1948: British Immigration Policy, Jewish Refugees and the Holocaust*: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Lipstadt, D. E. *Holocaust: An American Understanding*. Vol. 7. New Brunswick, USA: Rutgers University Press, 2016.

Misco, T. "Teaching the Holocaust Through Case Study." *The Social Studies*, January / February (2009), 14-22.

Nesfield, V. "Keeping Holocaust Education Relevant in a Changing Landscape; Seventy years on." *Research in Education* 94 (2015):44-54.

Novick, P. *The Holocaust in American Life*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2000.

Parkinson, S., V. Eatough, J. Holmes, E. Stapley, and N. Midgley. "Framework Analysis: A Worked Example of a Study Exploring Young People's Experiences of Depression." *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 13, no. 2 (2016):109-129.

Pettigrew, A., S. Foster, J. Howson, P. Salmons, R. Lenga, and K. Andrews. *Teaching About the Holocaust in English Secondary Schools: An Empirical Study of National Trends, Perspectives and Practice*. London: Institute of Education, University of London, 2009.

Punch, K. F., and A. Oancea. *Introduction to Research Methods in Education*: Sage, 2014.

Richardson, A. "Holocaust Education: An Investigation into the Types of Learning That Take Place When Students Encounter the Holocaust." Brunel University, 2012.

Richardson, A. "Site-seeing: Reflections on Visiting the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum with Teenagers." *Holocaust Studies* (2019):1-14.

Richardson, A. T. 1992. "War Crimes Act 1991." *The Modern Law Review* 55, no.1 (1992): 73-87.

Schwartz, D. "Who Will Tell Them After We're Gone? Reflections on Teaching the Holocaust." *The History Teacher* 23, no.2 (1990): 96-110.

Seidman, I. *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2019.

Shandler, J. *Holocaust Memory in the Digital Age: Survivors' Stories and New Media Practices*. California: Stanford University Press.

<https://www.scribd.com/book/355596929/Holocaust-Memory-in-the-Digital-Age-Survivors-Stories-and-New-Media-Practices> . 2017. Last Accessed 1st March 2020.

Shenker, Noah. "Postmemory: Digital Testimony and the Future of Witnessing." *A Companion to the Holocaust* (2020): 537-551

Short, G. "The Holocaust in the National Curriculum: A Survey of Teachers' Attitudes and Practices." *Journal of Holocaust Education* 4, no.2 (1995):167-188.

Short, G., C. Supple, and K. Klinger. *The Holocaust in the School Curriculum : A European Perspective*. Germany: Council of Europe Publishing, 1998.

Taber, K. *Classroom-based Research and Evidence-based Practice: A Guide for Teachers*: Sage, 2007.

Totten, S. *Holocaust Education*. Boston MA: Allyn & Bacon, 2002.

Totten, S., and S. Feinberg. *Essentials of Holocaust Education: Fundamental Issues and Approaches*: Routledge, 2016.

Trezise, T. *Witnessing Witnessing: On the Reception of Holocaust Survivor Testimony*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2013.

Tymms, P. "Questionnaires." In *Research Methods & Methodologies in Education*, edited by James Arthur, Robert Coe, Larry V Hedges and Michael Waring, 223-233. London, Sage, 2017.

Waring, M. Finding Your Theoretical Position. In Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe & LV Hedges, eds. *Research Methods & Methodologies in Education*. London: SAGE, 2017.

Wieviorka, A. "The Witness in History." *Poetics Today* 27, no.2 (2006): 385-397.

Wolin, J A. *Written in Memory: Portraits of the Holocaust*: San Francisco: Chronicle Books, 1997.