The silence of genocide and voice of survivors: the role of Holocaust memorials in education

by

Sasha Wittes

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

in

Theoretical, Cultural and International Studies in Education

Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Alberta

Abstract

Through Holocaust memorials, visitors to the sites are able to educate themselves on past events. It is with the building of these memorials that the importance of memory within the Jewish community is constructed and how an understanding of genocide is defined. Memorials are a product of their time and space, and to comprehend this point, the thesis begins with the importance of nationalism and the making of nationhood in all its variations. It is also critical to understand what makes up a nation, the ethnic identity, and the community. Through a lens of public pedagogy, I explore what the Holocaust means for societies, communities, and myself. I do this by delving into the politics of the word "holocaust," its various spellings, definitions, and enunciation and its multiple receptions and responses.

Using autoethnography and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), I explore the variety of meanings, linguistic enunciations, and social contexts of being the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor. I connect this exploration with an interrogation of the varied perspectives of (and in and through) collective memory and their relationships to identity formation and how people consider the various subjective and objective orientations to memorials on a continuum of the naively popular to the academically informed. Furthermore, my linguistic and social contextualization of materials draws on the selective use of an expansive secondary literature to provide an overview of the Holocaust in world history as well as Canada's role during the Holocaust and public pedagogy and education to comprehend antisemitism.

The main purpose of this thesis is to explore the nature of collective memory, public pedagogy, and education in and for public spaces. The thesis focuses on how these ideas fit into the notion of *Holocaust memorials as critical educative tools*. I conclude that informal sites of learning have the capacity to encourage questioning and critical understanding for people who

engage with memorials. Memorials, as places of public pedagogy, have tremendous power to influence people through their aesthetic use of physical space and the multitude of ways to learning opportunities for participants. My final reflections in the thesis provide a multi-perspective analysis on the role of memorials in public pedagogy, and how they can provide a myriad of new ways to relook at the past, revisit the present, and reimagine the future.

<u>Dedication</u>

For my grandmother, Annemarie Klauber Wittes, who only ever wanted to forget. Thank you, in spite of it all for showing me the fairies.

To my mother, Carla Wittes, for teaching me that we must always remember.

<u>Acknowledgements</u>

I would like to acknowledge the tremendous support I received from my supervisor, Dr. Jerrold Kachur, whose mentorship has allowed me to develop tremendously as a researcher and scholar.

Thank you Dr. Jonathan Anuik and Dr. Anna Kirova for agreeing to be examiners on my thesis defense committee. I have appreciated all your notes, criticism, and advice throughout the process.

Also, I would like to thank the Centre for Global Citizenship Education and Research and its directors, Dr. Ali A. Abdi and Dr. Lynette Shultz, for all the encouragement, support, and laughs during my time as a graduate student.

To my wonderful and supportive husband, Brad, thank you for all your love, kindness and support in helping me achieve this goal. Thank you for all the lattes and chocolate to keep me focused. Your calmness and encouragement was the best gift.

Thank you to my parents and brothers for their unwavering support throughout this process. Your belief in me meant more than you will ever know.

To all the Holocaust survivors that have been willing to share their stories with me, educate me, cry with me and laugh with me - you are an inspiration to us all. Thank you for being your open-minded, loving and thoughtful selves.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

Each of Us Has a Name

Each of us has name
given by God
and given by our parents

Each of us has a name
given by our stature and our smile
and given by what we wear

Each of us has a name
given by the mountains
and given by our walls

Each of us has a name
given by our celebrations
and given by our work

Each of us has a name
given by the seasons
and given by our blindness

Each of us has name
given by the stars
and given by our neighbours

Each of us has a name
given by our sins
and given by our longing

Each of us has name
given by our enemies
and given by our love

Each of us has a name
given by the sea
and given by
our death

- Zelda (Trans. Marcia Falk)

My Story

I do not remember when I first learned about the Holocaust, or that my grandmother was a survivor; however, I also do not remember not knowing what it was. It has been a significant part of my life and identity since I was a little girl as my maternal Grandmother was the only surviving member of her family. As a little girl, I always felt a strong connection to my grandmother. Her story fascinated me. It is hard to know whether it was my natural interest in history that drove me toward my deep captivation with my family's story or whether knowledge of my family's

experience in the Holocaust that led me to my love for history. Either way, the two have always been a significant part of my identity. I wanted to know everything about her life and her family before World War II. I loved hearing her stories. Unfortunately, she died of cancer when I was nine years old and I was never able to ask her the questions that I wanted. I felt like I was on a search for answers that never came. I am on a never-ending quest to understand the Holocaust and all its intricacies. I tried so hard to grapple with the concepts of good versus evil. I clung to my mother in hopes that she would help me understand our family.

Through reading Holocaust literature for children by Carol Matas and Judith Kerr, I was attempting to make meaning out of my Grandmother's story. I was hoping to come to terms with what happened to my own family. She was one of the lucky ones who travelled to England with thousands of other little children. I use the world lucky, relatively, because to the kindertransport children, they were anything but lucky. For they were taken away from their parents at a young age, they travelled alone through the night, crossing several foreign countries borders before arriving safely in Britain. These children did not know that they were being spared death, because Auschwitz, Einsatzgruppen and Tycochin[1] did not exist yet. All they knew was that their parents promised they would reunite with them soon. Unfortunately, for many, my grandmother included, that was the last time the children saw their parents, heard their voices, and felt their warm and loving touch.

My grandmother never talked about her life in Vienna or England to my mother and her brother and sister. She only ever wanted to forget. This saddened my mother, as she wanted to

---

[1] Tycochin, a small town in Poland that had its entire Jewish population shot into giant mass graves in a forest nearby in 1943. Einsatzgruppen — mobile killing units shot all Jews they found in the Soviet Union

study the Holocaust, she wanted to learn more about history and her family her grandparents. But, unfortunately, this upset my grandmother too much and so my mother never learned much of her story, other than that she felt abandoned and alone. When my grandmother died, everything changed. My mother started looking into her past, it was almost as though she felt free to do so. I walked alongside her even though I had just turned nine. My connection to my grandmother was so strong, and I was devastated when she died.

My mother's journey started when she was cleaning out my grandmother's drawers and found a folded letter written in German. Immediately without understanding the words on the page, she knew that it was from her grandmother. Once the letter was translated, it soon became clear that it was the last letter my grandmother ever received from her mother. It was painful to read, written just a few months before she was deported from Vienna to Maly Trostinec, a death factory in the Ukraine. My mother's life was transformed, and by extension so was mine. Even though I was young, my mother felt I could handle learning about concentration camps and mass graves. I never looked disturbed, only sad and curious. As I began to piece the puzzle of the Holocaust together through my grandmother's story I wanted to meet other survivors and read as much as I could to ensure my knowledge kept growing.

As the granddaughter of a survivor, I have always been very aware of the fact that my very existence was made possible because of genocide. I have spent a lot of time negotiating what that means, and what my role as the granddaughter of a survivor is. I know now that I must tell my story, because my grandmother never could. I must keep her family's memory alive. As Judy Weissenberg Cohen (1999), Holocaust survivor once said, "when you bear witness you become a witness." I have to be a voice for those who are no longer with us, to help us understand what happens when evil prevails over good. Adrienne Kertzer (1999), daughter of an Auschwitz

survivor, asks, "Do you know what Auschwitz means?" She thoughtfully answers her own questions with "Auschwitz is what I cannot narrate" (p. 238).   For me, Auschwitz is the unimaginable, the unbelievable, yet, so real, it is the face of evil. It is the reason we must never stop educating; society must never stop remembering.

From one survivor came three children and eight grandchildren and a yet to be determined number of great grandchildren (currently there are three). From one survivor, a family was born. I am number four of eight grandchildren; born right in the middle. I do not remember not knowing about the Holocaust. I do not remember learning about Adolf Hitler or Auschwitz. I remember doing a show and tell presentation to my grade two class on my grandmother's story. I remember reading books with my mom such as *Number the Stars* by Lois Lowry. I knew my grandma came from another country. I knew she had an accent. My grandmother died three weeks after my ninth birthday; she was 72 years old. It has been twenty-one years since she was prematurely taken from me, and my connection to her remains as strong ever. I remember how she told us stories about fairies in the woods. I remember her taking me to get my ears pierced when I was eight and how I thought it was our little secret. How she wrote me letters about the animals that lived in our country house. The chipmunks would eat out of her toes. She was so gentle. That country house was where all of us spent our summers, by the water, together. My cousin Relly and I had matching swimsuits because she thought it looked sweet that her two redheaded granddaughters were dressed alike — although we do not resemble each other at all! Every day I feel cheated that I never got to hear her story. Every day I know that something from my life is missing, a void that will never be filled.

I learned the basics of her story when I was seven or eight years old. The details were promised to me when I got older. I always heard that phrase, "when you get older Sash, I'll tell you about my journey on the train."   Eventually, I got older, but she was not there to share her

story with me anymore. She was taken away from me before I even knew how to ask. My deep bond with my grandmother has led me to the path that I am on. It has lead me to explore five extermination camps and three concentration camps, and led me to need to go to as many as I can, as often as I am afforded the opportunity. It's taken me to Vienna, her hometown, and Prague where her family came from.

When I first visited Auschwitz back in 2006 (now in southeastern Poland), I wondered to myself what the purpose of the memorial was, why was it there? What story did it tell the visitors and what it could teach the world about a world I was already a bit familiar with.   The next time I visited was 5 years later and I was just about to start my Master's in education program in policy studies. In Auschwitz, I carefully watched those I was with as they walked through the death factories. Later I watched their reactions to the Berlin Holocaust memorial and I listened to what they had to say afterward. It started to occur to me that through my own lens and imagining a new light as the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor I could do some research on the educational purpose of Holocaust memorials – what I now know as a kind of public pedagogy. I would have to reach deep within myself to understand what the meaning of the Holocaust was to me. My grandmother was the only surviving member of her entire extended family so the Holocaust signifies to me the destruction of a culture, the loss of community, a personal loss of family, and a sense that I did not know where I come from. My long existent family tree was lost and I knew nothing of pre-1900 period. The memory also represented the loss of the German language in my family.

It might seem strange but I see The Holocaust as the very reason that I am alive today. If it had not occurred my grandmother would never have left Vienna and met a Canadian air-force soldier or to be able to tell my story through primary research via autoethnography and critical

discourse analysis or develop a broader horizon via secondary research and the literature from history, historical sociology, and contemporary studies. This research has brought to light the importance of the study of memory, and how cultures choose to remember their past. *This thesis argues that through Holocaust memorials visitors are able to educate themselves on past events, the importance of memory within the Jewish community, and understand what defines a genocide.*

In order to truly understand the Holocaust, it is critical to delve deep into what it is; though this has proven to be a challenge since there is not one universal definition of the Holocaust. To understand the background of the Holocaust, how it started, and the role that antisemitism plays is critical to the significance of memorials. Visitors would have a difficult time reflecting during memorial visits if they did not know the history of the Holocaust. Furthermore, Holocaust denial has become rampant in Canada over the last 30 years, with several prominent educators and writers publishing false information booklets and articles. One of the chapters focuses on why education is so important in combatting scams and false information and why visiting memorials can be used as a tool to educate. To allow oneself to truly immerse in a memorial is to reflect on identity, history, and the importance of memory. There are also chapters on these topics. Each substantive chapter revolves around an object; the concept and event called the Holocaust. Each chapter unfolds as an alternative angle in keeping with the way I explored each topic over the past few years.. Since working on my thesis I have been back to Poland and Germany twice and each time I have learned something new about why memorials are designed the way they are, and what they can teach us about their past. Through this journey I have been able to answer the questions of what does the Holocaust mean as the granddaughter of a survivor and what is the purpose of memorials. The thesis takes the reader through related yet different perspectives. The final text in no way represents the logic of interpretation because it has been framed and reframed within the

context of the emerging studies, discussions and reflections with my supervisor, new readings and new travels and new insights. What follows is the logic of presentation, an organizational afterthought about how to make better the reader's comprehension of a somewhat impossible topic.

The world of this impossible topic has labeled my mother and her siblings second generation survivors. My brothers, cousins and I are considered third generation survivors. We did NOT survive anything like my grandmother survived. We are not Holocaust survivors in any sense of the word. Our identities of being descendants of survivors, and our stories are equally as important, but they are not the same and should not be thought of in the same way. My grandmother would be surprised if she knew that our identity was still so closely bound to ours. I am the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor, yes, but I did not survive. I am here because she did. I believe that the world must never forget, but I also believe there is a better word, a better phrase, a better way of categorizing the millions of descendants of survivors other than as survivors themselves. My story is exceptionally different from my grandmother's life — although our lives are intertwined.

Navigating identity is a complicated enough process without adding the notion of being a direct result or product of genocide. Internalizing it can become all but impossible. "I am here because you are not." I am here because of the Holocaust. What does that even mean? How can I negotiate that? Simply stated, if the Holocaust and World War II had not happened my grandmother would not have been sent on the *Kindertransport* from Vienna to England. If there was no war my grandfather would not have enlisted in the Air Force and wound up at the Jewish Community Centre welcome event where he met my grandmother. My grandmother was the only survivor of her entire extended family. Such are the contingencies of such a narrative.

The *Kindertransport* was a rescue mission by the British Government that they saved 10,000 Jewish children from Germany and Austria in 1938. My grandmother was 14 years old when she said "goodbye" to her parents and was sent to live with people whose language she did not speak. She became a victim of abuse and neglect. She was also saved before the horrors of Auschwitz, before the ghettoization of Polish Jews, before the war. This identity often led to her feeling as though she was not a "true" survivor, less than those who faced slave labour, smelled burning bodies and experienced the hell that was the cattle car journey and the selection process at the end. But this point should not be misunderstood: she is a survivor. My grandmother was not treated like a member of the family who had rescued her. Rather, she was treated like a slave and was not allowed to eat with them. She was not loved. These feelings of abandonment stayed with her until she died. She was taken away from everyone she knew and loved, only to find out later they had all been left for dead. Some memories endure — some do not.

My great grandfather had diabetes and was denied access to medication by the Nazis. He died shortly after the war began. My great grandmother went into hiding but was ultimately betrayed by a neighbour. She was deported to Maly Trostinec in the Ukraine where she was shot and discarded into a mass grave upon arrival with thousands of others. The rest of the family was taken to Theriesenstadt, Auschwitz, Sobibor and Belzec where Zyklon B and carbon monoxide poisoned them to death along with many others. All of them were treated less than human, much less than dogs or cats, discarded like trash.

It is not surprising that my grandmother is my hero. She is my inspiration every day. She survived the rest of the people. To me the rest of the people are names and numbers, their ashes floating among the rest of the victims, and their bodies disintegrating into the earth. From the time I was a little girl I yearned to learn more about the time period of their generation, about my family,

and about the genocide, and I went to visit where they once lived. I was 20 when I first visited the death camps. I was fascinated by the various memorials that I saw. I wondered what they meant, how they originated, and their purpose. This yearning ultimately led me to write this thesis and to explore the role of memory and memorials in Holocaust education. Here the ideas of nationhood and nationalism, public pedagogy, an educational theory that analysis public spaces and popular culture come into play (Burdick & Sandlin, 2010). Here I analyze controversial events. I reflect also on the nature of Holocaust/genocide studies, through both literature on memorials and my own experiences with them and *in* them.

Nationalism and Nationhood

Nation, nationalism and nationhood are key concepts informing this study even when I am not writing about them. To understand how memorials are built, and who they are for, it is critical to understand the nation's history and what makes up a nation. Nationalism, as an area of study, is massive. There are so many components that go into constructing a national identity. "It includes the growth of nations and, the national state, as well as ethnic identity and community…and can spill over into any number of cognate subject such as, race and racism, fascism, language development, political religion, communalism, ethnic conflict, etc." (Hutchinson & Smith, 1994, p. 3). According to Hutchinson and Smith (1994) "nationalism is one of the most powerful forces in the modern world" (p. 3). Ideas of nationalism in the Western world started with the French (Republic) and American (Liberal) revolutions. Both groups of people wanted to create a nation with the same values, understandings, and community to construct a unified identity. Liberal nationalism is based on the idea of equal rights for all citizens. However, this concept can be confusing when looking at the Holocaust because only Germans had citizenships rights, and

because the Nazis revoked Jewish German citizenship in 1935 (Bergen, 2009). Theories of nationalism are based on the devotion to the interest of a particular nation or culture (Hutchinson & Smith, 1994). In its most extreme forms, nationalism brings about radical measures including genocide and ethnic cleansing.

Although it is debatable, the literature is usually framed around two main kinds of nationalism: *ethnic* and *civic* nationalism. The Jewish people of the diaspora would fall under the ethnic category, whereas the Nazis are considered civic nationalists. The central theme of ethnic nationalism is that nations are united by a shared heritage, often this includes a common language, and religion (Ozkirimli, 2010). Theories of ethnic nationalism believe that it is the nation that creates the states, rather than shared political rights, nations are held together by pre-existing ethnic characteristics (Ozkirimli, 2010). State borders regardless of ethnicity, race, religion or language define civic nationalism. In principle, a civic nation is a community of "equal, rights-bearing citizens, united in patriotic attachment, who share a set of political practices and values" (Ozkirimli, 2010, p. 243). Both types of nationalism play a role in understanding the history of the Holocaust in Europe and in Canada.

During the 1930s and 1940s Canadians were still in the early stages of defining what kind of state they wanted to be, with what kind of people they wanted living in its borders. The Canadian government was strict with its immigration policies, declaring Jews and other minorities undesirable (Abella & Troper, 2012). The Canadian government, at the time, wished to be a nation of British and American Christian immigrants, who shared the same values. Canada has changed its nationalist views, and has become a peacekeeper, known for being a safe haven to refugees around the world. Currently, Canadian nationalism is based on being accepting and inclusive, and while the country has come a "long way," there is still work to be done. I discuss this dynamic in

more detail in later chapters but suffice it to say here, the Canadian government's policy toward Jewish refugees during the Holocaust was not to accept any, and now, 70 years later, the government is trying "to make up for it" by creating a national Holocaust memorial in downtown Ottawa, to commemorate all who were lost and honour all who survived. This state initiative to commemorate an event is part of what can be called "public pedagogy."

Public Pedagogy

I have chosen to utilize as an object of study "public pedagogy" as my social theoretical framework includes "analysis of the domains of cultural education, public space, popular culture and political struggle" (Sandlink, Schultz & Burdick, 2010 p. 1). All of the above are critical components to my research as I seek to understand how Holocaust memorials can be a vital component of Holocaust education. Public pedagogy is a relatively new area of educational thought, though it was first introduced in 1894, it did not become part of mainstream educational theory until the mid 1990s (Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick, 2010). The study of public pedagogy draws from a wide range of multidisciplinary source that pursue "forms of pedagogy that are radically different from those found in schools" (Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick 2010 p. 1). Public pedagogy urges learners to engage with public spaces such as zoos, museums and memorials as well as popular culture.

Everyday life is a type of public pedagogy that allows educators and cultural studies scholars to engage in diverse relationships that shape private life and public domain. Sandlin, Schultz and Burdick (2011) define public pedagogy has been defined with five domains:

1. "Citizenship within and beyond schools

2. pedagogical theory on popular cultures and everyday life

3. informal institutions and public spaces as educative arenas

4. dominant cultural discourses

5. public intellectualism and social activism" (p. 5).

These five fields essentially encompass all education that takes place outside of the school. Which essentially means that public pedagogy theory focuses on education, and engagement in public spaces. Sandlin, Schultz and Burdick (2011) describe education "as an enveloping concept, a dimension of culture that maintains dominant practices while also offering spaces for their critique and reimagination" (p.1). As such, public pedagogies are complicated, ethical dilemmas and diverse. The idea behind public pedagogy claims that while schools are not the only places where education occurs, they are also not the most influential (Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick, 2011). The implications of what this means could have vast effects on what education will look like going forward, and where the most meaningful education takes place for learners. Education in public spaces, such as memorials allows people to learn at their own pace and make sense of history and politics in a way that is meaningful for them. However, public pedagogy is the inheritor of a longer historical sociological tradition regarding collective memory and education in public spaces.

The main purpose of this thesis is to explore the nature of collective memory, public pedagogy, and education in public spaces. Throughout the document I explain how these notions fit into the notion of Holocaust memorials as critical educative tools. Collective memory discourse is created with narratives and traditions of social groups (Durkheim, 1912). In this manner, scholars can view social groups as made up of varying sizes from immediate family groupings to larger ethnic or religious communities, or rooted in nationalism. Collective memory becomes a significant part of memorials because they are designed with specific group interests

in mind. Holocaust memorials are constructed to remember the victims of a genocide and to recall tragic events that bind humanity together in solace. Public pedagogy and education in public spaces are intertwined as they both are focused on education that goes beyond the classroom. Public pedagogy and education differ in that the former is a theory for analyzing public spaces; whereas, the latter, focuses on how education takes place. Through these main themes, the purpose of Holocaust memorials becomes evident as they are built with the intention to educate in non-formal settings.

Collective memory binds groups together through symbols and shared experiences (Foucault, 1977). Studies of collective memory began with the work of Maurice Halbwachs (1952) and Emile Durkheim (1912). Halbwachs focused on both historical memory and collective memory, and Durkheim studied the connection that societies have to preserve natural unity. Interestingly, Durkheim never used the expression collective memory. Through his study of how societies unite through traditions, he believed that that shared rituals provided a sense of "'collective effervescence', a transcendence of the individual and the profane into a united space" (Durkheim, 1912, p. 31). He imagined that collective thought "required individuals to join to create a common experience shared by the entire group. Since the collective effervescence experience required the physical gathering of the community, it was important for groups to devise methods of extending that unity when the group disbanded" (Durkheim, 1912, p. 31). Durkheim's work helped pave the way to the understanding of social groups, imagined communities, and the importance of tradition.

Halbwachs was a student of Durkheim. He was the first scholar to write historical and collective memory using those terms. Halbwachs studied society's relation to time and how collective memory is mutual to all members of that society Halbwachs (1952) defines collective

memory as "events that were rendered to individuals by other members of society and historical memory as events which shape the past through the work of historians" (p. 11). As such historical memory is only relevant for history professionals, though it does help shape collective memory. According to Halbwachs (1952), "collective memory is a type of framework on which we can locate, understand and contextualize our own memories and gain significance only in relation, and through, collective memory" (p. 11). Halbwachs theoretical understanding of memory shaped the era in literature that would come to be known as the "memory boom".

The memory boom began in the 1980s and describes a time when memory as an academic study began to take off. During the time, Pierre Nora, a French Scholar expanded upon Halbwach's ideas that collective memory is used to interpret a past, he claimed that groups select certain dates and people to commemorate, deliberately eliminating others from representation or collective amnesia and invent traditions to support the collective memory (Nora, 1989). He maintained that what is remembered in collective memory is chosen by those in positions of power, the winners of war, the educated and those in politics. He theorized that collective memory is both a tool to help society understand its past and an object of power. He claimed that the dichotomy between history and memory emerges at a particular moment in history; it implies that there used to be time when memories could exist as such- without being representational. Durkheim, Halbwachs, and Nora were leaders in the study of collective memory and how it can be used to analyze our past. The works of later memory scholars are all built upon the theories that that these three put forth. Memorials are only able to have a purpose if notions of collective memory are understood. Walking through, or looking at a memorial is a transformative experience that draws the visitors into the collective past, teaching about life, death and the traditions of that group.

Public pedagogy is the newer and more fashionable framework that analyzes cultural spheres, pop culture, and political struggle. Henry Giroux coined the term public pedagogy to describe the political and educational force of a global culture. Giroux's early work emphasized the significance of producing critical understanding and exploring what public pedagogy is. (Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick, 2011). His early definition of public pedagogy influenced many educational scholars (Guy 2004; Sandlin 2005, 2007; Tisdell, 2008) as they studied public culture as education. Giroux (2004) claims that pedagogy, "is not simply about the social construction of knowledge, values and experiences; it is also a performative practice embodied in the lived interactions among educators, audiences, texts, and institutional formations" (p. 60). To put it simply, public pedagogy implies that learning takes place across social practices and settings; not just in the traditional sense of schooling. Roger Simon (1995) believes that it points to the multiplicity of sites in which education can occur. Giroux argues that cultural studies plays a transformative role in understanding education outside of the classroom. He began explorations into what popular cultural could mean for social justice, and spaces of learning such as memorials, public parks and museums.

Giroux (2003) maintains "education is not training, and learning at its best is connected with imperatives of social responsibility and political agency" (p. 9). It is important to note that while many scholars employ the use of public pedagogy as a theory; the definition of it is still relatively undefined and the "literature is still underdeveloped theoretically and empirically" (Sandlin, Wright, & Clark, 2011, p. 4). The authors whom I have read outline it as processes and sites of education and learning that occurs beyond formal educational institutions, it is different from both the hidden and the open curriculum and includes the media. (Giroux 2003; Sandlin Schultz & Burdick 2010; Sandlin, Wright, & Clark, 2011).

Henry Giroux popularized public pedagogy, as a term, in the mid 1990s. His first publications on the subject surrounded media and mass culture[2] (Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick, 2010). Through his influence, the field of pedagogy broadened beyond popular culture and into more critical realms of education, which include museums, parks and other public spaces of learning. Giroux (2003) utilizes the theoretical research of Hall (1997), Gramsci (1971) and Freire (1973) to explain how popular culture can act as a "political site of struggle over identities; to illustrate that popular culture does not automatically reproduce dominant ideologies, but exists as a site of negotiation where hegemony is struggled for yet not always won" (Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2011, p. 345). Many scholars have followed and much of the theory of public pedagogy is grounded in the idea that resistance can occur within popular culture. When discussing resistance within public pedagogy, the role of public spaces comes up quite frequently. Public spaces, such as zoos and museums lend themselves to critical thinking, and identity development among students and adults alike.

Raymond Williams's (1967) proposes a "notion that all culture is educative" (Sandlin, Schultz & Burdick 2010, p. 1). This point underlies the basic framework for theories of collective memory and public pedagogy used in this thesis. John Dewey (1916) was one of the first educational theorists to differentiate between schooling and education, "education should be defined as that reconstruction or reorganization of experience, which adds to the meaning of experience, and which increases ability to direct the course of subsequent experiences" (p. 76). Whereas Dewey believed that schools were "miniature societies in which democracy and reconstructive individual inquiry might flourish" (p. 76). Though education is a term that is

---

[2] Mass culture is defined as the set of ideas and values that develop from a common exposure to the same media, news sources, music, and art. Mass culture is broadcast or otherwise distributed to individuals instead of arising from their day-to-day interactions with each other.

commonly understood to mean learning, it is "an enveloping concept, a dimension of culture that maintains dominant practices while also offering spaces for their critique and reimagination" (Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2010, p. 1).

Public and pedagogy are two words that have been employed within educational settings for decades though their individual meanings are often contested within the academic community. Sandlin, Schultz and Burdick (2010) ask the ever-important questions "What does a public in terms of space, identity, democracy and education mean? What are the lines of demarcation that divide the public from the private, and just how porous are they?" (p. 2). Pedagogy is commonly known as the method and practice of teaching, especially as an academic concept (Sandlin, Wright, & Clark, 2011), though the term symbolizes many ongoing debates within educational discourse. However, regardless of the array of approaches, "public pedagogy has come to signify a crucial concept within educational scholarship that schools are not the sole sites of teaching, learning, or curricula and that perhaps they are not even the most influential" (Sandlin, Schultz, & Burdick, 2010 p. 2).

Informal sites of learning have the ability to encourage questioning and critical inquiry and allow the public to create new understandings of the world around us (Simon, Rosenberg, & Eppert, 2000). Sandlin, Schultz and Burdick (2010) write that public spaces of learning can "cultivate the emergence of a new political agent" (p. 292). Though places of historical significance can important educative tools, "community engagement with public history can be particularly difficult and controversial in situations in which remembrance practices concern histories of oppression and violence" (Simon, Rosenberg, & Eppert, 2000, p. 1). When looking at public history, and how and why it is important for communities we must remember that everything that goes into making the site significant are all aspects of public pedagogy including

the installation, the design, and the public discussions surrounding it (Simon, Rosenberg, & Eppert, 2000). Brett, Bickford, Sevcenko and Rios (2008) remind us that:

> sites of conscience seek to tap the power and potential of memorialization for democracy be serving as forum for citizenship engagement in human rights and social welfare. Using deliberate strategies, public memorials can contribute to building broader cultures of democracy over long term by generating conversations among differing communities or engaging new generations in the lessons of the past (p. 2).

As a society we are taught that history is something we need to learn from, society needs to do better, and we need to fix the mistakes of those that came before us. This central question of how to learn from history is outlined by Simon, Rosenberg and Eppert (2000), "what does it mean in both ethical and pedagogical terms to learn the lessons of the past" (p. 14). Learning from our past through public spaces such as museums and memorials has the ability to move away from the academic to the affective[3].

Many scholars who focus on informal sites of learning (Grenier 2010; Hemlih and Horr 2010; Kemp and Parrish 2010; Packer and Ballanytyne 2010) are exploring how these sites play a role in the "development of learners' relationships to their world and lives" (Sandlin, Wright, & Clark, 2011, p. 348). Though memorials are often not thought of in terms of pedagogy many of their visions and plaques state that the place is provided for an opportunity for both reflection and education. Ellsworth (2005) shares that "learning takes us up to and across boundaries between ourselves and others and through the place of culture and the time of history" (p. 55).

As such many view the concept of memorialization as a powerful tool that works with history and memory in order to illustrate contemporary social injustices (Ellsworth, 2005). Due

---

[3] Affective is defined as relating to moods, feelings or thoughts

to memorials being in open spaces they create controversy about their design, location and meaning. The Holocaust, specifically has been an event that has amassed curiosity throughout the years, the public spaces designed in its memory continue to grow, as such we as a Canadian society are able to use them to engage in uncomfortable issues such as who we are, and our own relationship to history. Designers of such places seek "new ways of knowing that also transform knowledge, self-experience, awareness, understanding, appreciation, memory social relations and the future" (Ellsworth, 2005, p. 37). The capacity of memorials as places of public pedagogy holds no bounds as through their physical space they create endless opportunities for teaching and learning traumatic events in history.

Public pedagogy allows learning to occur in a wide variety of diverse spaces around the world that can contribute to a deeper understanding of present day society and the impact of history. Ellsworth (2005) further explains that these cultural institutions are "places where the community explores and revises its value, where complicated conversations occur and where complexity and controversy are embraced and engaged" (p. 11).   Public spaces seek to focus on openness, creativity and complexity in order to foster critical thinking and inquiry amongst all people. Learning through these spaces allows us to experience education without the pressure of being right or wrong, but rather afford us the opportunity to reflect on what we are learning and why it is historically significant.

<div align="center">

Public Spaces and Education

</div>

Memorials are generally in public spaces, as such they are inclusive to all who wish to visit and learn from them (Young, 1993). Although education is assumed popularly to occur in the walls of formal educational institutions called schools, there are numerous other spaces that "possess

strongly educative capacities, despite having little or nothing to do with the process of school"
(Burdick & Sandlin, 2010, p. 349). The public spaces that exist outside the boundaries of schools
are just as important to "our understanding of the formation of identities and social structures as
the teaching that goes on within formal classrooms" (Burdick & Sandlin, 2010, p. 349). Theories
of public pedagogy tend to explore sites of learning that are part of popular culture, public spaces
and social activism. Burdick & Sandlin (2010) argue that learning occurs in various settings that
the reader may not think of as *education* — which is usually equated with K-12 schooling. These
places "often take on a subtle, embodied mode, moving away from the cognitive *rigor* commonly
associated with education, and toward notions of affect, aesthetics and presence" (Ibid., p. 338).
This notion of public pedagogy perfectly describes my intent to bring memorials to the forefront
of the educational world. Although, they often have very little text, the spaces and designs of the
structures can bring about a different kind of learning that is more engaging and relatable.

Learning that occurs at informal sites and public spaces has the potential to be more critical
than traditional schooling because the bias of textbooks or teachers are not as evident; however
because learning is informal or public does not guarantee this process. Pinar (2006) maintains that
if education does not address every day learning, popular culture and the media then it jeopardizes
functioning under the false narrative that schools are the only places where real learning can occur.
Scholars, who focus on public pedagogy of informal sites of learning, "explicate their pedagogies
and their role in developing learners' relationships to their world and lives" (Burdick & Sandlin,
2010, p. 350). The learning that occurs at Holocaust memorials is undeniable, as many of them
can question viewers' preconceived notions and beliefs about history. When a visitor is staring at

a pile of shoes from 70 years ago[4] it can be difficult to not question why it happened and how it happened. Public pedagogy of informal learning sites helps explain the purpose of why groups erect memorials to commemorate history. However, this process is not without controversy and Holocaust memorialization is extraordinarily controversial.

Meaningful and Reflective Learning

Meaningful and reflective learning are two separate but intertwined ways of making sense of the world. Meaningful learning is a process in which the learner reorganizes his understandings and lays foundations for deeper understandings (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2015). Dewey (1916) explains meaningful learning "as the reconstruction or reorganization of experience which adds to the meaning of experience and which increases the course of subsequent learning" (p. 76). Reflective learning is the process of exploring issues that are triggered by various lived experiences (Harvey, Coulson, & McMaugh, 2016). My thesis is based on my own experiences and observations at Holocaust memorials, to which my conclusions are based on the reflective practice of meaningful learning. Reflective learning "creates and clarifies meaning in terms of self, and which results in a changed conceptual perspective" (Harvey, Coulson, & McMaugh, 2016, p. 1). The idea of reflective learning is to engage deeply in the process of continuous learning. According to Harvey et al., (2016) "it involves paying critical attention the practical values and theories which inform everyday actions, by examining practice reflectively and reflexively" (p. 1). The purpose of reflective and meaningful learning is that it is able to support student learning through experiences (Darling-Hammond & Snyder, 2015). Reflective learning is a process that supports

---

[4] The Majdanek Museum and the Auschwitz Museum both contains exhibits of the collection of shoes that belonged to Jewish prisoners when they arrived at the camp. Prisoners were given slippers/other shoes as part of their uniforms.

learning, engaged with at multiple levels and from various perspectives, does not need to be critical, can lead to transformative learning and has the possibility of engaging with multiple ways of knowing (Harvey, Coulson, & McMaugh, 2016). Meaningful and reflective learning is rooted in understandings of events, and phenomena. Understanding is relationships between concepts, "to grasp the meaning of a thing, or an event or situation is to see it in in its relation to other things" (Dewey, 1916, p. 137). Experiential learning is based on the notions of reflective and meaningful learning as it takes learners outside of the classroom and provides the space to think about the meanings of where they are, and why they are there.

Learning About Controversial Events

The Holocaust, as a historical event, is considered to be controversial. Although, *most* people agree that it happened. The exact definition of what the Holocaust is, who it affected and why we use the term *holocaust or genocide* are often debated. Definitions of the Holocaust vary across scholars, survivors and everyday people. Some (Bauer, 2001; Bergen 2009;) say it was just Hitler's extermination policies of the Jews that constitutes the Holocaust and the other victims would fall into the category of a *genocide.* Sparking the debate over which is "worse' a holocaust or a genocide, and how subjective that can be. Others (Hilberg, 1985; Niewyk, 2010). believe that the Holocaust should encompass all victim groups. The Holocaust affected several European minority groups, and anyone who was not part of Hitler's Aryan Master Race was subject to discrimination, slave labour and, in some cases, annihilation. To fully understand the various Holocaust memorials around the world, the Holocaust must have a proper definition, otherwise it is difficult to know what message and to whom the memorial is sending. Throughout this thesis I explore the various popular and academic definitions of the Holocaust and the two main schools

of thought on interpreting the Holocaust. Because there is no clear definition of the Holocaust that is universally accepted by all, it can be difficult to interpret this "event" in history (let alone identify). This "politics of definition" is covered in the second chapter before specifying the methodology in the third chapter.

The final field of study that runs throughout the thesis is that of Holocaust/Genocide studies and my own interpretations. Holocaust and genocide studies are relatively huge contemporary fields of study that include historical analysis and interpretation of the Holocaust. However, this is considered to be an extremely vast topic as some scholars/institutions focus on the history, whereas others focus on related topics such as the sociology of the Holocaust, international relations, the Holocaust in world history versus the Holocaust in Jewish history, the Holocaust's impact on Jewish identity in the 20th century, and Jewish life. Holocaust studies also can include topics such as human rights education, Jewish theology, and ethics. Further to the second chapter, throughout my exploration in the thesis, I define what it means *to me*, and how that relates to my own understanding of what the Holocaust was or is or might be for others.

Holocaust and Genocide Studies

The Holocaust as subject matter is intimidating, sensitive, and never-ending.   The event was a defining moment of the 20th century and helped bring about the United Nations, and human rights. The Holocaust encompasses ideas of citizenship, dictatorship and the severe victimization of innocent peoples. It is also about numbers, statistics and cold hard facts, but mostly it is about people and their stories of survival, victimization and resistance. Lessons from the Holocaust are numerous, as it provides a context for exploring the dangers of remaining silent, apathetic, and indifferent in the face of others' oppression (Totten, 1997). Learning about the Holocaust shows

the importance of taking into account a host of socio-historical factors as well as psychological ones, if we are fully to understand the darker side of human behaviour (Reed & Short, 2004). The Holocaust, if taught well, can make a valuable contribution to anti-racist education. The events that lead up to the Holocaust were not an accident in history; rather, they occurred because individuals, organizations and the Nazi government made choices that not only legalized discrimination but allowed prejudice, hatred, and ultimately mass murder to occur (Totten, 1997). The Holocaust provides the framework for presenting the (Jewish) past, understanding its present, and envisioning the future. It has become the ultimate metaphor for Jews, a part of their roots and the source from which the meanings they bestow on daily life are constituted.

Without fully understanding the history of anti-Semitism, the lessons of the Holocaust can be difficult to grapple with. As Mock (1997) notes, "many educators try to motivate their students to take a stand against racism and promote human rights but neglect to provide an understanding of the nature and impact of racism in all its forms" (p. 468). By only studying the basic timeline and facts of the event, students are unable to make connections between what happened in the past and injustices and human rights issues of contemporary society. As Edward Sullivan (1998) explains, "Holocaust education can only be meaningful when we look at those events in the greater context of the human experience (p. 337).

Historical knowledge is a combination of memories and facts carefully woven to tell a story. The real question is whose memories and knowledge are these, and how did these memories and knowledge become official insofar that they are is written into history textbooks for its content to be memorialized in some way (Stevick & Gross, 2010). What the state chooses to remember and then teach in public schools is often thought of as official memory (Stevick & Gross, 2010). Whereas what individuals and collective groups remember is called popular memory, the act of

remembering historical events is deeply rooted in cultural experiences, and values. The link between the notion of historical-sociological concepts of memory and Jewish views of remembrance has played a role in the construction of Holocaust education in contemporary society (Young 1993). My visits to various memorials and monuments made clear to me that the design and the symbolization that the memorials display are constructed to share a specific message with the public about their past.

The Holocaust, from its conception to its implementation, was rooted in a long history of anti-Semitism in Germany, and throughout Europe. Liberal democratic education is the backbone of a democratic society, one that fosters the underpinning values of respect, morality, and citizenship (Mann, 2004). It is important to remember that the "Final Solution" was the policy of the state; it was sustained over a long period of time; and consequently, constituted the Nazi government priority supported by the legal system (Totten, 1997, p. 176). Understanding history is critical to how society views itself in the present, and how it can transform positively for the future. All Holocaust education should discuss the role of the victims, perpetrators and bystanders alike and portray them as individual human beings who either chose their fate or were forced into it. Holocaust education is interpreted as a paradox, "unspeakable" and "unbelievable," yet something that not only must be spoken about but something that must be made meaningful and real. Holocaust education must be sensitive, comprehensive, consistent and relevant to its learners.

Memorials are created and designed to be meaningful to those that enter them. They provide a space for education and reflection that goes beyond the classroom. In order to understand the Holocaust more deeply, I believe it is necessary to experience emotions in the spaces where it happened. Experiential meaningful education can have a profound impact on learning about

history and ourselves. The purpose of Holocaust education is not to pity the victims, or be in awe of the survivors, rather it is to instill positive values of humanity.

Chapter Summary

Through understanding public pedagogy, the Holocaust itself, and my own identity as the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor, I explore the purposes of Holocaust memorials in Germany and Poland and how they can be used as a critical educative tool for engaging with sensitive subject matter. This thesis starts with a discussion about definition of the Holocaust and the etymology of genocide. It is followed with a specification of methodology: autoethnography and critical discourse analysis (CDA). Chapter 4 interprets what the Holocaust means and reviews the two main theoretical orientations: functionalism and intentionalism. Chapter 5 draws on the perspectives of collective memory and identity formation and how that shapes understandings of memorials. Chapter 6 provides a primary documentation of my visits to various memorials and reflects on what they have meant to me as a visitor and teacher to the sites of destruction. Chapter 7 draws on secondary literature, provides an overview of Canada's role during the Holocaust and antisemitism in Canada during World War II, and ends with a look at Holocaust denial and contemporary antisemitic politics in Canada. The last chapter and final reflection attempts to bring my final reflections on the Holocaust, memorials and antisemitism to an end for this thesis, along with a few thoughts on future research.

The Holocaust

We played, we laughed
we were loved.
We were ripped from the arms of our
parents and thrown into the fire.
We were nothing more than children.
We had a future. We were going to be lawyers, rabbis, wives, teachers, mothers. We had
dreams, then we had no hope. We were taken away in the dead of night like cattle in cars, no
air to breathe smothering, crying, starving, dying. Separated from the world to be no more.
From the ashes, hear our plea. This atrocity to mankind cannot happen again. Remember us, for
we were the children whose dreams and lives were stolen away.

<div align="right">Barbara Sonek</div>

Etymology of Genocide

Discerning a historical object and defining its concept is not as straightforward or simple as it first appears. The controversy surrounding the Holocaust and a cluster of related events and concepts has its own politics that cannot be ignored. This chapter introduces the reader to both the complexities and controversies informing the delimitation of such a study before I get into to much detail about my methodologies and the specific studies about memory and memorials to the Holocaust. This is a linguistic and philosophical reflection that attempts to locate myself within the history as both event and competing representations of the event.

Prior to the end of World War II, genocide and crimes against humanity were crimes without a name. The Nazi atrocities sparked the creation of the term "genocide" by Raphael Lemkin, and gave new meaning to the old Greek word, holocaust (Bergen, 2009). Lemkin, a Polish Jewish refugee, coined the term genocide because he believed that the immorality of a crime such as genocide should not be confused with the amorality of war (Jones, 2010). Destexe

(1995) explains that war and genocide are two entirely different notions: "Killing someone simply because he or she exists is a crime against humanity; it is a crime against the very essence of what is to be human. This is not an elimination of individuals because they are political adversaries, or because they hold to what are regarded as false beliefs or dangerous theories, but a crime directed against the very humanity of the individual victim. Thus, it cannot be categorized as a war crime" (p. 1).

Since the creation and inception of both words, debates have been sparked over what fits into each definition and how to label certain historical events. What has come to be known as "The Holocaust" is a genocide, but not all genocides are considered holocausts: What differentiates a holocaust/the Holocaust from genocide? Scholars have been debating this genocide for decades now because "The Holocaust" (referring to the Nazi genocide against European Jews) has become the benchmark, for which all other genocides are compared. Which inadvertently (or perhaps intentionally) has created a genocidal hierarchy of suffering supposedly placing Jews at the top and all other genocides below.

In order to understand the reasons for the debate this thesis analyzes the etymologies of each term and how they earned their spots in society. Without the Nazi perpetrated liquidation of the Jews we scholars would not have either term to use in the way they are used today. Lemkin first coined "genocide" in 1944 in his book, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe.* Genocide comes from the Greek, "geno" meaning race or kind and "cide" meaning killer/killing. Lemkin (1944) introduced the word as meaning the following:

By "genocide" we mean the destruction of a nation or of an ethnic group. This new word, coined by the author to denote an old practice in its modern development, is made from the ancient Greek wordgenos (race, tribe) and the Latin cide (killing)….Generally

speaking, genocide does not necessarily mean the immediate destruction of a nation, except when accomplished by mass killings of all members of a nation. It is intended rather to signify a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group" (p. 80).

Lemkin became interested in the idea of genocide because of the Turkish perpetrated slaughter of Armenians[5]. He felt passionately about there being a difference between crimes against civilians during the war and the intent to exterminate large groups of people for reasons not associated with war at all (Jones, 2010). Lemkin was hired as a consultant to work with a team of Americans who were preparing for the Nuremberg trials[6]. He worked tirelessly for the Americans to include his word, the new term, "genocide" in the charges against the Nazi leadership. Unfortunately, the Nuremberg trials were held before genocide was made an international legal crime; however, the Nuremberg trials did not cover peacetime attacks against specific groups, only those crimes committed during war (Hilberg, 1995). Lemkin eventually got his wish on December 9, 1948 when the United Nations approved the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide. It established "genocide" as an international crime, which signatory nations "undertake to prevent and punish" (Jones, 2010, p. 2). The definition of what constitutes genocide was debated several times over in 1948 in preparation for the trials

---

[5] The Armenian Genocide was the Ottoman Empire's mass extermination of over 1.5 million Armenians. The Turks were the dominant ethnocultural group in the multinational empire as it broke up and transitioned in the modern republics we know today as Turkey, Serbia, Greece, Syria, Egypt and so on.

[6] The Nuremberg trials were a series of military tribunals, held by the Allied forces after World War II, which were most notable for the prosecution of prominent members of the Nazi party.

and scholars continue to agonize over what human crimes should fall into the definition and which should not (Jones, 2010; Kuper, 1981).

The field of genocide studies has become quite popular in the last two decades. It is primarily concerned with two aspects: first, what is genocide and how is it defined, and second, how to prevent it. Addressing "genocide" sounds like a lofty and abstract goal for academics; however, it is through careful analysis of dynamic comparisons and concrete descriptions of genocidal policies and practices that research can begin (Jones, 2010). Genocide scholars all agree that genocide is to be considered a crime on a higher scale than just "crimes against humanity." A genocide *implies an intention to exterminate a particular group of people* (Jones, 2010; Kuper, 1981). Destexe (1995) agrees that "genocide is therefore both the gravest and the greatest crime against humanity. In the same way, as in a case of homicide the natural right of the individual to exist is implied, so in the case of genocide as a crime, the principle that any national, racial, or religious group has a natural right to exist is evident. Attempts to eliminate such groups violate this right to exist and to develop within the international community" (p. 4). Furthermore, United Nations Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, evocatively declared in his Nobel Peace Prize acceptance speech in 2001 that "a genocide begins with the killing of one man – not for what he has done, but because of who he is... What begins with the failure to uphold the dignity of one life, all too often ends with a calamity for entire nations" (Annan, 2001, para 1). Where scholars mainly differ are in their interpretations of the UN convention, and whether all categories that should exist in the convention do exist (Bauer, 2001; Fein, 1985; Kuper, 1981).

Genocide scholars are divided into two main categories: harder positions and softer positions. Those that abide by the idea that the UN definition must be the one used or the term will lose its value by casual or cavalier use occupy. This definition is the stricter position. Other

scholars with the softer definitions contend that if the definition is too harsh it will leave out "too many actions that logically and morally demand to be included" (Jones, 2010, p. 20). The underlying belief is that the framework of genocidal policies should constantly be changing just as we as a human society are constantly changing. By adhering to a strict definition, some scholars argue that we are not allowing for continual development of the concept and a learning process about the event. The main problem appears to be that some scholars believe that grouping smaller mass murders with large scale attempted exterminations lessens the value of the very notion of what genocide is and what its significance is for modern society (Jones, 2010). If we can distinguish between large and small-scale wars, we should be able to differentiate genocides as well (Jones, 2010). However, as Jones (2010) also notes, it is critical that, "another core concept of social science and public discourse is deployed: war. We readily use 'war' to designate conflicts that kill 'only' few hundred or a few thousand people.... as well as epochal descents into barbarity that kill millions or tens of millions" (p. 23). Perhaps, the reason most scholars can intellectualize and understand that wars happen on large and small scales more so than genocides is because the conception of war has been part of the English vocabulary for a much longer time. Because of the short history of the term genocide, scholars are still trying to determine what exactly constitutes "a genocide" and trying to carefully adhere to a term that captures the particular events.

Etymology of holocaust

When the term "The Holocaust" [7] is used in modern day language today, without fail it has come to mean the Nazi Genocide perpetrated against the European Jews. It is the only modern day genocide with a name that is unqualified and universally understood (Bergen, 2009). "It is taken to be the archetype, the prime case, against which all secondary applications of meaning" (Garber & Zuckerman, 1989). The use of the word is quite contentious, as the term has been used to denote disasters of all kinds throughout history. The word itself comes from the ancient Greek *olos* meaning "whole" and *kaustos"* implying "burnt" (Gilbert, The Atlas of the Holocaust, 1982). The term has historically come to mean sacrifice wholly consumed by fire or a great destruction of life, especially by fire. Israel and Israeli scholars refer to "The Holocaust" as "*HaShoah*" or "*Shoah*" which translates into English as "The Catastrophe" or "The Disaster" (Bauer, 2001; Fridhandler, 2001). Due to the controversial use of The Holocaust (capitalized) as opposed to the Jewish holocaust many American writers have started to adopt the term Shoah into their own writings (Fein, 1987; Nywiek, 2010). Understanding the origins of holocaust and how it came to be popularized amongst the public provides a deeper understanding of the impact that the tragedy had on modern society.

Although the definition of what constitutes genocide has been discussed and debated, the debate surrounding the term holocaust is even more controversial. Although the term genocide is contested, a legally binding definition will always exist because of the UN Convention and this definition will be upheld in court (Kuper, 1981). However, what determines a holocaust is another issue all together. Within academic discourse the event itself is well known; nevertheless,

---

[7] I use capital "H" in Holocaust to define the genocide during the 1930s-1940s in Germany against the Jewish people. I use a small "h" when referring to others usages of the word.

the definitions vary depending on the source and debate. Many literary sources fail to provide a working definition and make the assumption that everyone sees it the same (Bauer 2001; Bergen 2009). In this latter case, the complexity and controversy is ignored simply by "letting the description speak for itself." This approach is not the one taken here or in many of the museums and memorials I have studied.

For example, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum defines the Holocaust (note: a capital H!) as "the systematic, bureaucratic, state-sponsored persecution and murder of approximately six million Jews by the Nazi regime and its collaborators" (Introduction to the Holocaust, 2013, para 4). Yad Vashem, the States Sponsored Israeli Holocaust Museum works with the definition, "The Holocaust was the murder by Nazi Germany of six million Jews" (What is the Holocaust, 2013, para 1). Donald L Niewyk, Holocaust historian, defines it in his book *The Holocaust* as "The Nazi Slaughter of Jews, Gypsies, and other 'racial undesirables' during World War II, commonly referred to as the Holocaust" (p. 5). "Since the 1960s the term 'Holocaust' has been used to refer to the murder of approximately 6 million Jews by Nazi Germans and their collaborators during World War II" (Bergen, 2009, pp. vii-viii).

The popular Internet encyclopedia, Wikipedia, provides a common source for the public. Wikipedia defines The Holocaust as "the mass murder or genocide of approximately six million Jews during World War II, a programme of systematic state-sponsored murder by Nazi Germany, led by Adolf Hitler and the Nazi Party, throughout the German Reich and German-occupied territories" (para 1). Wikipedia also differentiates the six million Jewish victims of the Nazis and the five million other victims by use of the term "systematic": "Taking into account all of the victims of Nazi persecution, they systematically killed an estimated 6 million Jews and mass murdered an additional 11 million people during the war" (para 1). Wikipedia suggests the

broadest definition, including Soviet civilian deaths, would produce a death toll of 17 million" (para 1).

To get a sense of popular understanding of the Holocaust from the person on the street, I conducted an informal survey on the streets of Calgary. I asked 10 people what the Holocaust is, three of them told me, "it has something to do with Auschwitz and tattoos," three of them shrugged me off and said "who cares, it's in the past; the Holocaust is not important," and one gave me a very thorough definition of the systematic killing of 6 million European Jews, and finally, three people told me that a few concentration camps existed and that it was a horrible event where many people were killed because of their backgrounds. This small non-scientific survey indicates what I have found as a common prejudice: that while the majority of people have some knowledge of the tragic event, it is certainly not detailed nor did they seem interested in learning or understanding more about it; however, without knowing their individual backgrounds or proper rigorous survey, it is difficult to draw many conclusions about the definition of the Holocaust used in our education or media systems or public pedagogy except to say that responses are complex and varied and usually superficial. As in most cases about popular and academic controversies, most people may express a strong judgement about something they know very little about.

Notable Holocaust historian, Yehuda Bauer (2001), in his seminal work, *Rethinking the Holocaust,* asks whether them Holocaust is definable, and whether it needs to be definable. "Definitions are abstractions from reality and are useful only insofar as they help us to better understand the world around us… definition by *definition* can never be fully adequate to the event they are supposed to define" (p. 8). Interestingly, in his chapter devoted to defining the Holocaust, he never gives it an exact definition, which may in fact have a meaning in and of

itself. Strict definition may foreclose on asking difficult questions. Nevertheless, definitions help us to understand events in some ways but in other ways they elicit more questions then they answer. Bauer (2001) differentiates between genocide and holocaust, genocide is:

> the planned destruction, since the mid-twentieth century, of a racial, national, or ethnic group as such, by the following means: (a) selective mass murder of elites or parts of the population; (b) elimination of national (racial, ethnic) culture and religious life with the intent of "denationalization"; (c) enslavement, with the same intent; (d) destruction of national (racial, ethnic) economic life, with the same intent; (e) biological decimation through the kidnapping of children, or the prevention of normal family life, with the same intent. The Holocaust is the planned physical annihilation, for ideological or pseudo-religious reasons, of all the members of a national, ethnic, or racial group (p. 10).

Finally, some researchers and sources contend that the key difference in the debate is in the efficiency of the rational or industrialization of killing in the Third Reich. The Nazis' ability to calculate how many bodies they could burn in a specified time is how the regime progressed from the Einsatzgruppen and shootings into open mass graves to asphyxiating people in gas chambers *(Niewyk, 2010)*. This link between rationality, science, industrialization, and the Nazi killing machine has been used to condemn science, capitalism, modernity and the enlightenment tradition while other pieces of the puzzle clearly show the problem to be the disintegration of science, capitalism, modernity and the enlightenment tradition (e.g. Snyder 2015). Many of these points will be touched on in my case study reflections that orient each chapter.

The Politics of Definitions

While the definitions of the Holocaust have similarities, each one could be interpreted very differently, which can lead to confusion among the general public. To look just at the definition of Yad Vashem the reader is unaware that it was bureaucratic and state sponsored or that there were collaborators. To study only the understanding of the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the museum curators understanding of the Holocaust and genocide, the reader would be unaware of the millions of other victims, and where do they fit within these definitive terms. This narrower approach begs the following question: Is the Holocaust a Jewish event or is it a world event? And, though the Jews were the only group targeted for complete annihilation, where do the Roma and Sinti, homosexuals, Jehovah's Witnesses, mentally and physically disabled, Communists, Slavic peoples and/or Poles fit into the delimiting definition? How can we create an understanding, without a hierarchy of suffering, without debating "Who had it worst?"— and in the simplest terms who does Auschwitz belong to?

Furthermore, does anyone really want to lay claim to Auschwitz? Auschwitz is the universal symbol of the Holocaust, a singular place of human barbarity. It is both a symbol for the Jews of the Nazi Holocaust and for the Poles, the chief shrine to their nation's victims of World War II. Jewish Holocaust survivors and their descendants believe that Auschwitz is their own intellectual property (Kertész & MacKay, 2001). Ninety percent of the 1.5 million victims of Auschwitz were Jewish, but most were also Polish citizens (Young, 1993). The camp was originally built for Poles who resisted the Nazi occupation (Lukas, 2012). Both groups want to lay claim to Auschwitz as their own, as "though they'd come into possession of some great and unique secret, as though they were protecting some unheard-of treasure from decay and (especially) from willful damage" (Kertész & MacKay, 2001, p. 267). Prior to the Nazis building

Auschwitz, the land had been part of several small villages near the campsite. In 1942, the Nazi government gave Polish families living on the land 24 hours to leave the area, following the war, the Polish government built a museum to honour those lost. The families who were forcibly removed never received any compensation for it (Kertész & MacKay, 2001).

The question of who "owns" Auschwitz lies deep in the turbulent history of Eastern Europe. Prior to the war, 3.3 million Jews called Poland their home and today only 10,000 Jews call it their home (Kertész & MacKay, 2001). During the communist regime, sacred Jewish places were neglected, and the propaganda at the time understated the extent of Jewish suffering. As a result, Jews became increasingly upset with the Polish government and the Poles retorted by claiming ownership of Auschwitz. Instead of creating a team to mourn for the losses from both sides, each group wants more corpses and to say with conviction that Auschwitz is theirs (Kertész & MacKay, 2001).

Although most people with some thinking capacity know what the Holocaust was, few understand the meaning of the word. The word itself carries a multiplicity of meaning(s) and for that reason, all of the victims and descendants of victims might want to be included in its definition to ensure that their histories are never forgotten. With the increasing awareness of the Holocaust around the world, the concept of Holocaust gained currency as a most horrendous crime (Bergen, 2009). For example in an influential Oxford University Press book, David E. Stannard (1992) frames the European conquest of the New World and its indigenous peoples as an *American Holocaust.* Therefore, the charge of Holocaust with a capital H can become a discursive weapon and many have tried to draw some parallels between the Holocaust and their cases. In another example, when President Jimmy Carter defined the WWII event for the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum in 1978. At first Carter included only the Jewish victims in

the official definition; however, uproars in other communities caused him to quickly rescind that definition and include the phrases "and millions of other victims" (Young, 1993, p. 4). To these victims the term genocide was not enough. The term Holocaust is bigger, it carries more implications, and everyone [or seems to] knows what the Holocaust is. Jewish Americans did not agree with the broad definition of the Holocaust because they felt that by including other victims it would obscure the "extreme virulence of the Nazis Jewish annihilation campaign if the Holocaust was used to refer to non Jewish victims as Jewish death in the Hitler period" (Petrie, 2000, p. 31). The growth and development of the term illustrates how much meaning language and public authority can convey to the public. The growth of Holocaust as a term to describe only the Jewish victims coincided with American Jews using the Holocaust to develop their Jewish identities (Petrie, 2000).

The Significance of Etymology

Despite the controversy that surrounds the use of the word there are only two sources. Both sources are articles that explicitly delve into the history and understanding of the term. The first article in 1989 by Zev Garber and Bruce Zuckerman was titled "Why Do We Call the Holocaust 'The Holocaust?' An Inquiry into the Psychology of Labels" and the second article in 2000 when Jon Petrie reacted with "The Secular Word Holocaust: Scholarly Myths, History, and 20th Century Meanings." There are a few theories as to why the word "Holocaust" was chosen, or rather why it came to be the popular term used to describe the Judeocide in the West.[8] One reason is due to its biblical and religious connotations and the other reason is a result of Elie

---

[8] The term "Judeocide" picks up on Lemkin's term "genocide" by adopting his attention to the Latin word "-cide" meaning killing. Judeocide is used in place of Holocaust because in some contexts the word Holocaust has taken on a colloquial meaning that includes non-Jewish victims, such as members of the Resistance killed fighting the Germans. Using "Judeocide" draws attention to a specific sect of victims.

Wiesel's popularization.[9] Finally, Holocaust or holocaust became a popular term in the larger American culture to denote nuclear warfare and the comparisons between atomic destruction *and* the Nazi genocide of European Jewry.

Elie Weisel, Holocaust survivor and Nobel Peace Laureate, was not the first person to use the term "holocaust" to denote the destruction of the European Jewry; however, his activities are assumed to be the main reason it was so widely disseminated and used. Weisel's memoir, *Night,* was published in 1958, but nowhere in it is the term holocaust found. Weisel is said to have popularized "the capital H term because he sought to banish the horribly euphemistic 'Final Solution' and to launch a brand name that would emphasize the singular nature of the genocide" (Davies, 2012, p. 22). Weisel believed that a new term was needed to describe the extermination of the Jews apart from the other Nazi victims of genocide. Academics did not begin to research the significance of the terms until 40 years after the event ended, and even now, it appears no one wants to address the controversial nature of term or what it means (Davies 2012; Garber & Zuckerman 1989).

Garber and Zuckerman (1989) state, "the power latent in words and phrases must be taken seriously, especially when they come to bear as much cultural weight as 'The Holocaust' has been made to bear in the modern world" (p. 198). Both Garber and Zuckerman and Petrie quote *Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary* (1988), which defines holocaust as "sacrifice consumed by fire" (p. 199); however, Garber and Zuckerman indicate that this definition implies a religious connotation (p. 199) whereas Petrie claims that "no dictionary definition that I have consulted suggests that 'holocaust' when used to mean 'catastrophe' or 'massacre' carries any sense of religious sacrifice" (p. 33). Much of the scholarly debate centres around the notion that

---

[9] Elie Weisel is a Nobel Peace Laureate and one of the most well known Holocaust survivors. He published his memoir in three books to bring attention to the Holocaust

part of the definition of the word implies righteousness on behalf of those offering the sacrifice, and some feel as though this definition makes the Nazis more like heroes than perpetrators of a genocide (Katz, 1994). Language and literary interpretation is often subjective and as such it is critical to analyze word use oneself.

Due to the debate over "Holocaust" carrying religious and sacrificial connotations, the historian Arno Mayer (1993) coined the term "Judeocide" to refer to the Nazi genocide of the Jews (Mayer, 1993). Mayer argues that Holocaust as a term is far too controversial and places the genocide outside of history, and as a unique event, as opposed to within the context of World War II, and the other mass murders and genocides of the 20th century. Through a generalized search of the term Judeocide it has not been popularized to the extent that Mayer (1993) had intended, or even to the same scope as Shoah has. Mayer (1993) may have entered the "naming game" too late for his contributions to make a lasting impact on the survivor community, society at large, and in academia.

Before World War II, the word holocaust was used several times in secular writings; the first published use was by Emma Lazarus in 1882 while referring to an imagined burning of the Jews (Petrie, 2000). Prior to its common understanding of denoting the Judeocide it was mostly used regarding nuclear disaster. In fact, in 1961 holocaust without a modifier implied nuclear warfare in the American academy and the general public (Petrie 2000).

The first usage of "holocaust" to refer to any part of World War II appeared in the *Philadelphia Inquirer* as an editorial urging American soldiers to enlist despite the country being "sternly set against sending an army into Europe's holocaust" (Petrie, 2000, p. 39). The writer was not referring to the victimization of the European Jews but rather to illustrate that this war is bigger, and more destructive than any previous ones had been. The first time holocaust was

used with specific reference to the massacre of the European Jewry was in an obituary in 1944 praising a man for his work with the Polish Jewry "during the present holocaust which has destroyed more than two million lives" (Petrie, 2000, p. 39). Introducing the term as the meaning of the attempted extermination of the European Jewry was a slow process that only seemed to begin in the mid 1960s.

The Eichmann Trial was one of the main events that brought the experiences of the Holocaust into the public sphere. Adolf Eichmann was a leading Nazi official who was responsible for management of the deportations of the Jews to Nazi death camps, development and implantation of lethal and efficient gassing techniques, and creation of the model for which the extermination camps were built (Gilbert, 1985). Eichmann was captured in 1960 in Argentina by the Israeli intelligence service. His trial in Jerusalem ultimately shed some light on the atrocities committed by the Nazis. He was charged with crimes against humanity and sentenced to death in 1962. During his trial the term holocaust was cited several times in news articles when referring to the crimes against humanity during World War II (Petrie, 2000). While the Eichmann Trials and his execution, and subsequently Hannah Ardent's use of the term in her pieces for the *New Yorker* popularized the term within intellectual circles, it was not until NBC aired the mini-series, *The Holocaust,* in 1978 that the term became widely accepted by the general public (Petrie, 2000).

The main issue with the use of the word holocaust to describe the Nazi atrocities is that there is no correct nor accepted definition of the word. The sacrificial and religious connotations have the ability to change how the event is viewed: for example, were the Jews sacrificed by God as a test. If so what kind of God would do that, would allow it to last for so long, allow it to be so destructive, and destroy so many lives, including the following generations. If religious

and sacrificial connotations just happen to be a byproduct of the original meaning of the word, why have we not clearly defined it so that everyone knows what the Holocaust means. The various interpretations have been debated throughout the Western hemisphere, and it has become a cause for constant fighting as opposed to cooperation. Naming an historical event carries meaning, and understanding - it helps to frame how future generations interpret it. Young (1993) contends that "as one of the first hermeneutical moves regarding an event, its naming frames and remembers the events and determines particular knowledge of events…Every…name thus molds event in the image of its cultural particular understanding" (p. ix). There is an undeniable amount of ambiguity surrounding the term, what and who is encompassed by the term, and when it started.

One of the main reasons that a proper clarification of what the Holocaust is should exist is to combat the issue of Holocaust denial and revisionism. Holocaust denial is an attempt to negate the established facts of the Nazi genocide of European Jewry. "It depicts a picture by which Jews conspired to create a hoax, the greatest fabrication of all time. Adolf Hitler did not plan genocide for the Jews but wished instead to move them out of Europe" (Cohen-Almagor, 2008, p. 216). Interestingly, Holocaust deniers and revisionists only deny the aspects associated with the Jewish populations. Deniers assert that the murder of approximately six million Jews during World War II never occurred. They claim that the Nazis had no official policy or intention to exterminate the Jews; and that the poison gas chambers in the Auschwitz-Birkeneau death camp never existed. The idea of Holocaust distortion is a newer trend in which revisionists, as they prefer to call themselves, believe that the figure of six million is a gross exaggeration. The deaths in the concentration camps were the result of disease or starvation but not policy, and the diary of Anne Frank is a forgery (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). Denial and distortion of the

Holocaust are generally motivated and inspired by the hatred of Jews and built on the claim "that the Holocaust was invented or exaggerated by Jews as part of a plot to advance Jewish interests" (Cohen-Almagor, 2008). This is part of the early 20th century myth of the text *The Protocols of the Elders of Zion* (1905). This anti-Semitic fabricated document describes a Jewish plan for total world domination. It was first published in Russia in 1903 and later translated into several languages.

Holocaust denial through the tenants of pseudoscience masquerades itself as a legitimate truth. Understanding Holocaust history is critical to how society views itself in the present, and how it can transform human rights education positively in the future. James Keegstra, a high school teacher in southern Alberta deliberately taught his students that the Holocaust never happened, and he later became the first teacher to lose his license in Alberta. Intentionally denying or distorting the historical record threatens communal understanding of how to safeguard democracy and individual rights. If Holocaust scholars cannot agree on what a/the h/Holocaust is, it becomes easier for deniers and revisionists to press their beliefs as "scientific."

As a result of the lack of one proper definitive meaning of what the Holocaust is and what constitutes a holocaust, it is challenging to know what historical events are considered genocides and which ones have, almost the honour, of being categorized as a holocaust. A common belief is that the Holocaust stands out as a historical event because it was systematic, state sponsored and technological. The Holocaust seemingly took a linear route, beginning with stereotyping and prejudice and ending with mass murder. It is argued that because the Jewish Holocaust was carried out in a Western country, one that was considered to be highly civilized at the time that it is understood to be even more important and more unique than the many genocides enacted in the colonial world. However, it is important to recall that the Nazi project was also one of German

continental colonization over the Jewish and Slavic worlds of Eastern Europe and was justified with harsh and explicit racist language also evident in the Anglo-Saxon world of Britain and the United States. Maybe such an equation of the Holocaust with colonialism faces current devaluation because it does not fit the convenient binaries of North/South and White/Non-white evident today in the decolonization research and possibly remains fashionable to ignore because it was a colonial relationship *between* Europeans and what is today (although was not a century ago) considered a conflict between "white people" (Snyder 2015). The German failure to colonize Eastern Europe with settlers all the way to the Urals remains an inconvenient event in contemporary literature.

What we scholars must remember is that every genocide has its unique characteristics whether it was the infamous trains system where all roads led to Auschwitz and as such the Holocaust. The biggest problem I see with the different terminology that is used here is that it creates a hierarchy of suffering amongst genocide survivors, placing holocausts on top and making everything and everyone else seem less important on the scale. Genocides/holocausts should all be studied, analyzed, and understood through their individual traits. Comparing genocides only works when bigger themes are also explored and deconstructed. It is essential that all genocides are contextualized within a proper historical framework and not just studied as one-off event (Bauer, 2001).

I started learning about the Holocaust at a young age, younger than most people as a direct result of my family's connection to it. I have always believed the following phrase to be the most succinct way to try to understand what the word means without creating a hierarchy of suffering and ensuring that all victims are included: "While not all victims of the Holocaust were Jewish, all Jews were victims."

The next chapter describes how I learned more about the Holocaust and how I have been thinking and learning more about how the broad horizon described above infuses my personal experience to today as a granddaughter of a survivor and as tour leader to Holocaust sites. I have now led three trips to Poland and Germany for university students to learn from the Holocaust. Through experiential education and readings, I try to impress upon my students that the Holocaust did not just happen to Jews; however, "The Final Solution" was a policy of eradicating only Jews. To make sense of this event is not easy; but I truly believe that we need use the Holocaust to teach about the fragility of democracy, racism and human rights education and as such all victim groups are critical. The stories are all heart wrenchingly difficult to hear, impossible to make sense of, and important to learn from. For that reason, the term, The Holocaust should encompass all those who were tortured, used as slave labour, incarcerated at concentration camps and annihilated. We need to educate ourselves about not only the Jewish plight, but the Poles and other Slavs under the German occupation, the Jehovah's Witnesses, political prisoners, homosexuals, prisoners of wars and Roma and Sinti and how any kind of discriminations towards one minority group can easily be transferred to another minority with little sympathy yet a lot of thought devoted to intentional killings.

CHAPTER 3:
METHODOLOGY

Who Speaks. Who is Silent.
Who speaks. Who is silent.
Who aims the camera. Who looks away.
Who records history. Who is recorded.
Who are the perpetrators. Who are the victims.
Who frames the photograph. Who is framed.
Who controls. Who pleads.
Who murders. Who is killed.
Who denies. Who remembers.
Whose photographs occupy the walls of our museums.
Imagine the photographs we will never see.
      Ruth Mandel
      from *"How to tell your children about the Holocaust"*

Introduction

This research includes a critical analysis of the roles that memorials play within Holocaust education. The aim of the project is to develop a deeper understanding of why and how the Holocaust is memorialized and the emotions that memorials themselves are able to illicit from those who stand in front of them. My research is based both on a review of scholarly work and primary research, most importantly, my own experiences as the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor who has travelled to Eastern Europe and observed memorials at former sites of destruction. I used a framework of public pedagogy in my interpretation of understanding how memory and memorials affect cultural groups while applying both a critical discourse analysis and autoethnographic analysis to the questions of what it means to comes to terms with the past. I also analyzed how people share stories, how the power of memory can reclaim love and joy in our lives and what we need out of memorials, both intellectually and emotionally. I also employed the use of meaningful and reflective learning theories to analyze the importance of

experiential learning and the impact it had on me while I was at these sites of memory[10]. I outline the reasons behind these methodologies in the following chapter.

Qualitative Research Methodology

The type of qualitative methodology that I am employing, critical discourse analysis and autoethnography, investigates the why and how of decision-making and is useful in understanding events and actions and the ways outcomes are achieved. One of the many reasons that qualitative research is employed is because it brings meaning to research because it, "investigates how social experience is created and given meaning through an examination of historical, interactional and structural forces, enabling the linking of lived experience with larger social and cultural structures and the past and present" (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998, p. 52). Merriam (2009) contends that qualitative researchers are primarily interested in "(1) how people interpret their experiences, (2) how they construct their worlds, and (3) what meaning they attribute to their experiences" (p. 23).

Furthermore, qualitative research enables a complex and detailed understanding of issues and requires talking directly with people in the spaces in which they live, work, and play as "we cannot separate what people say from the context in which they say it" (Creswell, 2007, p. 40). Given that multiple constructions and interpretations of reality are in constant flux, changing over time, qualitative research can enable researchers in understanding those interpretations within particular socio-historical contexts (Merriam, 2009). Wertz (2011) explains, "Qualitative research addresses the question of 'what' knowing *what* something is entails a conceptualization of the matter under investigation as a whole in its various parts, the way these parts are related

---

[10] Sites of memory are places where history took place, they can be concentration camps, places of battle, or buildings that hold historical importance

and organized as a whole, and how the whole is similar to and different from other things" (p. 2).

One of the benefits of qualitative research is that it allows participants and researchers to tell their stories without interruptions from outsiders, and provides them the opportunity to empower themselves through sharing their stories (Creswell, 2007). This aspect of qualitative analysis fits into my research quite well, as I am sharing my own story of intergenerational trauma and the impact of growing up as the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor. Using autoethnography allowed my experiences to play a valid role in the study because the method includes the researcher as a participant. As Gergen and Gergen (2002) eloquently state, "In using oneself as an ethnographic exemplar, the researcher is freed from the traditional conventions of writing. One's unique voice—complete with colloquialisms, reverberations from multiple relationships, and emotional expressiveness—is honored" (p. 14). Researchers and participants can, therefore, use critical qualitative research[11], to question structures of power as well as the role of power in knowledge creation, and transfer.

Defining Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical discourse analysis is a relatively new methodology that seeks to explore "often opaque relationships of causality and determination between (a) discursive practices, events and texts, and (b) wider social and cultural structures, relations and processes; to investigate how such practices, events and texts arise out of and are ideologically shaped by relations of power

---

[11] Critical qualitative research is an umbrella concept that encompasses many different forms of inquiry and methodological practices that frame "reality" and science as being critically mediated by human interpretation and meaning, by language and discourses, by socio-political processes, institutions and social structures, and by the positionality of the researcher (Denzin & Lincoln, 1998).

and struggles over power; and to explore how the opacity of these relationships between discourse and society is itself a factor securing power and hegemony" (Fairclough N. , 1993, p. 135). Critical discourse analysis focuses on the distal context, how it privileges some actors at the expense of others and how broad changes in the discourse result in different constellations of advantages and disadvantage (Wertz et al., 2011). Discourse analysis as a methodology has inherent meaning in how and why the social world comes to have the meanings that it does. It focuses attention on the processes whereby the social world is constructed and maintained. It also includes the academic project itself within its analysis; with its emphasis on reflexivity, discourse analysis aims to remind readers that in using language producing texts and drawing on discourses, researcher and the research community are part and parcel of the constructive effects of discourse (Phillips & Hardy, 2002). Without discourse, there is no social reality and without understanding discourse, we cannot understand our reality, our experiences and ourselves.

Critical discourse analysis provides a method for researchers to make sense of the relationship between power and knowledge, and the relationship between language and discourse in creating and symbolizing the social world. The methodology owes some allegiance to Michel Foucault's discourse theory (1971), which focuses on asking the following questions:

- What is valid knowledge at a certain place and time?
- How does this knowledge arise and how is it passed on?
- What functions does it have for constituting subjects
- What consequences does it have for overall shaping and development? (Jager and Meier, p. 35, in Wodak and Meyer, 2001).

Foucault's (1971) definition of knowledge maintains that it refers to everything that makes up the human experience. "Knowledge is therefore conditional i.e. its validity depends on people's location in history, geography, class, relations and so on" (Jager, 2001, p. 135).

Fairclough and Wodak (1997) offer eight foundational principles for CDA. They are as follows:

1. CDA addresses social problems;
2. Power relations are discursive;
3. Discourse constitute society and culture, and is constituted by them;
4. Discourse does ideological work – representing, constructing society reproducing unequal relations of power;
5. Discourse is historical – connected to previous, contemporary and subsequent discourses;
6. Relations between text and society are mediated and a socio-cognitive approach is needed to understand these links;
7. Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory and implies a systematic methodology and an investigation of context;
8. Discourse is a form of social action (pp. 271-280).

The aim of CDA is to uncover hidden and latent assumptions, everyday beliefs, and ideologies (Wodak & Meyer, 2009); furthermore, criticism is not simply negative, but has a positive emancipatory function.

One of the main goals of critical discourse analysis is to make meaning out of the social world through texts and social languages. It is about revealing how the world works through critical investigation and understanding the importance of narratives, stories and symbols within the social world. Discourse can be anything "from a historical monument *lieu de memoire,* a policy, a political strategy, narratives in a restricted or broad sense of the term, text, talk, a speech, topic related conversations to language per see (Wodak & Meyer, 2009, p. 35) . Discourses are embodied and enacted in a variety of texts; however, it is important to remember that on their own texts are not considered to be meaningful it is only through their connection with other texts, the various discourses with which they draw and how their knowledge is socially disseminated is what makes them meaningful (Phillips and Hardy, 2002, p. 4). The theory of CDA views discourse as a method of social practice. Gee (2014) describes a discourse as "a characteristic way of saying, doing and being" (p. 30).

Discourses are ever changing with no boundaries, as humans are always creating new discourses through new circumstances and situations while pushing the limits of the old ones (Gee, 2014). Discourses evolve as humans evolve, as they exist before and after all humans are born and die. Gee (2014) explains, "discourses, through our words and deeds, have talked to each other through history, and in doing so form human history" (p. 35). It is essential to note that discourse does not mirror reality, rather discourses not only shape but also enable social reality. Without discourses there would be no social reality. "Discourses can thus be understood as a material *sui generis"* (Jager, 2001, p. 36). It is through the use of discourses that we as humans are able to identify our various social identities which are made up of feelings, objects, tools, times, places, and interactions (Gee, 2014).

One of the main tenants of CDA according to Phillips and Hardy (2002) is that researchers are "no longer simply interested in what the social world means to the subjects who populate it; we are interested in how and why the social world comes to have the meaning it does" (p. 10). Since my research focuses on the narratives and meanings of memorials and how they can be utilized as an educative tool, this methodology allows me to interpret these sites reflexively[12]. It is an insightful and interpretative analytic tool in "reading" the world via my observations. Discourse analysis is one of a family of contemporary approaches that emphasizes human languages as a socially contextual performance and that brings a socially critical lens to its study of science and human life (Wertz et al., 2011, p. 4). It involves asking critical questions about the human experience, what knowledge is considered, and how specific situations give

---

[12] To interpret reflexively is is about reflecting on existing theoretical assumptions of doing. The word has a double meaning, namely indicating multiple levels of reflecting about interaction of levels on each other. (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2000)

meaning to language depending on their context at a given time or place. "Validity for CDA is based on the four elements of convergence, agreement, coverage and linguistic details" (Gee, 2014, p. 95). According to Phillips and Hardy (2002), CDA is a research enterprise enhancing human understanding and knowledge in which human thoughts are a prime concern. CDA, therefore, becomes a leading tool through which to enrich and explore social action and social construction in new ways.

Defining Autoethnography

Autoethnography is a qualitative research methodology that has recently gained a lot of momentum within the fields of education and social science research. It combines the features of both ethnography and autobiography, which allows the researchers to reflect critically upon their own personal experiences. Ellis and Bochner (2000) describe autoethnography as it "displays multiple layers of consciousness connecting the personal to the cultural" (p. 739). The method encourages the researchers to critically examine themselves and connect themselves to the larger cultural phenomena. Muncey (2005) suggests that "in order to take the leap into creating an autoethnography one has to first recognize that there is no distinction between research and living a life" (p. 3). Autoethnographers weave the self through their analysis of the past and the future; it allows us to "confront the tension between inside and outside perspectives, between social practice and constraint" (Adams, Jones, & Ellis, 2014, p. 1). Within the studies of ethnography and autoethnography, "culture is collectively constituted through the construction, deconstruction, and reconstruction of the edifices in which we physically, well as spiritually, imaginatively, and psychologically dwell" (Ellis & Bochner, 2001, p. 77). Heidegger (1977) notes "culture and cultivation derive from the same root word traceable to the origins of the verb 'to be'. Thus his point is to argue that culture and being share a kind of linguistic bridge

an etymological heritage that suggest that the event of being is to cultivate, that the event of being is to construct culture" (Bochner and Ellis, 2001, p. 77). Through the lens of culture, autoethnographers are able to engage their readers by sharing personal stories, which allows for a deeper connection between audience and author.

Ethnography is a particularly valuable resource for researchers seeking to unpack cultures or social settings that are hidden or difficult to locate. Description resides at the core of ethnography, and however this description is constructed the researcher seeks the intense meaning of social life from the everyday perspective of group members that it is sought. Participant observation is the most common component of this mix of qualitative methods but interviews, conversational and discourse analysis, documentary analysis, film and photography, life histories all have their place in the ethnographer's repertoire (Jupp, 2006). "Ethnographic inquiry in the spirit of symbolic interactionism seeks to uncover meanings and perceptions on the part of the people participating in the research viewing these understandings against the backdrop of the people's overall worldview or culture" (Jupp 2006, p. 7). Ethnographic fieldwork is shaped by personal and professional identities just as these identities are inevitably shaped by individual experiences while in the field.

Reed-Danahay (1997) claims, "One of the main characteristics of an auto ethnographic perspective is that the auto ethnographer is a boundary-crosser and the role can be characterised as that of a dual identity" (p. 3). In presenting a history of autoethnography Reed-Danahay (1997) identifies the many different understandings of the term. She defines her use of the term as the form of self-narrative that places the self within a social context. The term itself, breaks down into three separate words- auto, ethno, and graphy which represent one's personal experience's within the appropriate cultural contexts (Ellis & Bochner, 2001). It is a method

for discovering, understanding and learning through experiences that focuses on one particular case as opposed to generalizing (Adams, Jones and Ellis, 2001). One of the most important characteristics is that it has the unique ability among qualitative methodologies to balance intellectual and methodological rigor with emotion and creativity (Adams, Jones & Ellis, 2001). Through story-telling and narratives autoethnographers are able to provide meaning to identities, relationships and experiences and to create new relationships between history the present and the future with both the reader and the author (Adams, Jones, & Ellis, 2001; Foster, MicAllister & O'Broen, 2005; Nash, 2004).

Autoethnography allows for a deeper understanding of both personal experiences within a historical-sociological setting. Like other genres of self-narrative, such as memoir, autobiography and creative nonfiction, autoethnography involves storytelling; however, it is differentiated by the way it "transcends mere narration of self to engage in cultural analysis and interpretation" (Chang, 2008, p. 43). Ellis and Bochner (2000) agree with this notion and go a step further explaining that autoethnographies are "autobiographies that self-consciously explore the interplay of the introspective, personally engaged self with cultural description mediated through language, history and ethnographic explanation" (p. 742). Ellis (2004) asserts that autoethnographic research projects are marked by the following characteristics:

The author usually writes in the first-person style, making himself or herself the object of research; The focus of any generalization is usually within a single case over time rather than across multiple cases; the writing resembles a novel or biography in the sense that it is presented as a story with a narrator, characters and plot; the narrative text is evocative, often disclosing hidden details of private life and highlighting emotional experience; relationships are dramatized as connected

episodes unfolding over time rather than as snapshots; the researcher's life is studied

along with the lives of other participants in a reflexive connection; and, the

accessibility of the writing positions the reader as an involved participant in the

dialogue, rather than as a passive receiver (p. 60).

Although memoir, autobiography and creative non-fiction may share some of these characteristics, autoethnography is consciously planned, developed and described as research. Chang (2008) argues that autoethnography should be "ethnographic in its methodological orientation, cultural in its interpretive orientation, and autobiographical in its content orientation" (p. 48). Autoethnographic projects are steered by feelings, ideas, and questions we have from our lived experiences (Adams, Jones & Ellis 2001).

As a non-traditional methodology, autoethnography values alternative forms of investigation, and analysis such as personal memory, which provides a complicated link between culture and self. Relying on personal memory can be both an invaluable resource into the past; however, as the researcher it also gives one the decision to decide what is relevant to the paper or not, and which memories they want to bring into the narrative (Adams, Jones & Ellis, 2001). Autoethnography can leave the researcher in an extremely vulnerable position as their personal memories, and lived experiences are now in the public domain (Chang, 2008; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

Although the use of personal memory can tap into some critical cultural phenomena, it is not always considered on the side of autoethnography. Chang (2008) divulges that personal memory often "reveals partial truth and is sometimes unreliable and unpredictable. Memory selects, shapes, limits and distorts the past. Some distant memories remain vivid while other recent memories fade away quickly, blurring the time gap between these memories" (p. 27).

Adams, Jones and Ellis (2001) humbly state, "when we embrace this kind of vulnerability in our research and representations, we commit ourselves to improving the lives of others as well as our own" (p. 39). Due to autoethnography being written based on particular cases it has the ability to create voices where they have been previously silenced, and gives others the opportunities to bear witness to new experiences.

Where Autoethnography and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) Meet

Both autoethnography and Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) are reflexive and interpretive qualitative research methodologies that focus on making meaning out of the social world. While CDA is the analysis of the spoken and written language as it used to enact social and cultural perspectives as well as the function of language (Gee, 2014). Autoethnography is utilized to look inward into our identities and thoughts and outward into our relationships communities and cultures (Adams, Jones, & Ellis 2001). Both methodologies are critical; as such, I have chosen to employ them together in an empirically-informed and philosophically reflexive way. Autoethnography is critical through its exploration of the relationships and functions of culture and communication. The intersectional approach that is uses to analyze culture and narrative allows the researcher to think critically about everyday lived experiences. Critical discourse analysis is analytical through its focus on power and discourse in an explicit way. It works through ideologies, social representations of the mind and the relationships between individuals and of specific groups. Interpreting my experiences of being the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor through an autoethnographic lens allows me to write my own narrative. The personal journey of writing through an autoethnographic lens gives me the opportunity to understand memory from both a Jewish cultural perspective and as a descendent

of a Holocaust survivor. I am able to ask myself difficult questions by through using memorials as the means to understanding my own journey, "the goal of autoethnographic projects is to embrace the *vulnerability* of asking and answering questions about experience so that we as researchers, as well as our participants and readers, might understand these experience and the emotions they generate" (Adams, Jones & Ellis 2001, p. 35). By utilizing CDA, I am able to focus on the voices and stories that are being told through the memorials and the ones that are not. CDA allows researchers to gain an understanding of the relationship between power and knowledge, relationship between language and discourse in the constructing and representing the social world, while allowing researchers to describe, interpret, and explain such relationships (Adams, Jones & Ellis, 2001).

Gee (2014) maintains that CDA "studies the way in which ideology, identity and inequality are (re)-enacted through texts produced in social and political contexts" (p. 27). Memory and memorials help us learn not only from each other, but also with each other by sharing stories, and creating both collected and collective identities. By applying both CDA and autoethnography I am able to effectively discuss the ideas of memory not as a cause of private pain but as a source of public education.

Ethics of Historical Research

Although historical research does not have the same ethical requirements that using human subject does; historians have an understanding of the past, and how the past is conveyed. Historical research ethics has "primarily been understood as the moral consequence of particular forms of historical writing, such as those which served totalitarian or imperial regimes (in other words, with a concentration on malign rather than benign ethics)" (Roth, 2005, p. 157). The

ethics of historical research begins with integrity, and adhering to various points of views of the past. With historical research, it is critical to understand that it is shaped over time when new sources are revealed and new analysis are available. Of more significance, historical research is shaped by changing political, economic, social as well as intellectual contexts (Statement on Research Ethics, 2016). Historians should commit to preserving and honouring historical records, never tampering with them, and using all sources available, while never destroying or distorting them (Statement on Research Ethics, 2016). As a historian, it is crucial to remain open-minded, and listen to differing opinions about events and analysis of historical documents. Historical research has the potential to raise ethical questions regarding sensitive issues of the past (Moore, 2010). Research ethics "refers to the moral principles, guiding research, from its inception to its completion and publications of results and beyond" (Roth, 2005, p. 167). Historical associations provide guidelines of how to deal with sensitive topics and the unfavourable affects it can have on communities as a whole. While historical records are available to the public those working with them need to be aware of the responsibility that it brings and ask themselves important moral questions about whether the research is going to harm individuals or communities.

<u>Conclusion</u>

I chose to use the above methodology to analyze my research of Holocaust memorials because I felt that combined they provided me with the most thorough discussion and analysis. Critical discourse analysis and autoethnography allowed me to view each memorial I visited through a critical eye, while still telling my own story. It is difficult to be in spaces where mass murder occurred without having the learning be meaningful and reflective, as such I felt that utilizing it as a theoretical framework would positively contribute to this thesis. The focus of

public pedagogy symbolizes an educational approach that connects experiential education with history, and politics (Ellsworth, 2005). This approach lends itself to experiential Holocaust education as it allows visitors of memory-sites to connect to the past, while making sense of the future.

CHAPTER 4:
INTERPRETING THE HOLOCAUST AND ITS MEANING

The Holocaust Is

Not a metaphor
Not an allegory
Not a symbol

Not a stage
Not a backdrop
Not a mood

Not an example
Not a measure
Not the worst

The Holocaust is not is not is not

Not a syringe through which you inject meaning
Not a train for you to ride on

Not a camp
Where you can play

Not an accessory
Those who survived have nothing left but the word
And you would wear it for effect
No, it is not for dress up

The Holocaust is,
Smell sound sight
A scream without end
Ringing and ringing and ringing

The holocaust is
The holocaust is
The holocaust is

Ruth Mandel

Interpreting the Holocaust

History as memory or warning or myth may remind us of those who do "remember" that memory is neither straightforward nor self-evident. The meaning of the Holocaust has long been contested and discussed by historians, theologians and recently sociologists. Some believe that it was a watershed event, the culmination of 2000 years of antisemitism in Europe, others theorize that it was a product or a failure of modernity, and others that it was a Jewish event in Jewish history. As touched on earlier, it was out of WWII and the Holocaust that the United Nations was born and it gave the world the legal definition of genocide (Bauer, 2001). Its historical importance is critical for understanding political parties, ethnicity and relationships between particular groups, regardless of how it is defined; the event continues to find a place within public spaces. Bauer

(2001) maintains that the Holocaust is almost always the gold standard to which other genocides are compared to, "when people want to liken 'ethnic cleansing' in the Balkans or other mass murders to a similar event, they often compare it not with another mass murder somewhere else but with the Holocaust, whether such an analogy stands up to analysis or not" (p. xi). As such, the Holocaust has become "the symbol for genocide, for racism, for hatred of foreigners, and, of course, for antisemitism" (Bauer, Rethinking the holocaust, 2001, p. xi). For one historical event to convey such universal symbolism of death and genocide implies its importance, which means even more so that it needs to be understand for more than just series of connected events, but rather within the greater context of both Jewish history and world history.

There are two main schools of thought of how to interpret the Holocaust amongst historians: functionalists and intentionalists. This historiographical debate, as evident in his earlier works, is centered on the question whether or not Hitler premeditated the Holocaust. Furthermore, was the Holocaust a direct product of Hitler and high ranking Nazi officials or was it a combination of lower ranking members from within the bureaucracy and a collaboration of German society as a whole? Or both?

On one hand, functionalist scholars argue that the Holocaust was a result of a wide array of players who together were able to create and maintain the topography of terror (Postone & Santner, 2001, p. xi). Intentionalists, on the other hand, believe that Hitler had planned the Holocaust as early as the 1920s and that there is a direct connection between *Mein Kampf* and Auschwitz. Intentionalists hold Hitler and his worldviews as the most significant part of the Holocaust (Postone & Santner, 2001). Functionalists view the Holocaust "as a goal; it resulted from a series of bureaucratic initiatives and responses to various problems generated by the war and by the bureaucracies of a basically chaotic system" (Postone in Postone & Santner, 2003 p.

85). Both sides of the debate miss important aspects: functionalists seem to ignore the role and pedagogical history of anti-semitism; and intentionalists downplay the importance of the rest of the players such as German citizens, the rest of Europe and the role of the war itself.   The total analysis of the Holocaust needs to include elements of Jewish life in pre-war Europe and during the war, the role of other European leaders, the Jews outside the Third Reich, Hitler's role, and political and social ideologies, such as social Darwinism.

The Holocaust must be contextualized within its historical time period to ensure that students can start to understand the circumstances and the situation that led to the "Final Solution." Snyder (2015) maintains "we rightly associate the Holocaust with Nazi ideology, but forget that many of the killers were not Nazis or even Germans (p. x). Even though the statistics from the Holocaust are alarming and disconcerting, it is necessary to show the stories behind the numbers. Though the Nazis targeted all Jews for annihilation, the experiences of all Jews were not the same. For example, Western Jews had a greater chance of survival than Eastern Jews in Poland, Ukraine and Lithuania as result of the collapse of state governments in Eastern states (Snyder, 2015). Simplistic views and stereotyping take place when groups of people are viewed as monolithic in attitudes and actions. The common sense assumption is that the Holocaust is closely allied with Nazi ideology. Of course, this association is correct; however, many people forget that countless killers were Ukrainians, Poles, Hungarians and others (Snyder, 2015). Without a deeper understanding of antisemitism, German history, German-Jewish relations at the onset of the Nuremberg Laws[13] and Hitler's reign of power, it is difficult to fathom how the Holocaust as an

---

[13] The Nuremberg laws were a series of antisemitic decrees established by Hitler and the Nazi government in 1935, including but not limited to forbidding intermarriage between Jews and Germans, banning Jews from government and civic jobs and ensuring Jews adhered to a curfew.

event has helped shaped modernity. The Holocaust and modernity are tightly coupled as is the fragility of citizenship within a liberal democracy.

Antisemitism

Antisemitism was one of the main causes of the Holocaust. In order to fully understand Nazi ideology and the Hitler's political views it is critical to know the history of antisemitism and how it is defined. According to Bergen (2009), a German journalist coined the term "antisemitism" in the 1800s and he "…wanted to contract his supposed scientific hatred of Jews with religious forms of anti-Judaism" (p. 5). It was developed in order to make hatred of the Jews appear to be scientifically-based and rational. One Holocaust scholar, Fein (1987), defines antisemitism as "a persisting latent structure of believes towards Jews as a collective manifested in individuals as attitudes, and in culture as myth, ideology, folklore and imagery, and in actions - social or legal discrimination, political mobilization against the Jews, and collective or state violence - which results in and/or is designed to distance, displace or destroy Jews as Jews" (p. 67).

The term antisemitism itself is actually a misnomer because there is no such thing as *semitism*. Antisemitism literally means hatred of people who speak Semitic languages, a cluster of languages that include Arabic, Amharic, Tigrinya, Hebrew, Aramaic and Maltese; however, it is important to note that not all Jews speak Hebrew (Bergen, 2009). Many scholars refuse to write the word with the hyphen as that assumes the idea of a generic culture of Semitism, which as noted does not exist. In reality from the word's inception to the present day it has only one meaning: the hatred of the Jewish people.

The history of European antisemitism is quite extensive, beginning with the destruction of the temples in Jerusalem, continuing into Roman times where it was believed that Jewish refusal

to worship idols would threaten the state's security (Hilberg, 1985). The rise of Christianity added new fuel to anti-Jewish sentiments. Christianity grew out of Judaism. Jesus himself was a Jew as were the other important figures. However, they tried to separate themselves from the Jews as quickly as possible in order to win over the Romans. Many early Christians (and some people to this day) blamed Jews for Jesus' death (Bergen, 2009; Hilberg, 1985). Jews were objects of violent stereotyping and subject to violence because they were deemed as threatening outsiders. During this time period several conspiracies against Jewish people were believed, such as the "blood libel," which, claimed that Jews used the blood of Christian children for ritual purposes during Pesach[14], which became quite serious in 18th century Russia when trials resulted in execution and imprisonment based on no evidence (Bergen, 2009; Hilberg, 1985). Although a lack of conversion to Christianity signified Jews as the anti-Christ, as well as "of innate disloyalty to European (read Christian) civilization" (Hilberg, 1985, p. 13) when individuals Jews did decide to convert they were viewed as materialistic.

The middle centuries were periods of pogroms, expulsions, and crusades leaving the Jews moving from country to country attempting to find a safe place to settle. Jews were blamed for such things as the bubonic plague, ultimately leading to violent attacks and killings, which left a sense of vulnerability and scapegoating (Friedlander, 2009; Hilberg, 1985). During this period, economic changes exposed Jewish people to a new form of antisemitism: politically motivated. Jews were believed to be left wing socialists; these prejudices were based on social values, though influenced though traditional religious stereotyping (Friedlander, 2009). At the turn of the 20th century as political parties were developing in Eastern and Central Europe many of them were based on antisemitic rhetoric to gain popularity. This spawned antisemitic publications such as

---

[14] The Jewish holy days of Pesach or Passover, is an important biblical holiday in which Jews remember their days as slaves of the Egyptians and how they became free.

the Protocols of the Elders of Zion in 1905 in Russia. The Protocols of the Elders of Zion was a fabricated document that highlights of minutes of a meeting between Jewish leaders discussing their goals of taking over the world by subverting Gentile[15] morals and controlling the media (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009).

The 19th century saw antisemitism move from politically and socially based to one that was entrenched in racism. The belief in the superiority of one race over others and ideas of natural selection became quite widespread in Europe. The inferiority of other races was based on ideas of pseudoscience and social Darwinism. Thus, racial antisemitism was based on the idea that the Jew could not change due to his or her genetics and innate heredity qualities that have always existed (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). Social Darwinists claimed that the Jews spread their "so-called pernicious influence to weaken nations in Central Europe not only by political, economic, and media methods, but also by polluting so-called pure Aryan blood by intermarriage and sexual relations with non Jews" (Bergen, 2009, p. 15). Racial antisemites believed Jews were trying to taint Aryan nations in order to complete their goal of world domination. Although elements of religious antisemitism were used to create the more racialized version, it was insisted that because the Jews were a race, conversion would not save them either (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009; Snyder, 2015). In 1923, Hitler proclaimed that "the Jew is a race, but not human" (Hitler, translated by Manheim, 1999, p. 10). Holding Jews responsible for Germany's social and economic problems, Hitler systematically removed all of the civil, social, and economic rights, between 1933 and 1936, they had gained just 50 years earlier and embarked on a path toward The Final Solution. Hitler used elements of both racial and political antisemitism to gain popularity within both Germany and Austria. Furthermore, and unlike Western states, Hitler's

---

[15] A non Jew.

eastern Invasion included destruction of the Eastern states and the institutions that may have protected the "citizens" in any way (Snyder, 2015).

Hitler and the Nazi party effectively utilized elements of eugenics, social Darwinism and antisemitism in order to scapegoat the German Jew and others whom Hitler dubbed asocials as the cause of Germany's economic problems following World War I.   Interestingly, by the end of World War I, Germany was actually in a better economic place than many other countries; however, a politics of resentment towards losing the war was created and led Germans and anti-socialists to search for scapegoats (Bergen, 2009). The Jews were an easy target, as they were different, and old myths that the Jews had crucified Jesus were popularized once again.   The Nazi party believed that all non-Aryans "promoted immorality, spreading crime and polluting the bloodstream. Whether they were talking about Slavic people, Gypsies, Jews, Afro-Germans, or homosexuals" (Bergen, 2009, p. 3). The Nazi Party took hold of the German government in January 1933.   "This assumption of the most radical right wing movement made the implementations of the race hygiene utopia possible" (Friedlander, 2009, p. 45). Hitler believed that human races were like animals, "the highest race was still evolving from the lower which that interbreeding was possible but sinful. Race should behave like species, like mating with like and seeking to kill unlike" (Snyder, 2015, p. 1). A race had the potential to triumph and flourish and could also be starved and go extinct. The party vowed to make Germany pure again by getting rid of all those who did not fit the Aryan description.

Victims of the Holocaust

While the Jews were the only group that was sentenced by the Nazis for complete annihilation, the genocide history is not complete without connecting it to the plight of the non-

Jewish victims. As noted above, the first group that was sent to Dachau Concentration Camp in 1933 were political prisoners. Political prisoners included anyone who disagreed with Nazi politics, mainly communists and other left-wing citizens (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). The Nazi party did not find value in individuality; they believed that it would tear apart German nationalism, and that each individual had only value in their place within the collective racial community (Friedlander, 2009). From 1933 until the eve of World War II, Hitler and the Nazis sentenced tens of thousands of Germans for political crimes, whether they were real or imagined. Many of them were incarcerated without a proper trial, especially if the police were not confident in a court conviction (Bergen, 2009). For these political opponents the concentration camps were considered places for re-education into German society. They would learn to understand their value in the racial hierarchy and follow their restored natural instincts to do the right thing: accept and internalize the Nazi vision of the world. Many of these prisoners died as a result of starvation, poor living conditions and hard labour.

The first victims of Nazi genocidal actions were not in fact Jews, but rather physically and mentally handicapped German citizens. Shortly after Hitler took power of Germany in 1933, he implemented the "Law for the Prevention of Progeny with Hereditary Diseases" otherwise known as the sterilization of all handicapped German citizens (Friedlander, 2009). This was his way of Aryanizing the gene pool in order to ensure the Master Race was flawless, or biologically pure. The program was given the name "euthanasia" which comes from the Greek meaning a good death (Friedlander, 2009). It generally refers to ending the life of a terminally ill individual in a painless way. However, in Nazi Germany, euthanasia referred to the systematic killing of disabled individuals by gassing. In 1939, Hitler issued a decree, which enabled Nazi physicians to "euthanize" their "incurable" patients. Since the policy was never formalized as law for fear of

public reaction, the systematic killing of the handicapped began in secrecy under the code name "Operation T4" (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). The disabled were sent to live in institutions, and were later deported to killing centres where they were murdered at first by lethal injection, and later by carbon monoxide gasses. Victims' families were sent an urn along with official letters citing death by accident (Friedlander, 2009). These murder facilities were the archetype for the extermination centres that were built in occupied Poland for the mass murder of the European Jewry. The Euthanasia program continued into August of 1941 when widespread public knowledge of the killings became known and protests from the victims' family took place across Germany and Austria causing Hitler to put an official stop it (Friedlander 2009). The T4 program claimed the lives of over 70,000 institutionalized disabled persons. More than 300,000 mentally handicapped Germans were sterilized by vasectomy and tubal ligation from 1933-1945 (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). This particular Nazi program essentially foreshadowed their later genocidal methods.

There were approximately 20,000 Jehovah's Witnesses residing in Germany during the Nazi takeover and Hitler immediately banned them from Bavaria (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). The Nazis viewed this group as a threat, as a result of their rival ideology, which centred on their refusal to bear arms or Heil Hitler in public forums (Friedlander, 2009). The Nazis believed that because Jehovah's Witnesses had international connections they have the potential to become a major threat to Germany's European occupation. Not only did Jehovah's Witness members refuse to give the Nazi salute they were also unwilling to allow their children to join the Hitler Youth (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). During the 1930s they were dismissed from the civil service, banned from many areas of private employment and eventually in April of 1935 considered to be illegal (Bergen, 2009). The Secret Police Service (Gestapo) would infiltrate their

bible meetings, their distribution material was considered subversive and threatening. Many Jehovah's Witnesses were sent to concentration camps for refusing to be drafted into the Germany army. However, even in the concentration camps members set up an underground printing press, prayed and meet all as a form of resistance (Friedlander, 2009). When they were imprisoned, Jehovah's Witnesses were considered the most trustworthy prisoners because of their refusal to rebel against the Nazi guards, as a result they were often used as a domestic servants (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander 2009). The Nazis incarcerated almost half of the German Jehovah's Witness population, killing between 2500-5000 from 1933 to 1945 (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009).

The Nazis encouraged high birth rates in order to procreate the Master Race as quickly as possible; as a result, homosexuality and abortions were outlawed in 1933. A special division of the Gestapo was created in order to find and arrest all the homosexual men in Germany (Friedlander, 2009). In 1935, the criminal code, paragraph 175, was amended to create harsher punishments for sexual relations between two men (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). During the Nazi regime, approximately 100,000 men were arrested and half were imprisoned, the vast majority in regular prisons, while 5000-10000 were deported to concentration camps. Homosexuals were subjected to medical experimentations and surgical procedures in order to convert them to heterosexuals (Bergen, 2009). Lesbianism, although not looked upon as positive, was not treated in the same harsh manner as it appeared to be an alien concept to the nature of German women (Hilberg, 1985).

While the Jews were at the bottom of the racial hierarchy, and the Aryans were at the top, it is important to be reminded of the groups in the middle who were persecuted and incarcerated such as the Slavs, and the Roma and Sinti (gypsies). Roma and Sinti peoples were historically seen as social outcasts in Germany and by the 1920s were subjected to discriminatory laws (Bergen,

2009). Under the "Law for the Prevention of Offspring with Hereditary Defects" it was legal for German physicians to sterilize Roma and Sinti people against their will and under the "Law Against Dangerous Habitual Criminals" they were arrested, and deported to concentration camps in the 1930s (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander 2009; Hilberg 1985). The Nuremberg laws created in 1935 were soon amended to include Gypsies and special Gestapo offices were opened to combat the "Gypsy Nuisance." In fact, the Roma and Sinti were subject to many of the same laws as Jewish Germans, including the revocation of citizenship (Bergen, 2009). The Nazi treatment of the Roma and Sinti paralleled that of the Jews as they were also sent to ghettos, then systematically killed by Einsatzgruppen (mobile killing unites) and eventually deported to Auschwitz-Birkenau, and Treblinka where they were gassed upon arrival. There are no exact figures of how many Roma and Sinti were murdered by the Nazis but estimates say between 220,000 and 500,000 of the 942,000- pre war Roma and Sinti population (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009; Hilberg, 1985). One of the main differences between the Jewish victims of the Nazi genocide and the Roma and Sinti victims were that the Nazis attempted to annihilate all Jews of Europe, whereas they did not care about the Roma and Sinti population outside the Reich territories (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). The genocide of the Roma and Sinti is hardly mentioned, yet they followed a surprisingly similar path to the Jews. It just was not made official through policy documents.

Although the Slavic Peoples racial inferiority were not expressed as harshly as the Jews, they were also targeted and subjected to forced labour and incarceration. The German occupation of Poland was particularly destructive; shooting thousands of Polish civilians following the takeover, and attempting to destroy all elements of Polish life: religious, cultural, political and intellectual (Lukas, 2012). The Nazis were proactively trying to prevent resistance before it could even begin. The Germans aim was to kill all Polish leaders a quickly as possible, in order to instill

fear in the general public. Polish children were allowed to attend school for only a few years as the Germans feared they would become educated and eventually resist (Lukas, 2012). Approximately 50,000 Polish Children were taken from the homes and sent to the Reich to determine whether or not they were Aryan. Those that were deemed "Aryan enough" were sent to live with German families where they could learn the German ways, and those that were not were killed (Bergen, 2009; Lukas, 2012). Thousands of Polish citizens were expelled from their homes and sent to Auschwitz and Majdanek to be used as slave labourers. The Polish resistance movement staged a mass violent uprising in 1944 that was eventually crushed after 44 days, killing over 200,000 Poles (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). During the war years 1.5 million Polish citizens were deported to the Reich and interned at labour camps, and hundreds of thousands were imprisoned in Nazi concentration camps in Poland. It is estimated that the Nazis killed approximately 1.9 million Polish citizens (not including Jewish Poles) during World War II as part of the occupation.

Prior to the 1930s, Germany was a relatively safe space for Jews. In fact, most German Jews were assimilated into German culture, and only considered themselves to be secularly Jewish (Bauer, 2001; Bergen, 2009; Freidlander, 2009). German Jews were active in all areas of German society as physicians, lawyers, intellectuals and business owners. Of the 525,000 Jews living in Germany at the onset of the Nazi dictatorship (which was less than 1% of the total population), and only 37,000 left in the first few years (Friedlander, 2009). There was not a sense of urgency or panic even after the attempted boycott of Jewish businesses in April of 1933, and the Nuremberg laws the followed suit. Jewish German citizens, like most Germans, were unsure of whether the Nazis would stay in power or whether a conservative military coup was still a possibility (Friedlander, 2009). Unfortunately, just following the elections, which brought Hitler in as leader,

anti-Jewish violence began to spread rapidly across Germany, and April 1, 1933 there was a staged boycott of all German Jewish businesses. Although, for the Nazi party the boycott was not considered a success, a week later on April 7, 1933 "the Law for the Restoration of the Processional Civil Service" was enacted (Bergen, 2009). Of all the 1933 laws, this one became one of the most fundamental as a result of paragraph 3, which stipulated, "'Civil servants of non-Aryan origin are to retire'. On April 11 the law's first supplementary decree defined Non-Aryan as 'anyone descended from non-Aryan, particularly Jewish parents or grandparents. It suffices if one parent or grandparent is non-Aryan'" (Friedlander, 2009, p. 11). This would become the initial definition of who a Jew was during Nazi Germany, and the basis for which all future victimization would occur. The civil service law was the only one of these to be fully implemented at this early stage, but the symbolic statements the laws expressed and the ideological message they carried was unmistakable. Very few Germans Jews foresaw what this symbolism meant in terms of long-term discrimination and acts of racism.

Part of Nazi philosophy was based on the sacredness of the German soil. As a result, racial purity "was a condition of superior cultural creation and the construction of a powerful state, the guarantor of victory in the struggle for racial survival and domination" (Friedlander, 2009, p. 15). From 1935 to 1938 German Jews lived under The Nuremberg Laws, a heavy set of rules and regulations that included a curfew, which park benches they could sit at, and stripped them of their German citizenship (Friedlander, 2009). The Nuremberg Laws were created to exclude German Jews from every aspect of this perfect world such as limiting if not completely barring Jewish doctors, lawyers, journalists, civil servants, academics and other professions that are considered key to this utopian vision from practicing (Bauer, 2001; Bergen 2009; Friedlander, 2009, Snyder, 2015). The Nazis laws and philosophies were not an ordinary political view of the world rather it

was as though Hitler had created his own religion based on politics, culture and racial purity (Bauer, 2001). For Hitler and the Nazis, the goal was to create a space for the Aryan people to grow as a race. Once Hitler was elected chancellor of Germany in 1933 his rampant antisemitism became part of state legislated policies, and would soon have life and death implications.

Timeline of the Holocaust

One of the most unique features of the event, which scholars and the public now refer to as the Holocaust, is its bureaucratic and state sponsored nature. With the inception of the Nuremberg Laws in 1935 to the drawing of the Final Solution at the Wanssee Conference in January 1942, the Nazis were methodological in their approach. After the Nazi loss to the Red Army at Stalingrad and knowledge that war was effectively lost, extermination was intensified into a short-term strategy before the Allies eventually triumphed.

Some patterns were, however, already deeply established. Jewish Germans, and later Jews of occupied territories, were required to wear a yellow Star of David in order to identify them as Jews. On November 9-10, 1938 the Nazi Party sponsored a nation wide pogrom called Kristallnacht, which Jewish businesses, synagogues were destroyed and the first round ups to Dachau occurred (Friedlander, 2009). The name Kristallnacht literally translates to "the night of broken glass," representing the shards of glass that littered the streets the next day. It is estimated that Nazi authorities killed 100 Jews, and arrested and incarcerated 30,000 (Bergen 2009; Friedlander, 2009; Hilberg, 1985). Gilbert (1989) writes that not even in the complete history of German Jews between 1933 and 1945 was the crackdown so widely reported on as it happened that night, sending shockwaves around the world. Followinf Kristallnacht, German Jews engaged in a mass exodus to other parts of Europe and overseas. Press reports became more clear that

Hitler's policies were going to make life harder for Jews (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009; Hilberg, 1985).

World War II officially began on September 1, 1939 when Nazi Germany invaded Poland. With these attacks, Polish Jews from the area annexed to Germany were expelled to central Poland (Bergen, 2009; Niewyk, 2010;). The first ghetto was established shortly after, on October 8 1939 in Piotrkow Trubunalski. The two largest ghettos, Lodz and Warsaw were created later in 1940. In total, the Nazis founded 356 ghettos in Poland, the Soviet Union, the Baltic States, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Hungary between 1939 and 1945 (Gilbert, 1989). The ghettos were located in almost all cities that included a sizeable Jewish population. In the smaller villages, they were temporary without fences or boundaries, in the large cities they were often closed off by brick or stone walls. Conditions in the ghetto were brutal, as many residents died from starvation, and the diseases that ran rampant within the ghetto walls. Nazi guards patrolled the outside of the ghetto at all points during the day as Jews were prohibited from leaving under the penalty of execution (Bergen, 2009; Gilbert, 1989). Third Reich imposed laws and policies governed every aspect of Jewish prisoners lives.

Mass murder of Jews in the Baltic States took place in 1940 and 1941 through the use of Einsatzgruppen (mobile killing units). Approximately 500,000 Jews were slaughtered through this method. Hermann Goering, the highest-ranking Nazi officer and founder of the Gestapo, announced the first written orders regarding the "Final Solution" in mid-1941. Shortly after 34,000 Jews were murdered in Babi-Yar (outside of Kiev) and the first experiments in killing prisoners at Auschwitz with Zyklon B gas took place (Bergen, 2009). "The Final Solution" was the Nazis' code name for the policy that called for the total liquidation of the European Jewry. In January of 1941 high ranking members of the Nazi party and other European leaders met by a lake villa called

Wanssee to implement their annihilation policies (Bergen, 2009). The Wannsee conference asked for the help and cooperation of non-Nazi leaders with the transportation of Jews to extermination centres in Poland (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). Not one of the fifteen leaders in attendance objected to the policies put forward. To the Nazis mass murder was a noble act. "Heinrich Himmler, Hitler's most important deputy maintained that participation in mass murder was a good act since it brought to the race an internal harmony as well as unity with nature (Snyder, 2015, p. 5). Wannsee represented the first time a modern state had committed itself to the murder of an entire people. The outcome of the Wanssee conference was the plan to destroy 11 million European Jews in various countries (those neutral and free countries occupied by Germans) (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009).

The first extermination centre built under the "Final Solution" was Chelmno, constructed for the Jews of the Lodz ghetto. Chelmno was one of six extermination centres located around central Poland, the others were Treblinka, Auschwitz-Birkenau, Belzec, Majdanek and Sobibor. Jews from all over Europe were deported to these camps following the inception of the "Final Solution" policies. Although Nazis built thousands of concentration camps and slave labour camps located around Eastern and Central Europe, *hundreds of thousands of Jews were murdered either through conventional execution or starvation and disease brought on by their horrific living conditions*. These six *extermination* camps in Poland, however, were specifically designed as "death factories" which utilized carbon monoxide and Zyklon B to murder its many victims (Friedlander, 2009). In fact, in the vast majority of instances when victims arrived at the camp's gates they were often gassed within 30 minutes after their arrival. Almost no Jew who walked into Treblinka, Belzec, Sobibor, or Chelmno walked out alive (Snyder, 2015). Auschwitz and Majdanek were concentration camps *as well as* extermination centres and as such survival stories

around the world exist today and this is the major reason we hear about them in the popular media. It is important to note that by the time Auschwitz was opened as one of the six death camps most Jews in the East had already been murdered (Snyder, 2015).

To emphasize the significance of Belzec, Chelmno, Sobibor, and Treblinka, these death factories were responsible for killing approximately *three million* Jewish people during the war, while concentration camps and ghettos were responsible for only nearly *one million* deaths (Friedlander, 2009). For the Nazis, "the difficulty of seeing, for example, thousands of Jewish corpses marked the transcendence of conventional morality. The temporary strains of murder were a worthy sacrifice to the future of the race" (Snyder, 2015, p. 5). Concentration camps and ghettos were responsible for nearly one million deaths.

In 1944, the Allies began bombing Poland and Germany, and soon it became clear that the Nazis were about to lose the war. The first camp liberated by the Soviets was Majdanek in July of that year (Bergen, 2009). The Nazis soon began to burn the camps down in attempts to hide the evidence. On January 27, 1945, Auschwitz was liberated, and despite all attempts by the Nazis to march prisoners westbound on "death marches" it was abundantly evident that mass murder and incarceration had in fact taken place (Bergen, 2009). Liberators of Auschwitz actually found 800,000 women's outfits, and more than 14,000 pounds of human hair in the area known as Kanada (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009). Although the war and the genocide officially came to an end May of 1945, many survivors ended up dying in displaced persons camp as a result of starvation and diseases that ran rampant (Friedlander, 2009). Those that managed to survive the horrors of the ghettos and the camps faced a long road to recovery, one in which, they have had to question their beliefs, understanding of the world, and how to differentiate between good and evil. Following the war, survivors could tell their stories; however, few if any stories are available from

the death factories where most Eastern Jews died. With the end of the Cold War in 1991 Russia opened access to archives and camps in the Eastern bloc providing historians with new historical records to begin to make sense of the Holocaust. Eastern Europe was where the deadliest parts of the war occurred.

The world fell silent for decades. Survivors and liberators alike refused to talk about what they had been through, what they had seen, and most importantly, what it meant. Many claim that the Holocaust falls outside of history and thus cannot be examined; however, this places the Holocaust as a mythological, or biblical event, which releases the perpetrators from any wrongdoings (Bauer 2001; Snyder 2015). The idea of the Holocaust being absolutely unique suggests trivialization of the victims and survivors in concrete ways. This notion illustrates the Holocaust as something not worth studying because it could never happen again and because it is unexplainable. As Bauer (2001) reiterates several times, "the horror of the Holocaust is not that it deviated from human norms; but that it didn't" (p. 42). As Snyder (2015) aptly notes, "The Holocaust is not only history but warning" (p. xiii). In order for meaning and understanding to come from the Holocaust and the Nazi genocide as a whole and also as a warning, we must place it in real history as a horrific event that has the potential to happen.

CHAPTER 5:
THE SPACE BETWEEN: NAVIGATING THE ROLE OF HISTORICAL ANALYSIS AND MEMORY IN GROUP IDENTITIES

The Jewish Shtetl

And once,
there was a garden,
and a child,
and a tree.

And once,
there was a father,
and a mother,
and a dog.

And once,
there was a house,
and a sister,
and a grandma.

And once,
there was life.

(anonymous)

Collective Memory

Collective memory plays a key role in how cultures and societies reposition the past; question the importance of history and how it is remembered/to be remembered as a collective group. Memory serves as a significant source of documentation as well as playing a large role in the formation/maintenance of public history. Not only does the public role of memory contribute to engaging societies about the past, but it also has the power to transform the collective memory of a nation/ cultural group/society. Following the decline of postwar modernist narratives, nation states turned to the past as a basis for shoring up their legitimacy (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011). Historians have viewed memory as the enemy, the subjective side to their objective

comprehensions; however, sociologists believe the two are inextricably intertwined and one would not exist without the other (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011).Through memory, history has the ability to be transformed into something else. "Memory is life, borne by living societies founded in its name. History, on the other hand, is the reconstruction, always problematic and incomplete" (Nora, 1989, p. 3). History is theorized to be that which happened, while memory, on the other is that what is remembered of what happened. However, in the end, it is the intersection between history and memory, which gives us the idea of multiple truths, perspectives and the (in)complete stories of our past coupled with a greater understanding of cultures, politics, and ourselves.

Collective memory can be shared, passed on and constructed by small groups and large groups, they are indicated through physical monuments, museums as well as through the formal and informal education systems. Collective memory is the notion of sharing with members of your community through a common sense of heritage, and understanding of the past.   American sociologist, Barry Schwartz (2000) writes, "history and commemoration are the vehicles of collective memory… since historical and commemorative objects are transmissible, cumulative, and interpreted differently from one group to another, they exert influence in ways difficult to understand solely in terms of their producers' convictions and characteristics" (p. 183). Memories are often most disputed during times of instability when specific cultural groups or nations have a different understanding of the historical events and thus create their own collective memories depending on their location.

The scholars of memory can be divided into a few categories of thought: those who view memory historically, historiographically, sociologically and, finally, historical-sociology. The historian primarily studies memory in order to grasp an understanding of what they collectively refer to as the illusive problem with collective memory (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011). Historians

struggle with the study of memory because many of them view it as the personal opposite to their impartial studies. Historians engage with memory in order to better understand the past and fill the missing gaps within particular events. Historiographical methodology focuses on how memory is a historical phenomenon - "with what would be called the social history of remembering" (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011, p. 189). They engage with the importance of the commemoration of events through history; memory as a way of relating to the past through symbols and group identities has very specific histories that are worth delving into. While on the one hand, historians' emphasis the epistemological ideas of collective memory, on the other hand, sociologists are concerned with group identities and cultural memory.

Sociologist explore memory from two perspectives: one, "an integrative force that overcomes individuals and partisan interests and bequeaths to large collectivities a sense of purpose and obligation" (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011, p. 42); and two, "memory has been studied as a force of opposition, endowing subgroups with a sense of distinctiveness, often deriving from a particularistic sense of continuity with previous generations, whether this leads to a special sense of pride, a special compliment or both" (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011, p. 43). Both sociological approaches to memory focus on collective group identity of the past and how that affects the future. Historical-sociological thought, which is grounded in the theory of German historian-sociologist Jan Assman accentuates the notion that memory is "not a timeless structure but a fundamentally temporal process" (Olick et al., 2011 p. 43). In this school of thought, memory is viewed as a process, an ever-changing representation of the past; that can change depending on the views of the present. Studying and understanding the role of memory gives us the unique ability to study historical events from both a sociological perspective by focusing on group

identities and a historiographical viewpoint by concentrating on narratives, individuals, and in the broad sense the social, cultural and political factors that play into everyday life.

French Sociologist, Maurice Halbwachs, is in many respects considered the father of collective memory. He wrote in the 1920s and his work was not acknowledged nor appreciated until the memory boom a half a century later. Halbwachs was one of Durkheim's most notable students and the connection between the two is evident in Halbwachs' work. Halbwachs belongs to the school of thought in which history and memory are two contradictory ways of dealing with the past. In his seminal book *The Collective Memory*, he allocates an entire chapter to describing and explaining the differences between historical memory and collective memory. He suggests three methods for organizing knowledge of the past in a manner with contemporary society's need: autobiographical memory, which contains personally experienced events; collective memory, which contains events that were rendered to an individual by other members of society; and historical memory, which shapes the work of historians (Halbwachs, 1925/1980). Memory for Halbwachs is related to how individuals work together, and how social frameworks are the basis for these memories.

Autobiographical memory and collective memory, according to Halbwachs, demonstrate the individual's role in shaping the past: first, as a first hand accumulator of autobiographical memory and second as a retainer and distributer of collective memory. The distinction between autobiographical memory and collective memory is that collective memory concerns all or some of the members of a particular group (Halbwachs, 1925/1980). He argues that autobiographical memory is somewhat limited because all "individual remembering takes place with social materials, within social contexts, and in response to social cues. Even when we do it alone, we do so as social beings with references to our social identities, and with languages and symbols that

we may use in creative ways, but certainly did not invent" (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011). Halbwachs argues that individual memories are shaped by our social surroundings, and are only significant in relation to the collective.

Memory scholars have since updated and revised many of Halbwachs original theories. Both historian Wulf Kansteiner (2002) and historical sociologist Jeffrey Olick (1999) have theorized that the all-encompassing and somewhat ambiguous term of collective memory can be divided into two main ideas: collected memory and collective memories. "Collected memory is an aggregate of individual memories which behaves and develops just like its individual composites and which can therefore be studied with the whole inventory of neurological, psychological and psychoanalytical methods and insights concerning the memories of individuals" (Kansteiner, 2002, p. 186). Whereas compared to that of collective memories, defined as, "originating from shared communication about the meanings of the past that are anchored in the life-worlds of individuals who partake in the communal life of the respective collective. Collective memories are based in a society and its inventory of signs and symbols" (Kansteiner, 2002, p. 188). From the former perspective, it is only the individuals that are involved in the remembering. This approach can have a great deal of potential for producing insights about social memory outcome; however, it lacks explanation for tradition and mythology (Olick J. , Collective Memory: The Two Cultures, 1999). Collective approaches to memory help us to locate mythology, heritage and cultural understanding. Barry Schwartz (2011) asserts "collective memory works by subsuming individual experience under cultural schemes that make them comprehensible and therefore meaningful" (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011, p. 302). The two complementary frameworks (collected memory and collective memories) frame the basis of collective memory studies in contemporary times.

<u>Social/Cultural Memory</u>

Historical-sociological perspectives of memory began to grow with the work of Assmann. His work is centered on the ideas of social/cultural memory. Assmann believes that memory is phenomenon that is directly related to the present and that our perception of the past is always influenced by the present, which means it is always changing (Assmann J. , 1997). Assman coined the term "mnemohistory" — reception theory applied to history, that the "proper way of dealing with the working of cultural memory is mnemohistory — mnemohistory investigates the history of cultural memory" (pp. 9, 14-15). Mnemohistory is not the opposite of history; rather it is a branch such as intellectual history, social history, the history of mentalities, or the history of ideas. The concept of narrative organization and identity construction of individuals applies to that of group/nation collectivities (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011). On the collective level these narratives are referred to as "myths." "Myths in the sense of traditional narratives play a very important role in the formation of ethnic identities- 'ethnogenesis'" (Assmann in Olick et al., 2011, p. 211). Assmann believes that through the ideas of mnemohistory history and memory need not be opposites, and contradictories of each other, but rather work together to form a cohesive story of the past through the lens of culture.

According to Nietzsche, "humans must find a means by which to maintain their nature consistently through generations. The solution to this problem is offered by a cultural memory, a collective concept of all knowledge that directs behavior and experience in the interactive framework of a society and one that obtains through generations in repeated societal practice and initiation" (Nietzsche in Olick et al., 2011, p. 212). The notion of cultural memory refers to collective media of the past that are culturally determined through writing, images, and rites of

passage. Assmann theorizes, "the supply of knowledge in within cultural memory is characterized by sharp distinctions between those who belong and those who do not, i.e. between what appertains to oneself and what is foreign" (Assmann, Collective Memory and Cultural Identity, 1995, p. 128). In an effort to bridge the ever-growing gap between "social" and "cultural" memory, Assmann argues for "communicative memory." This refers to the daily modes of communication in which the past is discussed, debated and given meaning. These forms of remembrance are generally oral and very much determined by those individuals who lived through or during the event in question. Communicative memories are often short-lived, perhaps lasting for one generation and the meanings ascribed to historical events are based on the accounts of individuals who were alive at the time (Kansteiner, 2002, p. 182). Cultural memory relies heavily on knowledge that both transcends times and is preserved within history. This knowledge must be normative, in that, it provides rules of conduct as well as formative- educating civilization and human functions.

The phenomenon of cultural memory may be effectively understood when the distinction between memory and history is put forth. French Historian, Pierre Nora (1989) focused his seminal work, *Between Memory and History: les lieux de memoire,* on knowing and understanding, where history ends and memory begins, and vice versa. The moment between history and memory, coined *lieux de memoire* is "where history crystallizes and secretes itself and has occurred at a particular historical moment, a turning point where consciousness of a break with the past is bound up with the sense that memory has been torn-but torn in such a way to pose the problem of the embodiment of memory in certain sites where a sense of historical continuity persists" (Nora, 1989, p. 1). In other words, the dichotomy between history and memory emerges at a particular moment in history; it implies that there used to be time when memories could exist as such- without being representational. For example, for survivors of the Holocaust memories

became more *real* as time passed and more archival research was done that complemented their own memories and thus became history.

Nora's concept of memory describes the artificial landscape of the modern (re)creation of national and cultural memory. Nora's concept of *lieux de memoire* contrasted with the *milieu de memoire* (environment of memory) that describes that cultural appropriation of history into a mythic space of cultural memory; the *lieux de memoire* is a cultural subrogation of history into the imagined realm of cultural identity. "History is appropriated and re appropriated beyond recognition into the *lieux de memoire* and thus it is used for the political and cultural aims of society (Nora 1989, p. 1). History becomes transformed through memory into something else that has yet to be defined. The space between history and memory has been popularized by Nora.

Between History and Memory

The relationship between history and memory has been personified to depict the differences between the two. Nora (1989) claims that "history is perpetually suspicious of memory, and its true mission is to suppress and destroy it" (p. 9). It is therefore imperative to understand the difference between true memory and the transformed memory. True memory is characterized by "gestures and habits, in skills passed down by unspoken traditions, in the body's inherent self-knowledge, in unstudied reflexes and ingrained memories" (Nora, 1989, p. 12). On the other hand, transformed memory through historical events is characterized by the fact that it is "voluntary and deliberate, experienced as a duty, no longer spontaneous; psychological, individual, and subjective; but never social, collective, or all encompassing" (Nora, 1989, p. 12). According to Nora, memory is a perpetual actual phenomenon, a bond tying us to the eternal present; history a representation of the past. "Memory, insofar as it is affective and magical only accommodates

those facts that suit it. History because it is an intellectual and secular production, calls for analysis and criticism" (Nora, 1989, p. 8). It is thus through mutual reconstruction and unfolding that collective memory is constructed and reconstructed throughout history. It is through fabricated and refabricated collective memories that a group/nation are able to create a sense of belonging and as a result, a group identity. Through collective memories and a strong sense of their own history Jews have created an incredibly strong sense of group identity.

The conflicting ideas of history as memory, and memory as history effect how the past is constructed and reconstructed. Historical books, lessons and information have a profound influence on how history is interpreted. History is not just about the facts, the chronology, and in essence what happened, but how the ideas of the past are presented, what history we are learning, who wrote it, who the audience is and what biases exist within (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011). The subject of history is not as a simple as recounting the past, it is also how the events are presented within historical discourses (Stevick & Gross, 2010). Vinitizky-Seroussi and Teeger (2010) maintain, "the narration of certain memories and the silencing of others can often times be conceptualized as the attempts of those with power to the limits of what is speakable or unspeakable about the past" (p. 1103). Groups are constantly navigating the space between memory and history and more so between social memory and historical analysis and how that plays a role in identity formation and understanding the past for both what it was, and what is remembered of it.

Patrick Hutton (1993) discusses the contending views of modern historiography and memory and postmodern historiography and memory. For Hutton, history should be considered an art of memory "because it mediates the encounter between two moments of memory: repetition and recollection" (Hutton 1993, in Olick et al., 2011, p. 411). Repetition is considered to be the

habits of the mind; it is the part of collective memories that are generally associated with active and living traditions within a cultural group. Recollections "concern our past efforts to evoke the past" (Hutton, 1993, in Olick et al., 2011, p. 411). In other words, it is how people construct the past and our memories to fit in with the present social/political/cultural situations. In the beginning, it appears that early historiography was profoundly reliant on repetition as opposed to recollection.

Modern historians used repetitions and images of the past to frame how the past influences the present. Developing the relationship between repetitions (defined as: images received from living tradition) and recollection (images retried from a forgotten past) played a role in the modern historian's ideas of official memories. Postmodern historians added new methods of historical analysis to the table that were not just about "official memories" but rather were focused on alternative histories such as collective mentalities or women's history. However, in relation to memory studies, the distinction between modern historiography and postmodern historiography is that the latter has a tendency to view memory and history as sharply opposed in their purposes. "Memory is not the hidden ground of history, as it was in the historicists conceptions of modern historiography, but rather an internal activity of the living mind that can never be recovered" (Hutton, 1993, in Olick et al., 2011, p. 414). Postmodern historians focus on the changing ways that history has been commemorated over time. The notion of commemoration plays a significant role within the history/memory dichotomy and has the ability to connect the two for historians on both sides of the separation. A prominent example of this is through memorials and monuments that are designed to preserve people's memories but also to commemorate events as critical in creating our own understanding of history.

Commemoration, both public and private, is the act of "honouring the memory or of serving as a memorial to someone or something and something that honours or preserves the

memory of another" (Oxford Dictionary, 2012). Edward Casey (2000) contends that, "commemoration is not a derivative form of memory, but an integral part of it" (p. 184). Commemoration is the portrayal of historical events in a structured and participatory way. In some ways commemoration can be viewed as the act of remembering history and/or collective memories. While commemoration is revered in most cultures, the contestation begins with the question of whose history is being commemorated and for whom? Commemorations in and of itself can in many instances play groups against each other (two sides of a conflict) and who is being treated as the victim, and who as the perpetrator and how that affects both groups. For example, it is impossible for all historical events to be memorialized and the act of commemoration can be viewed as what the state views as "official memory." Patrick Hutton (1993) notes, "a commemoration of a past event, moreover, is itself an event and thus worth of historical analysis" (p. 45). The act of commemorating should not be taken lightly as it has the ability to draws the public's attention to cultural groups and differences.

The term "historical remembrance" was coined by Jay Winter (2006) in order to portray the positive relationship between history and memory, and why the two need each other in order to tell the stories of our past. He defines historical remembrance as "a discursive field, extending from ritual to cultural work of many different kinds. It differs from family remembrance by its capacity to unite people who have no other bonds drawing them together" (Winter 2006 in Olick et al 2011, p. 427). The idea of historical remembrance is that it offers a joint way of analyzing and interpreting the past that draws on both sides of the history/memory dichotomy. It has the capacity to allow us to gain the most out of the narratives of the past by being sensitive to the historical facts as well as the authentic testimonies. He devised the term in a sense to bring peace to both sides of the scholarly debate because he is under the opinion that "remembrance helps us

avoid the pitfalls of referring to memory as some vague cloud which exists without agency, and to history as an objective story which exists out of the people whose lives it describes" (Winter in Olick et al., 2011, p. 427). Winter advocates for abandoning the term "collective memory" for "remembrance" because he believes the latter suggests an inclusive and all an encompassing negotiation between individuals, and society.

Peter Burke (1989) in his chapter on *From History as Social Memory* puts forth the idea that "the historians function is to be a "remembrancer"" the custodian of the memory of public events, which are put down in writing for the benefits of the actors, to give them fame, and also the benefit of posterity to learn from their example" (p. 100). In his analysis of memory studies Burke concludes that the two should not be seen as fundamental opposites, rather as two joining forces, "historians need to study memory as a historical *source* to produce a critique of the reliability of reminiscence on the lines of the traditional critique of historical analysis" (Burke, 1989, p. 101). Historians should stop viewing memory studies as the enemy and instead embrace them as a way of gaining a deeper understanding of our past. "Memories are malleable and we [historians] need to understand how they are shaped by whom, they are affected by the social organization of transmission and the different media employed" (Burke, 1989, p. 103). Through his writings, Burke asked the question of why some cultures seem to be more concerned with recalling their past than others and how this influences our views of cultural identities and histories. Jewish tradition, for example, relies heavily on memory and honouring the past.

Jewish Views on Memory (Zachor! [Remember])

Throughout history it has been noted that some groups/nations choose to remember their pasts in a collective way, while others do not. Various groups choose "to remember" for two

reasons: "the basic attitude towards history and thus the function to remember itself introduces another variable, one group remembers the past in fear of deviating, from its model, the next for fear of repeating the past" (Assmann, 1995, p. 130). The Greeks are known to the Western world as "the inventors of history," with Herodotus dubbed the "father of history." Interestingly enough, neither Herodotus, his historian colleagues nor the rest of Greek civilization "saw any ultimate or transcendent meaning to history as a whole" (Yerushalmi, 1982, p. 4). Within Greek society it was thought that history had no lessons to teach. As such Yerushalmi argues that if Herodotus was the father of Western history, the fathers of the meaning in history were the Jews (Yerushalmi, 1982). He continues with the idea that "of all histories, that of the Jewish people has been the refractory to secularization because this history alone, as a national history, was considered to be sacred to begin with" (Yerushalmi, 1982, p. 6). The collective memories of the Jewish people were a function of the shared faith, cohesiveness, and the will of the group itself, transmitting and recreating its past through an entire complex of interlocking social and religious institutions that functioned organically to achieve this.

Memory itself has been part of Jewish culture since biblical times. "Zachor!" [Remember] is ordered several times within the Old Testament. This call to remembrance constitutes an enduring attempt to escape the burden of history by locating communal identity in a memory that, in its immersion in liturgical time, paradoxically holds out the possibility of redemption in the face of an event that, almost everyone would agree, appears to deny it's very possibility (Stevick & Gross, 2010, p. 191). Some historians are of the belief that Holocaust studies, and testimonies led to the memory boom. To many, The Holocaust signifies humanity's greatest evil, functioning like a "ubiquitous cipher for our memories of the twentieth century" (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011). As Pierre Nora articulates, "Whoever says memory, says Shoah" (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011).

It is argued that the iconographic status of Holocaust memories is reflected in and contributes to the formation of a global memory imperative (Olick, Vinitzky, & Levy, 2011). Somewhat in conjunction with the memory boom came the influx of Holocaust survivor memoirs, some individual and some as collective groups who managed to, against all odds, live to tell the tale. There has been a lot of scholarly debate on the authenticity of Holocaust survivor testimonies because occasionally survivors remember events differently than the "factual" historical accounts do (Stevick & Gross, 2010). What happens when history and memory tell two different stories? We need to dig deeper in order to find out the actual account of what happened.

The observation of Jewish holidays and of various Jewish practices ritually articulates theological ideas reflective of a collective Jewish memory. Jewish rituals and holidays, both cultural and religious, are focused on remembering the past- both the good and the bad (Sacks, 1997). The Passover seder, which is the ritual meal with a liturgy that celebrates the Jewish exodus from Egypt, is a reenactment of history. Jewish people all over the world symbolically interact with history through prayer, the way they sit, and not being able to eat anything that rises in order to thank their ancestors for leading them out of bondage (Yerushalmi, 1982). The miracle of Chanukah commands Jews to commemorate the Maccabees victory over the Syrians for political and social autonomy. The memory of the miracle of lights is memorialized and actualized by Jewish families all over the world by lighting the Chanukiah for eight days. Jewish theology maintains, "As Jews we remember, therefore we are able to transmit our history and beliefs from generation to generation" (Yerushalmi, 1982, p. 8). Cultural memory, as a component of identity, must be shaped through the rigorous historical study of the Jewish past, in which the Holocaust is the terrible finale of a two-thousand-year journey.

As noted above, remembering is a key component within not only Jewish religion, but also the culture. It is considered to be a *mitzvah* or a good deed to remember and share memories within the community[16]. Jewish survivors of the Holocaust were encouraged by their families, friends and communities at large to share their stories of survival in order to pass the stories along because they asked questions: What happens when the survivors have all died? Saul Friedlander (1992), Holocaust survivor and historian ponders this notion: "The question remains at the collective level…an event such as the *Shoah* may, after all the survivors have disappeared, leave traces of a deep memory beyond individual recall, which will defy any attempts to give it meaning" (p. 41). The construction, and continual reconstruction of Holocaust knowledge (both testimonies and historical fact) in public memory (both through formal and non-formal educational initiatives) is an interactive and social process in which the perspectives and understanding of all involved play a defining role. Holocaust education needs to be considered in light of both history and memory and how the two interact in order to complete the story through the past as well from our contemporary perspectives.

Jewish identity is developed and formed through a combination of both religious and/or secular elements. It is made up of religious, cultural and ancestral parts (Sacks, 1997). This approach dates back to when the historical kingdom of Israel was forced out by the Roman Empire. This depopulation in the first century of the Common Era is what first lead to the Jewish diaspora. According to Rabbi Jonathan Sacks (1997) (Chief Rabbi of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Commonwealth), anti-Semitism heavily influences most modern day Jewish communities. Jews living in the diaspora have suffered persecutions at the hands of the Romans, Spanish, Russians, and the Germans. According to Jewish liturgy, Jewish identity is comprised of

---

[16] I know this through growing up Jewish.

memory, "memory is the secret to redemption. Forgetfulness is the source of Exile. History preserves memory for our children and transfers the stories of our struggles to them" (Skinner, 2005). A proper analysis and understanding of Jewish identity must begin with understanding their history and their beliefs prior to the Holocaust.

The Holocaust had a profound influence on the new formation of Jewish identities. Primo Levi, Jewish Italian Chemist and Auschwitz survivor, commented that the Holocaust was a "war on memory, an attempt to eradicate not only the persons of Jews, but all traces of their existence to envelope Jewish history and tradition within a blanket of silence and secrecy" (Spiegel, 2002, p. 156). The Nazis, by trying to rid the world of Jews in "The Final Solution," were trying to rid the world of all memory of Jewish history, culture and identity as well. The memory of the Holocaust and its horrors, needless to say, sears the heart and mind of every Jew. This is particularly true of anyone who has lost family and friends in the Holocaust. The experience of loss has very often shaped the identities of Holocaust survivors, and has even gone on to shape the identities of those born into the second and third generations (Spiegel, 2002). Attitudes vary of course, but for many Jews it has become one of the key features of Jewish identity, possibly even the outstanding feature: many see themselves as the people of the Holocaust (Spiegel, 2002). It *may* well be that this feeling is strongest among secular (non-religious) Jews and those who practice their religion only nominally (Bergen 2009; Spiegel, 2002).

Identity formation in general is an ongoing social process subject to many socializing agents and environmental influences. Identity is shaped at the personal level, as well as at the collective level, through groups, the state, and social institutions, also it is given meaning via external appearance and performances for others who self-identify. In a 1998 interview with renowned Holocaust scholar Yehuda Bauer, at Yad Vashem, claims that Jewish identity cannot be

separated from the Holocaust, "The Holocaust affects all those who were born either before, or during the event (and their number, of course is diminishing), and all the rest who were born afterwards. The post-Holocaust birth of a Jew, whether he or she is conscious of it or not, is a statement against Nazism. The Nazis wanted to destroy the Jewish people, but Jews exist. Their very existence is a statement of a fight against Nazism, and a victory, if you like, over Nazism, Therefore, all of these things impact on how Jews see themselves" (Bauer, 1998). The memory of the atrocities of the Holocaust influence how "Jews define themselves as a unique ethnic entity, how they draw boundaries between themselves and others" (Rapoport, 1997, p. 56). Today, Jews living in both the diaspora and in Israel still carry within them the pains and tensions of the European Jewish experience because of their understandings of historical memory and what places they feel a sense of belonging to as a result of both history and memory.

Memory has been historically constructed in relation to a group that is located within a specific time, frame, and space (Stevick & Gross, 2010). The interrelationships between the group, time, and space intensify the memory and make it more unique and concrete. This constructive process is a substantial action that defines the individual and the group. Through memory we ensure that certain events, eras, people and experiences are remembered. Every memory is a product of social interaction (Stevick & Gross, 2010). As educators and researchers we seek to understand how education shapes our awareness of the past. Each lesson may seem to consist of exposure to a collection of historical texts, but how do we read those documents?

Throughout this extensive search on history, memory, and in particular how it relates to the cause study of Holocaust education, I feel a strong connection to the historical sociological approach to collective memory. This approach as Olick (2007) suggests is one that "is genuinely historical, but that avoids wherever possible transcendentalism. It must appreciate that social life

takes place in time without relegating that temporality to a residual category" (p. 9). Following

Olick, the state, and therefore the *Canadian* state, plays an integral role in determining what aspects

of *Canadian* history are worthy of historical memory for today's teachers, and students. Holocaust

education in Canada is not mandated in any of the provinces or territories (B'Nai Brith, 2012).

Holocaust education faces the dual challenge of embedding the history within the collective

memory, while teaching the mechanisms by which such acts were committed. If these problems

are to be addressed, Holocaust education must preclude desensitization and find ways to empower

youth by educating them about human rights and civic responsibility. The opportunities and

challenges of these ambitious endeavors must be examined carefully in order to productively

utilize historical memory as a transformative educational agent.

BEARING WITNESS TO THE HOLOCAUST: MEMORIALS AND THEIR MEANINGS

To Each of Them

And to teach of them I will give a name and a monument
To every man, to every woman, to every child
And to those who fought
And to those who had no way to fight
And to those who sang on the way to their deaths
And to those who were silent
To who found a God in the camps
And to those who declared God dead
To each of them I will give a name and a monument
To those who were there
When every bite of bread was a decision
When every step could cause more death
To the heroes, and the non heroes
The strong and the weak
To those who were superhuman
And to those who, like you and I
Were merely, more importantly
Human.
- Aviva Goldberg

Introduction

By understanding what the Holocaust is (and how it is interpreted), I am able to look more deeply at the meanings of the memorials that were built to educate those who visited the sites following the war. As I wrote in an earlier chapter, without a more complete and thorough definition of the Holocaust, it is difficult to delve into how memorials can help us learn about the past, specifically because memorials, for particular affects and purposes, tell not only the story of those who they are commemorating but also those who designed them. Researchers must study the architectural design of interpretations as well as the interpretations themselves. The memorials

that I discuss in this chapter are all in Eastern Europe where the majority of the deaths occurred. As the Holocaust has taken a more prominent place in public life, Jewish philanthropists have erected memorials all over the world. Recently the Canadian government has made the decision to create a national monument in the capital city of Ottawa, Ontario. This political action illustrates just how critical memorials are created for state-based learning and public pedagogy — not just for Jews, but for all peoples.

What Memorials Are

Public memorials that commemorate historical events are more than just a notion of collective memory; rather they are symbolic, political and artistic representations of the past. "For public memory and its meanings depend not just on the forms and figures in the monument itself but on the viewer's response to the monument, how it is used politically and religiously in the community, who sees it, under what circumstances, how its figures enter other media, and are recast in new surroundings" (Young, 1993, pp. xii-xiii). Memorials have the ability to take on lives and meanings of their own despite the state's original intention. Memorials are intended to be physical constructions of collective memory and are designed in order to heal communities (Young, 1993). "Social remembering," which is a collective recounting of the past is necessary for our healing (Winter, 1995). They are seen as spaces for story telling, commemoration, and finding peace with tragedy. This chapter discusses and analyzes the role of Holocaust memory sites (the places where history happened such as ghettos, Concentration Camps, and Death Factories) and memorials. I am focusing on memorials, ones that I have had the privilege of visiting both for personal and research reasons. While I've been to several memorials and death sites, I am writing about the ones that had the greatest impact on me personally, and my connection to my grandmother and her family. The memorials at the former camp-sites of Auschwitz-Birkenau,

Belzec, Majdanek, Treblinka, The Warsaw Ghetto, and the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin. Each memorial has its own narrative, both commemorating those that died and also telling the story of the designers and their social location.

 The term memorial means to "preserve memory" (Young, 1993). Memorials serve a variety of functions to the public such as preserving history, providing a space for grieving, and educating those who visit. The aim of Holocaust memorials is to educate the next generation through shared experiences. Holocaust memorials reflect not only national and communal remembrance or their geographical locations, but also the designers own time and place (Winter 1995; Young, 1993). One of the main purposes for building memorials is a sense of place and connectivity to the hallowed ground, as many share the land where the event occurred or are built at a site of importance to either individuals involved in the event or the event itself. Memorials, as noted by Winter (1995), "not only commemorate, but fulfill a part of the mourning and bereavement process" (p. 20). Memorials are designed for the living in order to remember those that were lost in generally catastrophic ways through war or through other horrific means. As a result, the physical arrangement of the memorial is particularly important - what message the place conveying to the visitors is a critical component. When visiting memorials, it is important to remember that they themselves are more products of the time they were designed and constructed, the source of funding (state or private) than the individuals or events being remembered, "these sites remember the past according to a variety of national myths, ideals, and political needs. Some recall war dead, others resistance, and still others mass murder" (Young, 1993, p. 1). Every memorial generates its own meaning within history and memory.

Preservation of these sites, specifically the former camps, are not something that just occurred spontaneously or quickly overnight. In fact, development of the sites required a lot of

work on behalf of the Polish government and private agencies following the war. Policies began to be written as early as July 1944 when the Red Army liberated Majdanek (Lukas, 2012). The Soviets began to work on the memorial stones for the camp shortly after. In 1947, just two years after Auschwitz was liberated, the Polish government announced, "Auschwitz will be forever preserved as a memorial to the martyrdom of the Polish nation and other peoples" (Lukas, 2012). In the early 1960s, Treblinka was transformed into the memorial that it is today with the help of funding from the Polish government and Jewish agencies around the world (Young, 1993). Policies for the construction of memorials can be a tedious and long process, or they can be developed quite quickly depending on timing, the source of funding and those in power. Memorials have the ability to show and educate its visitors on what those people deem to be important parts of history that will be forever remembered, "memory-making can be dominated or silenced by state-sanctioned narratives" (Dellios, 2015, p. 253) . By learning and visiting memorials viewers are able to understand when they became a piece of history, and not just a group's memories. Most of the Holocaust memorials in Poland are a result of Polish government policies to preserve history (Lukas, 2012).

Auschwitz-Birkenau

The first memory-site I had the opportunity to visit was the former camp of Auschwitz I and Auschwitz II- Birkenau. Auschwitz is located in Central Poland in the town of Oswiecim. Auschwitz over time has become the symbol of the Holocaust. The word itself has become synonymous with death and genocide. It is estimated that over 1.1 million victims were murdered in Auschwitz (Bergen, 2009). Auschwitz #I was constructed in 1940 for the purpose of incarcerating Polish prisoners who began arriving in May of that year. Auschwitz #II- Birkenau was finished in September of 1941 when the first transports arrived from the Polish ghettos

(Bergen, 2009). From 1942 to 1944 Birkenau became the premier death factory, to which Jewish and other victims were delivered on transport trains and cattle cars from all over German occupied Europe where they were met with their untimely deaths as a result of the pesticide Zyklon B. Auschwitz, unlike some of the other memorials I will be discussing is both a memorial and a museum filled with artifacts. Yet, while Auschwitz has been remembered, most of the Holocaust has been forgotten (Snyder, 2015). Auschwitz symbolizes the intention to murder all Jews under German control and Jews from every corner of the German empire were murdered in its gas chambers. Some Jews survived Auschwitz because it remained, to the end, a set of camps as a well a death facility, where Jews were selected for labour as they entered (Snyder, 2015). Thus, a story of survival at Auschwitz can enter collective memory.

One of the Holocaust survivors that I have worked very closely with over the last year was deported to Auschwitz in December 1941 on one of the first transports. Every time she tells me her story, she pauses, and then with great conviction says, "I built Auschwitz. I built a city." For her, the "city" became her home for 18 months. She knew it so well. She can tell you today where she buried her treasure — and what block she lived in. When visiting Auschwitz, it is so important to remember and understand that even though this was a place of slave labour and death. It was also the only place the prisoners knew. They created it. Being in Auschwitz and looking at the artifacts that have survived, I try to remember that people lived here, and take that all in.

The blocks at Auschwitz where I visited are now a museum with each barrack telling a different story and with each room crammed with prisoners' possessions. "By collecting a composite memory of Auschwitz, these national pavilions preserve the essential diversity of memory here" (Young, 1993, p. 129). The museums at Auschwitz are a scattering of belongings, from pots and pans to glasses and book, reminding us the entire way through that individuals were

lost, but so were communities and with them their memories. As Young (1993) so eloquently puts, "the sum of these dismembered fragments can never approach the whole of what was lost" (p. 132). Because Auschwitz is so symbolic in Holocaust history, it has to live up to a global image of itself for visitors. During my first time visiting to Auschwitz, I felt more confused than anything else because it did not appear to live up to what I had imagined. All I saw that day was a museum. My mind was flooded with questions as opposed to the emotions I thought I would feel. It took me a long time to recognize that it was *okay* that I did *not* cry that day, but rather intellectually questioned everything about it I ever knew.

Although the possessions help me put pieces of the story together, I will never know about the lives of the people lost, their education, relationships, religion, and culture. Just by looking, I will never know their traditions that bound them together as a community. In the end, all I can see are things without specific meaning and without exact memories. Although, I have a lot of information regarding the victims lives I lack a shared sense of lived experiences that can tell the stories of these objects. Like looking at a piece of art, I do not know what the artist saw and what the artist's intentions and purpose was. Instead, I impose my own histories and my own perspective. This leaves us, as visitors to the camp, to create our own stories, our own understandings, and our own interpretations based on the stories of the survivors and of the victims. Memory sites, and in particular, sites of destructions such as Auschwitz-Birkenau are devastating because the crimes that were committed are so evident immediately upon arrival.

The first thing visitors see are the iconic words "Arbeit Macht Frei" ("Work shall set you free"). Those words followed me through my visit of the museum at Auschwitz I. They left me without feeling. Staring at the mounds of hair, shoes and possessions, no matter what I could not feel. I stood in the museum room where all the hair from the prisoners is displayed. I felt paralyzed

after I grabbed onto my own long hair. After a while, I glanced around to find every woman in the room holding onto her hair as if it might be taken away at any moment. I could not move. I could not look away. Another participant on the program with me turned and whispered, "I have to leave. I cannot keep looking at this." After she left I said to myself "I cannot not look at this. I do not know how to walk away." This is where twins were tortured, and experiments were done. This is where Dr. Mengele worked as an apparent doctor, slicing people up (they were not considered humans) and starving all of them (each in the name of medicine). Auschwitz was built by its own prisoners, and as Young (1993) staunchly notes, "when we recall that the Germans rounded up 250 local Jews to build the camp Auschwitz, we also realize that the memorial was there was, in effect built by the victims it would later commemorate" (p. 120). Auschwitz is almost perfectly preserved, from the guard towers to the half burned down crematorium, the camp looks exactly the way it did when the Russians arrived in January 1945.

At Auschwitz, there are so many stories of struggle, suffering, and of sadness, but also of survival and resistance. Visiting the former death camp gave me hope for the future, because it was filled with others who had come to learn, pay tribute and understand the past. Seeing the piles of hair, shoes, and personal belongings was devastating in a way I never imagined. And yet it was also humbling. As I walked through the many buildings, and heard tales of the horrible things that happened at Auschwitz, I could not help but notice some of the beauty of some of the relationships I witnessed. Young children helped elderly visitors. A girl cried on a woman's shoulder. A couple of friends held hands for support. Individuals helped others. People made sacrifices. In the rubble, in the piles of shoes, pots, and luggage, there was more proof of human dignity, honour, patriotism, love, devotion to family, and hope of survival. Even in the most extreme situation, where the chances of even living only a few months were slim and life was fragile, there was compassion,

and love. Living through history this way is critical. It helps us see the scars — and not just read about it in books. The artifactual remainders, the simulation, and the stimulation make it a little more real which can drive human compassion to ensure that this life/death never again becomes a another reality.

As discussed above memorials and sites of memory are not just about commemorating historical events, but also have the ability to be highly politicized. Although 90% of Auschwitz's victims were Jewish, the camp itself was located in Poland which adds a political element to the memorial and museum that exist today. It is critical to remember that Poland was occupied by Germany in 1939 and thus those in power were Nazis. The Poles near Auschwitz were removed from their homes, and the Poles who lived within Jewish ghetto boundaries were told to leave. The geopolitical boundaries at the time were confusing because of the way the Nazis reorganized Poland. Poland was split into three areas: The General Government in the centre, Polish areas annexed by Nazi Germany in the west and Polish areas annexed by the Soviet Union in the East (Snyder, 2015). Western Poland was absorbed into Poland and run by Berlin. The General Government was formed when Germany declared a total collapse of the Polish state on October 8, 1939 (Snyder, 2015). The General Government became a German *colonial* zone for Adolf Hitler in the centre of Poland encompassing much of Poland and western Ukraine today and includes the major cities of Warsaw, Krakow, Lvov, Lublin, Tarnopol and Stanislawow (Snyder, 2015). The General Government was a satellite of Nazi Germany, had its own government structure including a governor and police officers, all of course were Nazis. Operation Reinhard, which was a super secretive plan to destroy all Jews in Central Poland, was organized and designed by the General Government. The operation was the introduction of killing facilities and became what is now known as the deadliest phase of the Holocaust (Snyder, 2015). The extermination centres in

Central Poland were Treblinka, Sobibor, and Belzec. Sobibor, most secret of them all, is still difficult to find in rural Poland and on the border of the Ukraine. The geopolitical borders of Poland help tell the story of how the Nazis ruled the country and how some of the present day political issues in Poland were set in motion.

Young (1993) explains, "It was agreed that Auschwitz- Birkenau was the site of the greatest mass murder of Jews in history. But it was also in Poland, where some six million Poles (half of them Jews) died during this German occupation. Auschwitz would be, by geographical default, a Polish memorial to both Polish and Jewish victims, a shared shrine to both Jewish and Polish catastrophes" (p. 154). For many years following the Holocaust there was a constant debate as to who Auschwitz belonged to - was it the Jews? Or the Poles? Laying claim to Auschwitz or other memory-sites fed into the notion of the hierarchy of suffering. Other people like myself, fight for the memory and work collaboratively to make it a site of collective memory where the visitors can work to create their own meaning and their own significance (Young, 1993). Visitors to Auschwitz have the ability to create their own meaning based on their own lived experiences, family histories, and connections. The education that visitors receive at Auschwitz, and the meaning that each person takes from the camp varies as a result.

As the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor, I imagine a much different view and feeling than what another visitor might understand. My connection is so deeply personal that I must always remember that, for me, it is not just a memory-site, it is the place where I actually lost family. Auschwitz, because of its sheer size and meaning, has the capacity to remember and commemorate not all only all *who* were lost there, but all *that* was lost there.

Majdanek

Auschwitz has hundreds of visitors every day, and thousands every year. Majdanek, on the other hand is empty by comparison yet located in Lublin. And Majdanek is significantly smaller than Auschwitz. Majdanek is another one of the 6 "death factories," although like Auschwitz it also served as a concentration camp. The camp was used to kill people on an industrial scale during Operation Reinhard, the Nazi plan to murder all Jews within their General Government territory of Poland. The General Government was a territory in Poland and Ukraine that Hitler circled at the onset of World War II after the invasion of Poland. The General Government was run by Nazi Germany as a separate administrative unit for logistical purposes (Bergen, 2009; Lukas 2012). The camp was in operation from October 1, 1942 until July 22, 1944. The fast advancement of the Red Army allowed the camp to remain completely intact, including the gas chambers and crematoria. Approximately 78,000 Jews lost their lives in Majdanek. Upon arrival visitors can see through to the mausoleum at the back. Despite the smaller size, to walk through it is just as painful and numbing. The memorial aspects of Majdanek are similar to that of Auschwitz because the barracks have been converted into museums, preserving artifacts, and displaying facts about the Nazi years. According to the Young (1993), the aim of the memorial was threefold: " to preserve the building as material evidence of the crimes committed here; to analyze the facts of these crimes; and to present analyzed facts to the public" (p. 121). Majdanek, unlike the other death factories located in rural Poland, is in the middle of a bustling mid-sized city with a population of 350,000.[17] In fact, people's backyards look out into the camp.

The entrance to the camp is on a slight hill, so visitors can walk in. Its appearance is almost like descending into a valley of death. The first time I walked through the gates all I could see and

---

[17] I learned this through a tour in the summer of 2013 from Krzysztof Banach.

look at was the mausoleum that carries 7000 tonnes of human ash. The 20-minute walk to the main part of the camp is a prescribed time for reflection and contemplation. The inscription by the mausoleum reads, "Let our fate be a warning to you." Both times I have been to Majdanek it is those words about fate that have made me shiver. Majdanek is a reminder to humanity as a whole about how fragile *human* life in particular and in general can be. Majdanek's most powerful element is that the gas chambers can be turned on for use in 48 hours. Although the sign outside the building reads "experimental gas chambers," it was really not an experiment at all. The Nazis were quite conscious that what they were doing was not in fact a science experiment but rather the willing intention to play God. My heart pounded so hard I thought I might faint when I was there. Seeing the fake showerheads made my whole body shudder and a giant lump formed in my throat. The blue zyklon B stained walls and the scratches from the prisoners' nails are forever etched into my mind. In the back is the bathtub where the commandant of Majdanek would take his bath because it would be heated from the gas. Never had I heard or seen anything quite so volatile and disturbing. How does one even begin to think that way? Walking through Majdanek is surreal: the bunkers, houses, shoes and artifacts. As I walked closer to the crematorium I could feel myself growing numb again. The ground by the mausoleum and crematorium is uneven from where the victims' bodies were buried in a hurry before the Allies arrived.

I have been incredibly privileged to befriend several Holocaust survivors throughout my life. One gentleman is a Majdanek survivor and I have been blessed to know him since I was a young child. He was deported from the Lodz ghetto with his mother, father, and twin sister at the age of eight. Upon arrival his father told him to lie about his age and he was sent to the right line while his father was directed to the left line. From his spot he could see his twin sister running towards their mother. The last thing he remembers is her long blonde braid. That was the last time

he ever saw his family, and to this day still cannot remember his twin sister's face. I have heard

him tell his story at Majdanek three times which only make the place seem more like hell each

time. It stole so many lives and broke up so many families. When visiting sites of destruction, it

is critical to remember that without the state and public's intent to remember, "the ruins remain

little more than inert pieces of landscape, suffused with the meanings and significance created in

our visits to them" (Young, 1993, p. 119).

Treblinka

While Majdanek looks exactly the way it did in 1944, Treblinka on the other hand, is a

memorial at the site of destruction and nothing more. The Nazis successfully burned all the

evidence from one of their biggest death factories. Located about two hours northeast of Warsaw,

Treblinka was in operation between July 1942 and October 1943 as part of Operation Reinhard,

and marked the most destructive phase of "The Final Solution." Approximately 800,000 Jews as

well as an undetermined number of Romani people were killed in Treblinka's gas chambers. While

Majdanek and Auschwitz were both concentration camps as well as death camps, *Treblinka's sole*

purpose was to kill its victims upon arrival. Treblinka is devastatingly beautiful. It is peaceful, and

the perfect place for self-reflection. Treblinka has spoken to me, each of the three times that I have

been there. The flowers that grow around the memorial are trying to peer out of the ground. The

memorial candles of visitors past burn brightly. The community stones remind visitors that to

everyone there is a name. Treblinka, itself, is calming to a point.

The memorial at Treblinka has seventeen thousand granite shards set in concrete, each

representing a different Jewish community that members were deported from. The only individual

commemorated at Treblinka is Januk Korczak, a Polish Jewish orphanage owner who chose to

accompany his children to Treblinka. They were all murdered together. Januk could have been saved but opted to stay with his children. The memorial symbolizes an old cemetery. At the base of the obelisk, a stone plaque reads in Yiddish, Russian, English, French, German and Polish, "Never Again." Young (1993) explains that "the design of the memorial declared that their aim would be to suggest iconographically the greatest of all genocidal cemeteries (p. 186). Treblinka is quiet, located in the middle of a forest far away from the nearest town. From the entrance to the memorial are concrete railroad tracks in the forest, symbolizing the tracks that the cattle cars carried Jews to their demise on. The memorial at Treblinka allows each visitor to take his/her own path through it and experience it individually as they walk through the broken tombstones. The granite shards are fragmented to symbolize the broken Jewish communities that in some ways can never be restored (Young, 1993). As a memorial, Treblinka is powerful, resonate and demoralizing, and has the ability to reach all its visitors in a profound way.

As I entered the actual memorial, the first thing that I noticed was the vastness of the operation. Walking in silence, a young Jewish woman, I could not help but think of what my own fate would have been in World War II Warsaw. It was all too difficult and painful to contemplate, and so for a moment I allowed myself to escape by focusing on the sounds of the birds and the smells of the woods where I had found peace. Walking through Treblinka, I have noticed many people using the space as a place for prayer, and song. In 2015 and 2016, I led a Holocaust Education trip of 30 Canadian university students to learn about the horrors of the Holocaust and what we can learn from of it. Accompanying our group to Treblinka was a small group of Polish High School Students, there despite not speaking the same language the two groups participated in a ceremony of remembrance. We felt united in knowing that we are all there to commemorate,

and to educate ourselves. This quiet clearing in the forest was not always just a forest. It was a death factory. It was designed to kill all who entered.

Belzec

The final site of destruction is that of the former camp of Belzec. Belzec still haunts me in my sleep. It is the most powerful memorial, its vastness and its beauty swept into my soul. I could not speak at Belzec. Walking through the memorial is overwhelming, confusing, and elicits feelings of being lost. The town of Belzec is located in the Lublin district of Poland. The surrounding communities, at the onset of the war were almost completely Jewish. Today, there are no known Jews residing in the area.[18] The camp was only in operation for eight months from March 1942 to December 1942. Interestingly enough, it was the very practice of burying bodies in mass graves in the surrounding areas that caused the premature closure of the camp. The bodies began to swell as winter came and pushed themselves out of the ground which had the potential to create health risks for the Nazis and their collaborators, and as a result the camp abandoned. The former campsite is covered in concrete rubble, somewhat resembling coal, and around it is barbed wire fencing. In the middle there is a pathway, which essentially leads the way to the gas chambers; however, in this case to the memorial at the back of the camp. The walls leading to the memorial are angled upward so when you reach the end, there is a feeling of loss, and being overwhelmed. The memorial itself has common Jewish names carved into it, remembering those that were taken. It's simple yet powerful, invoking feelings of sadness and numbness. Belzec is a reflective space. As you walk along the edge of the camp, the months and places of each arriving transport are

---

[18] I learned this through a tour in the summer of 2013 from Krzysztof Banach.

carved into stones. Walking past the name of my great grandfather's village from three transports was heart wrenching. Every time I looked up, I wondered what they were thinking when they arrived; where did the prisoners think they were and did they know what was to become of them? Belzec's memorial was all encompassing. I alone, at that moment, in that place, thinking of a time 70 years earlier, was mesmerized.

It is estimated that approximately 500,000 Jews were exterminated in Belzec. Only two Jews are known to have survived both Belzec and the Holocaust. The lack of survivors is the primary reason why so little information and literature is available about the camp despite the significant number of victims. The Belzec memorial is quite new. It was only finished in 2004. It has an isolated location near the Ukrainian border. Belzec had only a small number of visitors to the site before 1988. Belzec was quite poorly maintained. Following the fall of the Berlin Wall and the end of the Cold War, many visitors became unimpressed with the state that they found Belzec in. As a result, extensive investigations of the former campgrounds were conducted[19]. Later, it became a branch of the Majdanek State Museum, which continues to operate it. The small museum located at the entrance of the camp is filled with artifacts from the camp. There is one particular art installation, which continues to make my heart stop. Carved into stone are the words (in English, Polish, and Hebrew), "Mommy, haven't I been good? It's dark. It's dark." Reading this was heart wrenching and painful. I could not imagine what it must have been like for that mother to think that her child thought he had been bad and was being punished. When in reality, the only "wrong" thing he had done was being born into a Jewish family. For the millions of parents that had to try to explain the situation to their young children must have been incredibly

---

[19] I learned this through a visit of the former camp in 2013 by my tour guide Krzysztof Banach.

difficult and upsetting. Memorials have the unique ability to transport their visitors back to that time in history to try to make sense of everything, to learn about the past in a more personal way.

<h2 style="text-align:center"><u>The Warsaw Ghetto/Rappoport Memorial</u></h2>

Sites of memory are likely to have a profound impact on those that choose to both visit and allow themselves to reflect about where they are. The Warsaw ghetto has several memorials and monuments within its old borders which include Umshlagplatz (the place to which Jews were deported from) to the Rappoport Memorial. Memorials also include small inscriptions on lampposts and sidewalks that cover a large portion of the city. Officially established in 1940 the Warsaw Ghetto was to be both a concentration camp and a transit centre for Jews before deportation. Most deportees went to Treblinka (Marcuse, 2010; Young, 1993). The Germans erected thirty miles of wall, topped with glass and barbed around what had been the largely Jewish area of the city. Escape was punishable by death immediately. By April 1942, the Germans had crammed approximately 750,000 Jews into an area usually housing 50,000 (Young, 1993). In total, as a result of slave labour, shootings, diseases, and starvation, 100,000 Jews died in the ghetto by the time it was liquidated in September of 1942 (Bergen 2009; Friedlander 2009). A walk through the Warsaw Ghetto tells visitors of the stories of struggle and hardship, of deportation and death, and of resistance and defiance.

The most famous memorial located within the old ghetto walls is the Rapoport Memorial in honour of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising was finished in 1948. It was the first memorial erected to honour the victims of the Holocaust. The uprising opposed the Nazi's final effort to liquidate the Ghetto population and deport them to Treblinka Extermination Camp. The resistance was planned and led by the Judenrat (the Jewish Council) organized by Mordechai Anielewicz, who

was eventually killed in the rebellion (Bergen 2009; Friedlander 2009). It was the largest revolt by Jews during the Holocaust. The monument stands where the last Judenrat met. The structure has two sides, each telling its own story of defiance. The Western facing side shows has a structure of men, women and children all armed with guns and Molotov cocktails, the central figuring being Anielewicz, symbolizing the revolt itself, "the seven figures…are classically, even mythologically drawn: fighting their way out of stone, out of the burning ghetto, these historically sculpted men and women are transformed to legendary proportions" (Young, 1993, p. 179). On the opposite side, the persecution of the population by the Nazis Jews is represented "in numerical reference to the tribes of Israel, twelve stooped and huddled figures embody archaic, archetypal Jews in exile, with only three Nazi helmets and two bayonets" (Young, 1993, p. 179). The words engraved read in three languages, "Jewish nation to its fighters and martyrs." Young (1993) maintains, "Everyone memorializes something different here, of course; each creates different meaning in the monument" (p. 170). The two sides of the monument are to be viewed separately, as two distinct, but interconnected stories of the plight of the Jewish people during the war. The memorials located in the Warsaw Ghetto, specifically the Rapoport Memorial are aimed to show the bravery and resistance amongst the *Polish Jews*, and that they did not "go like lambs to the slaughter" like popular opinion assumes. Strikingly and paradoxically, it is Rapoport's clichéd sculpture of the fighters and martyrs of the Warsaw Ghetto that has emerged as the emblematic Holocaust monument.

The Rapoport Memorial, because of its unique location within the ghetto walls (but not being a site of destruction) allows visitors to educate themselves. The Holocaust was not just about death camps. There were many more steps before the camps became the end-point reality. This memorial in particular is a product of an earlier time: from the enormous chasm of postwar loss

and chaos, from the shock and mourning of those who remained alive, there arose a desperate and immediate need to pay tribute to those who managed to fight back. Rapoport felt compelled to portray his "Anielewicz as a man of monumental proportions and strength" (Marcuse, 2010, p. 55). The misrepresentation is that he would have looked completely opposite to how he actually looked in 1942, emancipated and weak. It can be interpreted that Rapoport wanted Anielewicz to be represented a pillar of strength to the entire Jewish community. He was depicted as a Greek god to allow for visitors for years to come to imagine Anielewicz's sacrificial role as a hero.

Also in Warsaw, there is a new (as of April 2013) Museum of the History of Polish Jews that now faces the resistance side of the monument. The new museum was built across from the memorial to remind visitors of the lives and the culture of the Polish Jewry that existed for centuries in Warsaw and Poland but whose memory has been lost during and immediately after the Holocaust. The museum is now being revived. Museums and memorials are often interconnected in that memorials are created and designed to remember how people died. The purpose of museums, however, is also to remember how they lived. With this thought in mind, the space behind the Rapoport Memorial was the best location to build a museum whose mission it is "to contribute to the formation of modern individual and collectivities identities amongst Poles, Jews, Europeans and citizens of the world by recalling the thousands years of Polish- Jewish history" (About the Museum, 2016). Touring the Warsaw ghetto, through visiting many of the major parts of it was a sobering and an enlightening experience. I was able to put the pieces of many stories I had heard together by being in the locations that they were told. Stories of survivors who were taken to Umshlagplatz, knowing that they were about to be deported to a death camp unable to stop it, holding on to their families with all their might. Stories of young children using the underground sewer system to try to find food on the Aryan side and bring it back to their

families. Walking through the ghetto and looking at the old walls and buildings, I could sense how crowded and dirty it was. One survivor I know remembers getting to the ghetto and finding out there was one picnic table to sleep on; however, the table was reserved for married couples. She was with her brother and his best friend. Together they found a Rabbi who married her and her brother's best friend. Just so that they would have somewhere to sleep that was not the cold ground. She and her new husband slept on either side of the picnic table and her brother slept on top.   Survivors have shared their stories of selling all their belongings for food to eat, sharing a one room apartment with four other families, watching their family members starve to death or be killed by rampant diseases that spread throughout the ghetto like wildfire. As I stood at the Umshlagplatz memorial I felt as though I could understand the gravity of where and who I was to a much higher degree than just a mere reading about it would have given me. Walking through the history of the old Warsaw Ghetto and ending up at the museum allows visitors to contextualize the Holocaust within history, and to remember that it was not only a Jewish history event but a World history event of significant proportions.

The Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe

The final and most contentious memorial that I am writing about is the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe located in downtown Berlin and was inaugurated on May 10, 2005 as part of the 60th anniversary of the liberation of Europe. I have been fortunate enough to walk through this space three times. More like an art installation, the memorial contains 2711 grey concrete slabs, which are identical in their horizontal dimensions but differ vertically. They are arranged in a grid like fashion over 4.7 acres. The site chosen is symbolically important because it is located between the Brandenberg Gate, an important monument in German history, and the

Hitler's bunker, where Hitler died (Zach, 2012). The pathways between the blocks are long, straight and narrow. It creates the effect of a visitor is inside a tunnel with no light at the end. The ground is uneven. There is a sensation of uneasiness throughout. The memorial is located at the epicenter of the Nazi operation, which makes it unique. Most memorials are built to remember a victory or the lives of the victims but rarely do nations and/or groups remember the crimes that they committed (Young, 1993). There is a small museum located next to the memorial and it provides contextual information for the visitors regarding the time period itself. This memorial has a small plaque but other than that there is no text, leaving much to interpretation and analysis from the visitor, and the reason for praise and criticism of the memorial.

The Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe is the most academically written about Holocaust memorial because of its geographical location, its official name, and its aesthetic appearance (or lack thereof). Brody (2012), a critic for *The New Yorker*, took up issue with its name, "Which murdered Jews? Where? The title doesn't say 'Holocaust' or 'Shoah' in other words, it doesn't say anything about who did the murdering or why…the failure to mention it separates the victims from the killers and leaches the moral element from the historical event, shunting it to the category of a natural catastrophe. The reduction of responsibility to an embarrassing, tacit fact that 'everybody knows' is the first step on the road to forgetting" (Brody, 2012, p. New York Times Online). While Brody's point of contention is interesting, he fails to mention in his article that the museum does assign historical contextualization to and responsibility for the event. The debate over "holocaust" echoes how it can be an uncomfortable to many because of its sacrificial tones, and unclear definition. The designer of the memorial, Peter Eisenman explains that the memorial is a place "to keep this memory as an open question in the present, to represent a spatial experience that works towards analogizing the rupture in German history to this

alien rupture in the city of Berlin" (Eisenman, 1998, p. 88). The memorial is meant to be an open space for reflection, and interpretation by that of its visitors, which as I have seen, it is able to accomplish quite well. The groups that I have taken to this memorial have all been moved to their very core by how the space is used. And, no matter how many people are there, they are able to find a quiet place for reflection. Each of my students has come up to me separately to tell me that they were surprised by how they felt walking through cement blocks, but that it really did allow them space to understand the Holocaust without telling them how to feel.

Some critics argue that the Memorial is lacking an overall narrative; however, I would argue that the narrative is more fluid, and open, which allows more space for understanding. Matatyaou (2008) suggests "foregoing traditional means of representation and referential significance. The Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe breaks with traditional didacticism of memorials, interrupting and challenging the customary ways in which the culture of remembrance is commonly articulated and represented" (p. 94). Eisenman's purpose for the memorial was "a rigid grid - a reason gone made. Its warning is against too much belief in reason and the system" (Eisenman, 1998, p. 92). Though most memorials are geared towards helping visitors remember the past, these sites often elicit and encourage instinctive responses (Huyssen, 1995). Eisenman purposefully wanted to create an abstract memorial that would encourage visitors to question where they were, and really engage with the structures through the long pathways, varying sizes and large area that it masterfully covers. As a result of the blocks being so similar, it is often a disorienting walk through, unsure of where you entered and where you should exit which, according to Zach (2012), "triggers the conditions for ethical thinking" (p. 11). Each experience I have had walking through this powerful abstract memorial have been thought provoking. The disorienting walk allowed me to lose myself within the memorial and connect

with history on a unique level. The lack of textual information gave me the opportunity to create my own narrative of the space, and use my own emotions to connect more deeply to the pieces around me.

The Berlin Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe has the ability to transform its visitors and at the same time is the perfect symbolism for such an atrocious event in human history. The ground beneath the memorial undulates and slopes without warning, and yet from the outer parts you would never know that. Paralleling the journey of German Jews, everything looked normal at the beginning but it slowly began to change without any notice until they were completely alienated from German society. The blank cement blocks represent the anonymity of all the victims lost. It symbolizes, in a sense, a blank gravestone for all those whose names we will never know. The 6 million Jews murdered in the Holocaust were treated as a cement slab, nothing, unnamed, unmarked, and stark.

All memorials from Auschwitz-Birkenau, Majdanek, Treblinka, Belzec, Rappoport Memorial to the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe bring their own qualities to which memory is represented, which have the ability to generate unique meanings. Memorials are not just about creating a collective memory, but more so about creating a collective meaning that is passed down from generation to generation (Young, 1993). Public spaces for memory are critical for the public to understand both historical facts and the significance of them. Memorials are spaces for both self-reflection and open discussion and engagement with others. Memorials have the ability to let its visitors form their own spaces. Holocaust memorials in particular give survivors a place to remember themselves and their loved ones, and for descendants, such as myself, they create a space to remember family members we will never know, and a world that has ceased to exist, "an act of recovery whereby they locate themselves in a continuous past" (Young, 1993, p.

285). The story behind each memorial transforms the visitors to the place and space of the architects themselves, which helps to develop connections between generations and between people of different backgrounds, and cultures. Memory sites and memorials are able to educate their visitors in both an abstract and meaningful way through both symbolic and real representation.

CHAPTER 6:
BITTERSWEET: CANADA, JEWS, ANTISEMITISM, AND HOLOCAUST DENIAL

Shema
*You who live secure
In your warm houses
Who return at evening to find
Hot food and friendly faces:
Consider whether this is a man,
Who labours in the mud
Who knows no peace
Who fights for a crust of bread
Who dies at a yes or no*

*Consider whether this is a woman
Without hair or name
With no more strength to remember*

*Eyes empty and womb cold
As a frog in winter*

*Consider that this has been:
I commend this words to you
Engrave them on your hearts
When you are in your house,
When you go to bed, when you rise.
Repeat them to your children.
Or may your house crumble,
Disease render you powerless
Your offspring avert their faces from you.
-Primo Levi*

Preface

During the Holocaust, the rest of the world was silent, which Hitler took as permission to go forward with his plans to annihilate European Jewry. In July of 1938, representatives from thirty-two countries around the world met in the French town of Evian to discuss the European refugee issue which was arising. However, the most powerful countries in the world did not even send high ranking officials. For example, the United States sent a close friend of Roosevelt's. Canada had an official observer, Thomas Crerar, the Minister of Immigration at the time, who had been told by his superiors that letting refugees into Canada would set a dangerous precedent. During this nine- day conference, the only country that offered to accept European Jewish refugees was the Dominican Republic. Most countries such as the United States and Great Britain, offered excuses. Following the conference, the German government claimed that it was "astounding that the foreign countries that had openly criticized Germany for their treatment

of the Jews, but when the opportunity presented itself, shut their own doors" (USHMM, 2017). Canada's "none is too many policy" was the worst of the Western Countries. Because of Canada's policies, along with the other countries that refused to take on refugees, Nazi Germany escalated its plans to erase the Jews from history by starting with the centralization of people in ghettos to exploit Jewish labour, and moving toward dedicated Nazi concentration camps and death factories with the sole endpoint of extermination. Thus, the story of the Holocaust, and its place in history, would not be complete without considering the pushes and pulls in the history of Canada's own attitudes and policies towards their Jewish citizens and potential citizens at the time. Canada's dark past with regards to many minority groups needs to be understood in this context and retold again and again to ensure that Canadians might learn from the past. Holocaust education is built on the notion of "never again," that is, to make never again *a reality* we Canadians are also responsible for and must bring into Canadian policy discussions (and educational discussion) about the genocide of the European Jewry.

Introduction

One of the most fascinating parts of Auschwitz for Canadians is hidden in the back of Birkeneau, at the end of the fields in the forest, a large warehouse that went by the name "Kanada." I have spoken to many Auschwitz survivors who remember Kanada *fondly*. It was the place where the jewelry, money, and other belongings of the prisoners were stored. According to Abella & Troper (2012), "It represented life, luxury, and salvation; it was a Garden of Eden in Hell; it was also unreachable" (xix). The giant warehouse is as eerie as it sounds and filled to the brim of stolen goods, stolen stories and stolen memories. When I first walked into Kanada with survivors telling their stories of working in the warehouse, I was amazed by the sheer size of it. Those who worked in Kanada (and who I spoke to) said it was one of the best jobs to have in Auschwitz

because you were indoors and sheltered from sweltering Polish summers and debilitating winters. It was easier work going through luggage to find treasures, and most of all, the guards did not yell as much. Prisoners working in Kanada did not feel as though there life was as much on the line as they did in other jobs throughout the extermination centre. Abella & Troper (2012) wrote, "In effect, the barracks at Auschwitz symbolized what Canada [the country] was to all the Jews of Europe throughout the 1930s and 1940s—a paradise, enormous wealthy, overflowing and full of life; but out of bounds, a haven totally inaccessible" (xix). Canada's relationship with European (and Canadian) Jews is not a history the country should be proud of. While the Jews of Europe were being sent to their deaths, the Canadian government (safe on the opposite side of the Atlantic) decided to do nothing and had the worst record of any Western nation for taking in refugees during World War II.

Canadian Government and The Jews

The story of the Canadian government and its policy towards Jewish refugees during the Holocaust was not widespread until 1982 when Irving Abella and Harold Troper published the first edition of *None is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe 1933-1948.* They chose the title as a response to a question from a senior Canadian official who asked: How many Jews would the Canadian government allow following the war? He infamously, took his time to reflect on his answer and finally answered that "None is Too Many." Not only were the Jews of Europe being discriminated against, sent to work and labour camps, and eventually to places like Auschwitz, those that could help were also abandoning them. From 1933 to 1945, the United Kingdom opened its doors to 70,000 and permitted 125,000 into British mandated Palestine. Argentina took in 50,000, Brazil 27,000 and Australia 1,500 (Abella & Troper, 2012). The most shocking totals came from the two North American democracies. "The United States and Canada share more than a

common border and common values. They also share responsibility for the fate of the Jews of Europe" (Abella & Troper, 2012, xx). The United States took approximately 200,000 Jews, including the select of European intellectual, cultural and scientific life (Abella & Troper, 2012). Canada, on the hand, permitted less than 5,000 Jews to enter during the 12-year reign of Nazi terror.

Canadian immigration policies in the early twentieth century were more liberal than they were during the war towards Jews. Many Jewish refugees emigrated to Canada from Russia due to pogroms (Tulchinsky, 2008). However, Asians were restricted and the head tax on Chinese immigrants continued to increasingly making it more and more difficult for them to enter Canada. In 1923 an Order in Council excluded any immigrant of any Asiatic Race- except agriculturalists, farm labourers, female domestic servants and wives and children of a person legally in Canada (Tulchinsky, 2008). Canada did have a period of post World War I immigration boomed; however, they were to only be from "preferred countries" such as Northern and Western Europe, with Eastern and Southern Europe being considered "non preferred" countries. As World War II neared, Canada once again cut off immigration to Asians, Jews and other "undesirables." In fact, Canadian immigration reached its lowest of the twentieth century in 1942 at only 7,576 people (Tulchinsky, 2008). Following the war, Canada opened its door to war veterans and refugees from Europe.

The story of the *SS St. Louis* is one of the most famous in Canadian World War II history. Though, it was just one of many boats of refugees turned away at various borders forcing itself back to Germany where most of them perished in German camps. Six months after *Kristallnach* (the night of broken glass) on November 9-10, 1938, the boat sailed from Germany with 937 people, mostly Jewish, seeking asylum from Nazi Germany, and terrified for their future fate. *Kristallnacht* showed German Jews that the Nazi reign was only going to get worse for them than

just the enactment of the Nuremberg Laws. Rather the Third Reich was now using violence and force to control the Jewish population. This inevitable would be a foreshadowing of what was to come (Klein, 2014; Tulchinsky, 2008). The *SS St. Louis* originally was scheduled to arrive in Havana, Cuba. Unfortunately, by the time the ship arrived at the port, the Cuban Government had already invalidated their documents. "Jewish refugees unable to meet increasingly exorbitant amounts now demanded for permits were not allowed to disembark" (Klein, 2014). As a result, the boat set sail once more looking for safety, arriving in Canada a while later. Despite an outcry of public pleas, the "official response was unmistakable: silence" (Klein, 2014, p. xvii). The ship was not allowed to dock in Canada, and with their food and water supplies dwindling it was forced to turn around and sail back to Germany. On June 6, 1939 the *SS St. Louis* arrived back in Germany, by the end of the war only about half of those on board survived. In recent years, this ship has come to represent Canada's rigid exclusionary policies.

<u>Antisemitism in Canada</u>

Antisemitism in Canada, like most places in the world, has a colourful history. Jews first came to Canada to settle in Quebec as a part of a British Army regiment in 1751 (Robinson, 2015; Tulchinsky, 2008). These Jewish men were barred from attending, sitting or voting in the legislature simply because of their religion. Lower Canada passed an historic act in 1832 called "The Act to Grant Equal Rights and Privileges to Persons of the Jewish Religion" which afforded Jews in Lower Canada to full civil and political rights. It was the first jurisdiction in the British Empire to grant such rights to Jews (Robinson, 2015). By 1851, there were approximately 451 Jews in Canada. The majority lived in present day Quebec, and approximately 100 Jews lived in present day Ontario (Tulchinsky, 2008). By 1931 there were approximately 156,000 Jews living

in Canada, those who came from Eastern Europe had a much more difficult time being accepted by mainstream Canada because they spoke neither English nor French, and the Russian Revolution and Nazism impacted the people perceived Jews, specifically in Quebec (Robinson, 2015; Tulchinsky, 2008). Beliefs of a Jewish-led conspiracy proliferated in Quebec during the 1930s. Quebecers believed that Jews were out to dismantle the leadership of the Catholic Church in the province. Moreover, Quebec was devastated by the Great Depression – like the rest of the country – and Jews were an easy target. Consequently, they were often scapegoated and accused of controlling finances and dominating the fragile job market. Additionally, as Jews gradually integrated into English-speaking society, they represented – along with Anglophone Protestants – increasing domination of the English language, which was perceived by Quebecers as a "symbol of misery and submission." During the 1920s and 30s, Canadian organizations such as the Social Credit Party and the Native Sons of Canada were public about their antisemitic views (Tulchinsky, 2008). Jews were also subject to job discrimination and admission quotas at universities across the country. The Depression during the 1930's, faced by Quebec as elsewhere, had an impact on political discourse. Ontario's Jewish population numbered approximately 45,000 individuals who were mostly centered in Toronto and surrounding areas. Jews were prevented from holding positions of authority in banks, educational institutions, and other professional associations. Ontario Jews were also subject to antisemitic discrimination in social and recreational arenas. Signs reading "Christians Only Need Apply," "Gentiles Only," and "No Jews Wanted" appeared in certain areas of the popular vacation spot, Toronto Island, as well as at various resorts along Lake Ontario (Robinson, 2015; Tulchinsky, 2008). As the war continued on antisemitism in Canada increased which led to riots across Toronto and Quebec and an overall feeling of uneasiness for Canadian Jews.

During the Nazi regime, Canada and the United States were facing their own domestic issues, they were in the middle of the great depression, and thousands were unemployed. As a result both countries had restrictions on immigration that had never been so severe (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. xxi). Unfortunately, for the Jews, never had they been so desperate for a ticket out of Europe and into safety. Once the Nazi government took over, immigration offices all over Canada and the United States were flooded with applications from Europeans Jews looking for an asylum. Unfortunately, the immigration quotas in the United States were so strict to all but a few who were deemed intellectually or culturally elite (Klein, 2014). Canada, at the time was only allowing immigrants with special permits to enter, and those permits were few and far between (Klein, 2014). Canada, when it became absolutely necessary economically, would permit immigrants to enter the country. The government had a ranking system of desired immigrants who came from Northern and Central Europe and the United States (Abella & Troper, 2012). It was only during times of prosperity and success that the country would permit less desired immigrants. Those that came during the Great Depression worked mostly in the mines, forests, and farms of Canada's interior. The Canadian government had a national vision of how its country's ethnic make up should look, and at the bottom of those lists were Jews, Asians and Blacks (Abella & Troper, 2012; Klein, 2014; Tulchinsky, 2008). When Jews did try to gain entry into Canada at the onset of the Holocaust they were met with the same response, "Unfortunately, though we greatly sympathize with your circumstances, at present you cannot be admitted. Please try some other country" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. xxi). Rarely were they admitted elsewhere. It soon became clear that no one wanted to take Jews, which only gave the Nazi party more fuel for their fire. While the government was able to blame their immigration restrictions on the depression and the thousands of native-born Canadians that were unemployed, critics believed that this was too easy

(Klein, 2014; Tulchinsky, 2008). Even after the outbreak of the war, even after the world knew

about Dachau and the ghettos, Canada did not break its rigid policies. The Canadian government

was decidedly antisemitic, which was clear despite the economic situation.

<u>Governmental Policies</u>

When the Liberal Party, headed by William Lyon Mackenzie King, came to power in 1935,

the immigration branch was placed within the Department of Mines and Resources. The head of

the branch was Frederick Charles Blair, a strict, no-nonsense rule abiding man (Abella & Troper,

2012; Klein, 2014). The Immigration Branch had been shuttled from department to department

when the rules imposed on immigration became too strict for anyone to be allowed entry into the

company.   Since the policy on immigration remained tough, it was not a priority for the

government; thus the immigration department did not matter to King. The Department of Mines

and Resources cared little for humanitarian relief and "its priorities had everything to do with need

for labour" (Klein, 2014, p. 23). The Minister of Mines and Resources was Thomas Crerar, a man

working far past his prime had little knowledge on immigration and decidedly did not care, thus

handing all his power over to Blair. Blair took the power he was given and ran with it, essentially

creating a one man wrecking crew. He personally went through every single application,

determining who he thought would be a "good Canadian." For the Jewish population of Europe,

this was less than good news, Blair was antisemitic, and closed-minded. Blair would openly

express his negative feelings towards the Jewish population. Interestingly enough, he saw them

both as "threatening, people that can organize their affairs better than other people" (Abella &

Troper, 2012, p. 8) and "selfish, inassimilable, and never happy until they the whole lot" (Abella

& Troper, 2012, p. 8). He staunchly believed that Canadians should be British or North European

and that most people should be kept out (Abella & Troper, 2012). Blair warned Crerar several times that if Canada opened its door, even a little, it was in danger of being "flooded with Jewish people" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 8), which was worse than hell for him. The most telling part of his policies, was the pride that he associated with them stating, "Pressure on the part of the Jewish people to get into Canada has never been greater than it is now, and I am glad to be able to add, after 35 years of experience here, it was never so well controlled" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 8). Blair's contempt for the Jewish population was never ending. He firmly believed that Canada was a better place without them.

While Blair infused his antisemitic beliefs and tendencies into the government, he personally believed that by keeping Jews out of Canada he was doing them a favour (Abella & Troper, 2012). He maintained that, "The arrival of Jews would create antisemitism in Canada, undermine the security of the existing Canadian Jewish community and little benefitting the new arrival" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 8). When he was called publically an antisemite he vehemently denied it, claiming that those who called him one did so as a "self-serving motive" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 9). Abella & Troper (2012) cite Blair's comment, "I am sure the treatment of Canada by Jewish people in no way warrants the charge of Anti Semitism. I suggest that those who hold such a view are putting it forward on the ground of our past history but probably as an argument in favour of an open door policy, which under present economic conditions is impossible to adopt" (p. 9). Even though Blair's power within his own department was boundless it would be simplistic to blame him alone for Canada's position towards Jewish refugees. He, of course, was just complying to orders of those above him in the government. King, during his first tenure of Prime Minister in the 1920s and again after 1935, regardless of the economic situation was very firm in his decision to not allow Jews to enter Canada.

The Evian Conference, which took place in the summer of 1938 in France, had delegates from thirty-two countries to discuss the ongoing refugee situation. The conference lasted a week, and most countries gave excuse after excuse as to why they could not accept refugees, mostly citing economic hardships (Bergen, 2009; Friedlander, 2009; Klein, 2014). The only country that agreed to take on a substantial amount of Jewish refugees was the tiny island of the Dominican Republic (Abella & Troper, 2012; Klein, 2014). The only somewhat positive notion that came out of this conference was that it created the Intergovernmental Committee of Refugees (ICR), which was designed to work on the ongoing refugee problem. Unfortunately, if no countries were willing to accept any there was very little the committee could accomplish. Most member states ignored the refugee situation, or lamented that it was not as serious as some made it out to be, and still others believed that the problem would solve itself (Abella & Troper, 2012). Chaim Weizmann, the man who would eventually become the first President of Israel stated, "The world, seemed to be divided into two parts, those places where the Jew could not live and those where the Jew could not enter" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 4). The Evian Conference showed Nazi Germany that no one wanted the Jews; thus, they could do with them what they pleased. Germany believed that the rest of the world shared their beliefs about the Jewish population and giving them complete power justify their anti-Jewish policies (Abella & Troper, 2012; Klein, 2014). Jews around the world knew that they were alone, no one would be their "knight in shining armour"; Jews desperately needed to change their own fate.

Shortly after the Evian Conference, Crerar, Blair and the rest of the immigration branch met to discuss the refugee policies the country had adopted. Crerar, who at first was uninterested in immigration, had begun following the plight of the European Jewry and soon began to feel intense pity for them (Abella & Troper, 2012). The news reports were all over mainstream

Canadian media, with editorials being featured in most newspapers focusing on situation in Germany (Grzyb, 2014, in Klein, 2014). Crerar came into this meeting with the intention of changing the immigration policies to allow more refugees to enter the country "although great care should be taken we probably should admit more of these unfortunate people on humanitarian grounds" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 32). Regrettably, for both Crerar and the refugees it was too little too late. Though Crerar had the best intentions, he was too naïve for Blair and his staff of immigration experts. Blair had somehow managed to convince Crerar not to loosen the purse strings on the policies but in fact tighten them. By the end of the day the necessary capital required by immigrants for entry into Canada was increased from $10,000 to $15,000 (Abella & Troper, 2012). For many of the Jews of Europe that was almost an impossible sum of money and Blair's power was transformative within his department.

Looking at Canadian immigration policies during the Holocaust illustrates the role that nationalism played in countries that could have helped the Jews, but choose not to. Antisemitism was not just a European phenomenon and when trying to analyze the scale of the event, historians must look at international reactions. While, many of the countries involved in the Holocaust recognized it shortly after, it took Canada a long time to come to terms with its own racist history and to visibly admit this history to its citizens by erecting a memorial in the nation's capital to commemorate those who died. It is of great significance to delve deeper into Canadian immigration policies and show its citizens how the country started and how it slowly became known for being a more accepting nation-state — when clearly it did not start out that way.

Antisemitism in public spaces in Canada

When Canadian immigration officials did allow admittance to those immigrants who were further down their preference list, the government hoped the immigrants would settle in the farmlands, out of sight, and "risking life and limb in the mines and smelters of the west and north, [or be] holed up in lumber camps deep in the forest or farming the more marginal areas of the western wheat frontier" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 5). Historically, Jews were city people, interested in business, law and medicine (Bergen, 2009). This very fact made Jews the worst offenders for Canadian immigration officials. Even when Jewish immigrants did request to work on farms or in the agricultural sector, the officials believed it was impossible to keep them out of sight, as every attempt in history to do that had failed. "Somehow 'the Jew' always made his way to the city" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 6). Canadian immigration authorities did everything they could during the war years to shut off Canada from the world migrations of refugees in a great time of need.

The situation in Canada was increasingly worse for Jews. Antisemitism following World War I was growing. This was reflected both in proto-fascist movements and in entrenched in attitudes and policies (Bialystock, 2010). Jews in Canada were beginning to face discrimination more in public life than they had before including universities beginning to establish quotas on Jewish students. Ira MacKay, Dean of Arts, at McGill University in Montreal maintained that, "the simple truth is that the Jewish people are of no use to us in this country and as a race of men their traditions and practices do not fit in with a high civilization in a very new country" (Tulchinsky, 2008, p. 318). MacKay, without a substantial amount of effort was able to convince the university's administration to require Jews to have high school averages of 75% (compared to the 60% for Gentiles) and to limit Jewish enrollment within the arts faculty to 20% of all students

(Tulchinsky, 2008, p. 318). Soon after these changes were made McGill's other faculties developed quotas of their own and by 1939 Jewish presence had declined in the major faculties of arts, law, and medicine.

After 1920, the University of Toronto's Jewish enrollment in medical school was increasing, so much so that by 1930 Jews made up more than 25% of total enrollment (Tulchinsky, 2008). This statistic began to concern both university senior officials and the general public, so much so that many people wrote letters of complaints to the university to ensure they rectified the situation (Tulchinsky, 2008). About a decade later, when Jewish discrimination was at an all time high, the faculty of medicine followed McGill's lead and created a quota for Jewish students. Medical schools had the lowest quota for Jewish students in the country, but it was interning that created the biggest problem for Jews. The internship became so restricted, that they were forced to move to the United States to complete their training, and many of them never came back (Tulchinsky, 2008).

Not only were Jews not allowed to enter universities as students, they were banned from being faculty members as well; the future was desolate (Grzyb, 2014 in Klein, 2014). These antisemitic attitudes were not just reflected in official policies, but in attitudes as well. Jews were no longer allowed to join fraternities and sororities, which created a volatile environment for Jewish students (Tulchinsky, 2008). Canadian universities policies mirrored those of the federal government: "keep the Jew out". Bialystock (1988) observed "In the interwar period and increasingly in the 1930s antisemitism had become a constant in Canadian society. It was not confined to win one region, nor was it promoted by one dominant movement" (p. 19). As mentioned earlier, Jews in Canada were discriminated against in all facets of life, education, employment and civil involvement.

When the Canadian public knew the immigration policies there was very few outcries. Most Canadians were focused on their own well-being and during the depression this was understandable. The most vocal criticism came from Canadian Jewish community, unfortunately, "it was small, politically weak and its protest barely heard" (Abella & Troper, 2012, p. 9). The Jewish community in Canada was only 1.48% of the total Canadian population at the time, which was actually higher than the percentage of Jews in Germany at the time, and in government only three members of parliament were Jewish. Thus, their voice was barely heard both before the war and during it. In the 1920s and 1930s when Jews were admitted into Canada they were considered working class citizens, and as a result were not able to change the persistent attitudes that Jews were not hard working, and did not want to properly contribute to Canadian society (Klein, 2014). The Jewish Community was not strong enough to break its way into domestic issues (Abella & Troper, 2012). This was stressful for the Jews of Canada, as those in Europe were not just people they shared a heritage with, rather they were friends and family with whom they had close relationships. As Abella & Troper (2012) so widely observed, to the Jews of Canada, "the oppressed [in Europe] had names and faces; each was a father, a sister a cousin or friend" (23). Most Canadian Jews looked to their elected officials and the community leaders from the Canadian Jewish Congress to increase immigration possibilities. Despite the desperate pleas from their European relatives, Canadian Jews could do nothing to break down the barriers that Blair and his staff had imposed.

Canadian Press and The Holocaust

One of the biggest questions to be answered is what did the general public know about the war, and did they care? While it can be difficult to determine how much Canadians cared about the war, through newspaper archival research it is evident that they were made aware of the

situation fairly early on in 1933 when Hitler took power. The Anglo Canadian press immediately started following Nazi Germany; however, it was undetermined the importance of it and how much of an effect the new government would have (Grzyb, in Klein, 2014). When the Nuremberg Laws were enacted in 1935, and as the Jews began to be stripped of more rights in Germany, *The Star* in Toronto splashed their front pages with fascinating headlines covering the complete assault on the Germany Jewry (Grzyb, in Klein, 2014). *The Star* was known for its anti Nazi coverage, and was one of the more liberal newspapers in Canada during the war. Even the more traditionally conservative newspapers carried extensive coverage of the situation overseas; however, the tone was more positive (Grzyb, 2014, in Klein, 2014). In fact, shortly after Hitler's rise to power, the *Montreal Gazette* and the *Toronto Globe* "published a number of articles by Erland Enchlin, who was said to have admired Hitler's record of achievement and portrayed Hitler as commanding total support if not adulation of Germans of all ages" (Grzyb, in Klein, 2014, p. 59). At one point the *Toronto Star* "ran a story that assigned part of the blame for Nazi antisemitism to the behavior of the Jews" (Grzyb, in Klein, 2014). The mainstream newspapers did not have a lack of coverage of the situation in Germany; however, they lacked a clearcut view. It could be said that through the press in Canada the Nazis were viewed as "grey" (Bialystock, 2010).

While Canadians, through editorials and other means were compassionate it was difficult for them to really understand what was happening so far away from their own safety. As Grzyb (2014) writes, "there was very little to connect the reader to singular narrative that would give a relatable, individual face to mass suffering. The only exceptions were periodic reports of suicide in which a Jewish victim might be named and individualized" (p. 85). Some speculated that the Canadian community developed "compassion fatigue" from reading story after story unable to do anything or truly make sense of the situation. A poll was taken in Canada that, "showed that articles

had the inadvertent effect of objectifying European Jews of describing mass violence so pervasive and so prolific that it had the potential to overwhelm Canadian readers with a sense of hopelessness or inevitability" (Grzyb, 2014, in Klein, 2014, p. 85). The English press ensured that throughout the war Canadians were aware of the plight of the European Jewry. Unfortunately it was not enough to lobby the government to help those abroad.

Following the war, despite all the press coverage of the camps, Canadians remained staunchly antisemitic. In fact, "in an October 1946 Gallup Poll that asked respondents to list nationalities they would like to keep out of Canada. Jews were deemed the second least desirable immigrants" (Tulchinsky, 2008, p. 403). When high ranking officials in the government wrote home of "black marketing, dirty living habits and the general slovenliness of the Jewish Holocaust survivors in German Displaced Persons Camps" (Tulchinsky, 2008, p. 403), it certainly did little to increase the compassion of the Canadian population and the desire to allow refugees into Canada. Between 1945 and 1947 the Canadian government barely changed their pre-war immigration and refugee policies and Jewish community leaders within the country had "resigned themselves to the fact that immigration policies were not going to be changed sufficiently to allow more than a token number of the surviving refugees seeking admission" (Bialystock, 2010, p. 16). Fortunately, in 1947 Mackenzie King rose in the House of Commons to share the government's new view on immigration. He stated, "The policy of the government is to foster the growth of the population of Canada by encouragement of immigration. The government will seek by legislation, regulation and various administration, to ensure the careful selection and permanent settlement of such numbers of immigrants as can be advantageously absorbed in our national economy" (Bialystock, 2010, p. 42). Canadian Jewish community leaders sighed in relief realizing that their home could finally help their relatives and friends overseas. The Canadian Jewish Congress went

to work to develop projects that would see Canada finally becoming a safe haven for European Jews. The first was that the council would sponsor 1000 Jewish orphans, and the second was a "submission to the government to allow carpenters, needle-trade works and other workers in which Jews specialize to enter the country" (Bialystock, 2010, p. 43). These two initiatives in the end brought over 3000 survivors and their children to Canada between 1947 and 1949. The Canadian government was finally living up to its expectations as a place of salvation for refugees.

Postwar Policies

The new Canadian policy on immigration that King introduced in 1947 was based on six considerations, "it was required for population growth; it was required for economic development; it was to be selective; it had to be related to 'absorptive capacity'; it was a national prerogative; and it was not intended to distorted the present character of the Canadian population meaning that the restriction on Asian immigration would remain" (Bialystock, 2010, p. 44). The Canadian government also decided, along with other democratic nations, to adopt a more humanitarian response, which was how the displaced persons were allowed into the country (Bialystock, 2010). Between 1947 and 1960 Canada admitted 46,000 Jewish immigrants. What is perhaps most interesting to note is that while Canada had the worst record during the pre-war and war years of accepting refugees, the numbers of Jews Canada admitted following the war amounted to a greater proportion of the greater population than any other country, including the United States (Tulchinsky, 2008). Tulchsinky (2008) shared, "By 1990 Holocaust survivors compromised about 8% of the United States Jewish population; in Canada, they accounted for between 30% and 40% of the total Jewish population by the same date" (p. 422). The policies enacted following the end

of World War II was the beginning of Canada becoming a leader in humanitarian action and a safe haven for democracy and refugees.

Slowly after the Holocaust, the vehement antisemitism that existed in Canada during the war began to subside. New human rights acts and government action lead anti-discrimination laws allowed that Jews to reenter universities, professional life and social areas such as golf clubs that had previously been off limits for them. The post-war economic boom lent itself to the Jewish community's growth in terms of institutions (Bialystock 2010; Tulchinsky, 2008). By 1970, Holocaust survivors in Canada were well integrated in all aspects of Canadian life. Many became successful professionals and many of them started businesses, got married, had children, and started recreating a new life from nothing. Many Canadian Jews were finally feeling as though they belonged in Canada. The Eichmann Trials brought the Holocaust into the public eye once again, but this time Canadians yearned to learn more about what happened, they wanted to hear the stories and so the Holocaust become encapsulated as a part of Canadian life.

The Holocaust became a part of Canadian identity and memory of its people so much so that by 1980 almost every major city had a Holocaust memorial service and a monument to the victims who were lost (Bialystock, 2010). Survivors began to tell their stories and public Holocaust education became prominent in Toronto and Montreal. The political and cultural landscape was beginning to change; however, just as Canadian Jews began to feel safe again Holocaust denial within the country ran rampant. Though, the Holocaust denial movement began in the Western world following the Nuremberg Trials it did not reach mainstream Canadian society until decades later.

Holocaust Denial in Canada

There have been four notorious Holocaust deniers in Canada in the last 40 years, and three of them were educators in the public school system: James Keegstra, Malcolm Ross, and Paul Fromm. All three were Holocaust deniers who brought various aspects of their beliefs into the public school classroom. The fourth was Ernst Zundel. He was not a teacher but a "public pedagogue" who printed newspapers on the subject. When Holocaust denial is introduced either directly or indirectly into the classroom it affects students understanding of history and prejudice. Holocaust denying educators present themselves as advocates of free speech and that they are searching for the truth (Cohen-Almagor, 2008, p. 218). James Keegstra, taught in Eckville, Alberta from 1968 to 1982, when he was fired on the grounds of "failing to follow the education departments social studies curriculum" (Cohen-Almagor, 2008, p. 218). His main divergence was that he taught history from the perspective of the Institute for Historical Review. The Institute for Historical Review was founded with the sole purpose of reviewing the historical truth that is the Jewish Holocaust (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). Keegstra taught his students that the Jews were the devil, and that there was an "all-encompassing Jewish conspiracy to undermine Christianity and control the world (Cohen-Almagor, 2008, p. 221). Keegstra's students were expected to recite these teachings in class and on exams, otherwise their grades suffered immensely.

Keegstra's students came to believe that Judaism and Christianity were mortal enemies, and that the Talmud is perverted and evil. None of his students had ever met a Jew, and thus they truly came to the belief that they were the devil incarnated. In 1984, James Keegstra was charged under the Criminal Code of Canada for "willingly promoting hatred against an identifiable group" (Criminal Code of Canada, 1985). He appealed the decision, maintaining that this "charge violated his freedom of expression under section 2b of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms" (Cohen-

Almagor, 2008, p. 222).   The Court determined that his argument was limited under section 1 of the Charter, where "the expression involves the promotion of hatred against an identifiable group" (Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, 1982). The Court limited his freedom of expression as a result of the harm that can flow from hate propaganda. James Keegstra is the only teacher in Alberta to ever be fully expelled from teaching in an accredited school after having his teaching license revoked in 1984 (Cohen-Almagor, 2008).   The Board of Education's legal representative stated, "to have a doctrine of hate taught to students is not only a betrayal of the trust and respect accorded teachers, but it is a betrayal of the hopes of society for a better future" (Cohen-Almagor, 2008, p. 222).   Keegstra's deep-seated hatred for the Jews characterized him as an enemy of democratic education.

Unlike Keegstra, Malcolm Ross did not bring his controversial views into the classroom; however, throughout his time as an educator he made several public appearances alleging that the Holocaust was a hoax. Ross, who was executive director of the Maritime branch of the Christian Defense League, worked as a resource teacher for grade seven to nine language and math students in Moncton, New Brunswick from 1976 to 1991 (Cohen-Almagor, 2008; Grobman & Shermer, 2000). Ross "denounced the Jews as the synagogue of Satan alleging that Christianity was under attack as a result of an international conspiracy headed by the Jews" (Cohen-Almagor, 2008, p. 226). He maintained on public radio that the Anne Frank diary was a fraud, the Nuremberg trials were a travesty of justice and that the international Red Cross three-volume report on German concentration camps found no evidence of genocide. Ross was reprimanded by the school board in March 1988 as a result of publicly expressed concerned and warned that continued public discussion of his views could lead to further disciplinary action including dismissal (Grobman & Shermer, 2000).

Following the provincial government's refusal to charge Ross under the criminal code, David Attis, a parent of three children at the school, filed a complaint with the Human Rights Commission against the school board (Cohen Almagor, 2008; Groman & Shermer, 2000). He stated that because the school board failed to take appropriate action against Ross, they condoned his racist, discriminatory and bigoted statements. Ross was put on probation for 18 months, and noted that his employment would be immediately terminated if he published or wrote anything that mentioned a Jewish Zionist Conspiracy or attacked followers of the Jewish faith (Cohen-Almagor, 2008). The case was eventually taken to the Canadian Supreme Court who ruled that his rampant Holocaust denial and anti-Semitic publishing created a poisoned environment for his students by his very presence (Cohen-Almagor, 2008, p. 229). The Court stated that if a "poisoned environment within the school system is traceable to the off duty conduct of a teacher that is likely to produce a corresponding loss of confidence in the teacher and the system as a whole, then the off duty conduct of the teacher is relevant and should be taken into consideration" (Cohen - Almagor, 2008, p. 227). Given the high degree of publicity surrounding Ross's publications it would be reasonable to anticipate his public appearances were a factor of influencing some discriminatory conduct by students. Students in his school gave repeated evidence of continual harassment in the form of derogatory name-calling of Jewish students, and carving swastikas by other students into their own arms and into the arms of Jewish children (Cohen-Almagor, 2008). Ross was no longer allowed to teach. The court considered this restriction necessary to protect the rights and freedoms of Jewish children to have an education free from bias, prejudice, and intolerance.

Paul Fromm is the final infamous Holocaust revisionist teacher. He worked at an elementary school just outside of Toronto and he taught for the Peel District School Board for over

20 years. Paul Fromm's name is synonymous with the white supremacist movement in Canada. In 1967, he founded the Edmund Burke society — a rabidly anti-communist, anti-sex education, anti-gay, anti-immigration, anti-welfare group. The Society later became the Western Guard mostly drawing its members for the Canadian Nazi Party (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). He founded several groups opposing foreign aid to Third World nations, supporting apartheid, Holocaust denial and the eugenics movement. In 1980, Paul Fromm founded the *Canadian Association for Free Expression*, which has devoted itself to defending and supporting Holocaust deniers such as the above-mentioned James Keegstra and Malcolm Ross (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). Fromm's activity with these overtly anti-racist groups continued throughout his teaching career.

The Peel District School Board received several complaints regarding Paul Fromm as a teacher over the years, but refused to do anything about them. The board issued him two reprimands with a warning that further participation in racist activities could result in his dismissal (Cohen-Almagor, 2008). Fromm ignored this warning and continued promoting his bigoted organizations (Cohen-Almagor, 2008). Finally, in 1992, the Minister of Education appointed a lawyer to investigate Fromm's effect on the school community. The report maintained that Fromm's racist activities violated the Education Act and breached the PDSB Multicultural and Race Relations policy as well as the regulations from the Ontario Teacher's Federation. He concluded that Fromm had an adverse effect on the school community (Cohen-Almagor, 2008). Unfortunately, the school board failed to take appropriate action following this report.

The groups that Fromm was associated with make no pretense of hiding their allegiance to National Socialism, and actively promoting the view that Hitler was a great leader whose ideas of racial superiority were scientifically correct and that genocide or a holy war is necessary to preserve the white race (Cohen-Almagor, 2008). Ultimately, the Canadian Jewish Congress and

the League for Human Rights of B'nai Brith Canada succeeded in pressuring the Peel Board of Education to fire Paul from his position as an elementary school teacher in 1996. Fromm filed a union grievance against his dismissal in 2002 (Cohen-Almagor, 2008). The court, however, argued that the restrictions on Fromm's Charter rights to free speech were justifiable given his position as a role model and the requirement of all teachers to comply with the underpinning principles of education, which included multiculturalism and ethnocultural equity (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). Paul Fromm was unable to provide a safe learning environment for any student of color or minority background who became aware of his views. Fromm's presence in the Peel District School Board created an atmosphere of intimidation and fear fueled by racial tensions in the school (Cohen-Almagor, 2008).

It is clear that in each of the three cases, having a prominent and well-known Holocaust denier as a teacher had an adverse effect on the students in the classroom. There is a not a lot of information on Paul Fromm's students, but it is noted that many of Ross' students pretended to be Nazis in the playground intimidating the Jewish children. The Jewish children in Moncton at the time were terrified of going to school or taking part in any community event that Ross might attend for fear that he may hurt them. In Keegstra's case, unfortunately the impact of his teachings has been lifelong for his students. Several years later his students were interviewed and the vast majority of them continued to support Keegstra and remained angry at the way he was treated. They understood the International Jewish Conspiracy as a historical fact; the idea was not only legitimate it was an accurate depiction of reality. For example, according to Mason-Lee (1985),

> Now, I've yet to see hard evidence, other than a few guys who are Jewish coming
>
> into Eckville saying, "I'm Jewish and six million died." Mr. Keegstra has a census,
>
> and according to it there weren't even six million of them in Germany. When you

look at pictures of 2,000 bodies, how can you tell which are Jewish or German? (p. 10).

James Keegstra was eloquent and persuasive. His students were clearly impressionable, and as a result influenced by his persona and his "antiestablishment teachings." His students were so indoctrinated with his anti-Semitic views that when the replacement teacher arrived the students still defended Keegstra's harsh beliefs stating: "Hitler liberated Poland!" (Cohen-Almagor, 2008 p. 225). These cases demonstrate that educators may hold a great deal of influence over students within democratic education and they should handle such a position with understanding, empathy, and societal values.

While teaching false history is an excellent way to spread thoughts and beliefs, Ernst Zundel, the prime practitioner of Holocaust denial in Canada, went in a different direction and public neo-Nazi and anti-Holocaust writings. In the early 1980's he gave Canada the dubious distinction of being the principal source for Holocaust denial and neo-Nazi material being exported to West Germany (Grobman & Shermer, 2000; Lipstadt, 1994). Zundel, in his publications and activities, forthrightly purveyed Nazi memorabilia, advanced Nazi doctrine, and admired Nazi personalities. He sold military SS-like paraphernalia, glorified Aryan man, and was the co-author of the panegyric work, *The Hitler We Loved and Why* (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). The criminal charges brought against Zundel arose out of his publication and dissemination of two pamphlets. One publication was a thirty-two-page pamphlet entitled "Did Six Million Really Die?" It branded the Holocaust a hoax and was widely distributed throughout Canada, especially to politicians, media people, and librarians. The second one was a four-page letter entitled: "The West, War and Islam!" It advanced the notion of a conspiracy by Zionists, bankers, communists and Freemasons to control the world (Grobman & Shermer, 2000; Lipstadt, 1994). It was mailed to twelve- hundred

specific addresses in the Middle East. In the late 1970s he began running Samisdat Publishers, one of the largest distributors of Nazi and neo-Nazi propaganda and memorabilia in the world. He has also been the inspiration for and key content provider of the Zundelsite, since 1995, a leading online repository of Holocaust-denial propaganda (Grobman & Shermer, 2000; Lipstadt, 1994). Zundel's activities led to numerous trials in Canada, where he lived from 1958 to 2001. It made him subject to arrest when he returned to Germany, his country of birth. Adept at attracting media attention, Zundel apparently relished his legal battles with what he calls the "Holocaust industry" (Grobman & Shermer, 2000; Lipstadt, 1994).

In the Canadian press, opinions were divided on the wisdom of prosecuting Zundel. Some Jewish organizations lobbied strongly for his prosecution; Sabina Citron, of the Canadian Holocaust Remembrance Association, went so far as to file charges privately against Zundel under Canada's criminal code (Lipstadt, 1994). Others, however, both in the Jewish and non-Jewish communities, suggested that a trial would only provide Zundel with an opportunity to publicize his views. Legal scholars also questioned the decision to prosecute Zundel under the so-called "false news" charge (Lipstadt, 1994). To win, prosecutors had the distasteful task of "proving" that the Holocaust had occurred and the difficult task of proving that Zundel had knowingly lied when he wrote that it had not. Section 281 of the Criminal Code, which prohibits the promotion of hatred against any "identifiable group," seemed a more appropriate charge, but the statute was notoriously difficult to prosecute (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). Other criticisms were raised during the trial: for example, the prosecutor could have asked the judge to take "judicial notice" of the fact of the Holocaust; had the judge agreed to do so, the jurors would have been instructed simply to accept the historical fact of the Holocaust. In fact, the government did request judicial notice of the Holocaust, but only after it had called survivors and academics to the witness stand. The judge

subsequently refused the request, stating that once the Holocaust had been made the subject of testimony the defense deserved the opportunity to respond (Grobman & Shermer, 2000; Lipstadt, 1994). Nonetheless, Zundel was convicted on February 26, 1985, of publishing false news about the Holocaust. He was sentenced to fifteen months in jail and three years probation, during which he was prohibited from publishing on the subject. The fear that the trial would help Zundel publicize his cause was apparently merited (Grobman & Shermer, 2000).

Facing possible deportation from Canada back to his native Germany, where he would be prosecuted for his neo-Nazi and Holocaust-denying activities, Zundel immediately applied to the Canadian government for refugee status. During hearings to determine whether he would be held in custody while his refugee application was processed, he attempted to portray himself as a human rights activist rather than a white supremacist. "I am known as the Ghandi of the right," Zundel said at the hearing. "What I defend with all my heart is my ethnic group" (Grobman & Shermer, 2000, p. 111). Despite Zundel's claims, the Canadian Security Intelligence Service described him as a "lightning rod" for white supremacists, and on May 2, 2003, Canadian Citizenship and Immigration Minister Denis Coderre and Solicitor General Wayne Easter announced that under the provisions of the Canadian Immigration and Refugee Protection Act, they were issuing a "national security certificate" against Zundel. (Such certificates are issued against persons whom Canadian intelligence services deem a threat to Canada's national security or to the human rights of Canadian citizens) (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). If upheld by a Canadian federal judge, this certificate would automatically deny Zundel refugee status, and require his deportation from Canada (Grobman & Shermer, 2000). In February 2005, capping two years of legal proceedings, Canadian Federal Court Justice Pierre Blais ruled that Holocaust denier Ernst Zundel may

reasonably be described as a threat to the security of Canada; under the country's immigration laws he is therefore subject to deportation to his native Germany (Grobman & Shermer, 2000).

While the Zundel and Keegstra trials occurred simultaneously, Abella & Troper (2012) released their first edition of *None is too Many*. The Canadian Jewish community, as well as general society was finally learning the truth about Canada's submerged and subdued history with Jews. Concurrent with this event was the realization that the government had knowingly let Nazi war criminals to enter the country. This combination of events created tremendous public outrage. Many Canadians were finally letting their government know how they felt about Nazi sympathizers, anti-Semitism, and Holocaust denial.

Contemporary antisemitism in Canada

Jews in Canada are almost completely assimilated now; and they have created large community organizations through their own fundraising and their own public education efforts (Mock in Decoste and Schwartz, 2000). However, Canadians have witnessed a rise in the spread of hate propaganda and hate activity in the last two decades, which is unprecedented since before the war (Mock in Decoste and Schwartz, 2000). Antisemitism in Canada is now closely related to anti-Zionism and anti-Israel movements. There's been a shift from racial antisemitism that was prominent during World War II to one that is undeniably related to anti-Israel sentiments and pro-Palestinian movements (Antisemitism , 2016). As a result of some of conflict in the Middle East there is a perception that all Jews who support Israel are anti-Palestinian. This perceptions is not true, but, has resulted in several acts of vandalism against Jews in the last decade (Antisemitism , 2016). However, at the same time, many Jews have realigned with conservative right wing governments because they are perceived to be more friendly with Israelis (Antisemitism , 2016).

The new race politics of the 21st century are less cultural and more geographically based as it pertains to peoples of Middle Eastern decent.

The B'Nai Brith League for Human Rights monitors antisemitic issues and reports annually on these events. Since 2010, there have been several antisemitic attacks across Canada including a teenage girl being attacked, spit at and yelled at with the word "let's burn the Jews" (York, 2016). In March 2015, a Toronto police published the 2014 Annual Hate/Bias Crime Statistical Report. According to the report, the victim group most targeted in 2014 was the Jewish community, with occurrence of 30% of all the hate crimes in Toronto. The total number of reported incidents that occurred on antisemitic base was 52, which makes the Jewish community to the most targeted population to assaults (York, 2016). According to a phone survey of 510 Canadians conducted by the Anti-Defamation League in 2013-2014, an estimated 14% (+/- 4.4%) of the adult population in Canada harbor substantial antisemitic opinions (Antisemitism in Canada, 2014). It is thought that once again the Jews are being scapegoated by Western society during times of economic recession and as such antisemitism continues to be on the rise.

The history of Canadian immigration policy is closely linked to that of its multicultural policies. During World War II, Jews were considered undesirable immigrants and those already residing in Canada were restricted from universities and careers. However, half a century later, Jews are now thought of as just as "white" as Christians by the majority of Canadians (Day 2002). Canada is now domestically and "globally" understood as a bi-national-state (French and English) informed with a multicultural mosaic (new and old immigrants) where all enthnocultures are welcomed and First Nations are acknowledged original inhabitants. Although, this is somewhat of a utopian view of the country, for many minorities Canada offers peace and security that their home countries could not Canadian Jews became more assimilated into mainstream society as

Holocaust education became popularized. As such, it links the governmental policies of creating a national Holocaust memorial to Canadian understandings of its past, present, and future attitudes towards their Jewish citizens.

The lessons of the Holocaust are of undeniable significance to Canadians, as it has the power to teach Canadian's what hatred and discrimination can lead to, and the challenge of democracy in a multi-ethnic and multicultural society (Diversity Education, 2007). The study of the Holocaust, Canada's history with its Jewish residents, coupled with Canada's struggle with its own problems and challenges related to anti-Semitism, racism, and xenophobia will shed light on the issues facing our society.

As mentioned in the introduction, the Canadian government in 2014 approved designs for a national Holocaust memorial to be erected in Ottawa. This illustrates that memory, knowledge, history and policy are closely intertwined. Half a century ago, few Canadians would have even thought of spending public money on this memorial; however, as the Holocaust has become a part of Canadian historical and collective memory, the federal state has taken steps with acknowledging its own part in the tragedy and wanting to educate future generations. The purpose of the monument is "to serve as a symbol of Canadian values and diversity, and as a memorial to the innocent men, women and children who perished" (Holocaust Monument, 2015). This new monument "will ensure that the lessons of the Holocaust remain within the national consciousness" (Holocaust Monument, 2015). Through a new national memorial, citizens know that the Canadian government recognizes the importance of commemorating and honouring the survivors one of the most horrific events in 20th century, regardless of where it took place.

CHAPTER 7:
PUTTING THE PIECES TOGETHER

Do I want to Remember?

Do I want to remember?
        The peaceful ghetto, before the raid:
Children shaking like leaves in the wind.
        Mothers searching for a piece of
        bread.
Shadows, on swollen legs, moving with fear.
        No, I don't want to remember, but
        how can I forget?
Do I want to remember, the creation of hell?
        The shouts of the Raiders, enjoying
        the hunt.
Cries of the wounded, begging for life.
        Faces of mothers carved with pain.
Hiding Children, dripping with fear.
        No, I don't want to remember, but
        how can I forget?
Do I want to remember, my fearful return?
        Families vanished in the midst of the
        day.
The mass grave steaming with vapor of
blood.
        Mothers searching for children in
        vain.
The pain of the ghetto, cuts like a knife.
        No, I don't want to remember, but
        how can I forget?
Do I want to remember, the wailing of the
night?
        The doors kicked ajar, ripped
        feathers floating the air.
The night scented with snow-melting blood.

While the compassionate moon, is
        showing the way.
For the faceless shadows, searching for kin.
        No, I don't want to remember, but I
        cannot forget.
Do I want to remember this world upside
down?
        Where the departed are blessed with
        an instant death.
While the living condemned to a short
wretched life,
        And a long tortuous journey into
        unnamed place,
Converting Living Souls, into ashes and gas.
        No. I Have to Remember and Never
        Let You Forget.

- **Alexander Kimel**

The role of memorials in public pedagogy, education and history is critical to understanding the past in an abstract and meaningful way. Memorials provide society with the opportunity to construct and reconstruct their own meanings about historical events based on the space and artistic representation of the memorial. Throughout this thesis I commented on the role of public pedagogy, geopolitical boundaries and how memorials are used to educate. Geopolitics played a huge role in the Holocaust as it happened throughout Eastern Europe but Berlin controlled it. The Nazis had concentration camps throughout Germany, but Poland was the epicentre of the Holocaust where more than 3 million people were exterminated. Poland, itself was occupied and annexed by Nazi Germany and as such had no power to change or stop anything. The death camps were all placed in Poland, five out of the six memorials that I discussed were in "Poland,[20]" although according to the geopolitics at the time it was not considered Poland but Greater Germany, that is, the Third Reich. The last memorial that I refer to, the Berlin Memorial to Murdered Jews of Europe, is in the centre of the city where Hitler ruled and the space where it all began. Public education via memorials and how visitors experience education depends on the narratives of those who created the memorials and those who go and visit them.

When I started this thesis I wanted to explore how memorials were designed and what their purpose was. What I learned was so much more. It took me on a deep exploration of geopolitical and sociocultural boundaries of World War II. I had to consider politics and culture impacted the design of the memorials and who they were created for. For example, Majdanek's

---

[20] Poland was partitioned and the end of World War I. In September of 1939 Germany occupied Poland, controlling all its governmental decisions and policies. The German-Soviet Pact enabled Germany to attack Poland on September 1, 1939, without fear of Soviet intervention. On September 3, 1939, Britain and France, having guaranteed to protect Poland's borders five months earlier, declared war on Germany.

memorial was built by the Soviets for Soviet prisoners of War before it was built for Jewish victims. This understanding led me to learn more about the politics of Holocaust remembrance within Poland itself and how even today it is a controversial topic. As a result, I felt the need to really make sense of what the Holocaust was, who it was for and why all of that mattered. Without this greater understanding, the memorials themselves made little sense to me. I began to understand why the memorial in Berlin is located where it is and the significance of the size. The Berlin memorial is a product of its time and built 60 years after the liberation of Auschwitz. The German state *wanted* to remember the genocide that it had caused. Therefore, the government gave it a huge space in the middle of the downtown core. The Warsaw Ghetto memorial, on the other hand, was built only a few years following the war, and while it is quite tall, it does not quite take up the same amount of space.

Learning about memorials is also about understanding what makes up nationalism and ideas of a nation. In my introduction I discussed how nationalism is an extremely powerful force that has the ability to divide and unite nations together. It was one of the causes of World War I, and one of Hitler's reasons for taking over Germany. Hitler was extremely nationalistic towards his motherland and believed that Germany should rise above all other nations (Bergen, 2009; Snyder, 2015). Nationalism's role in the Holocaust should not be minimized. German nationalism that developed before World War II was a huge motivation behind many Germans to join the Nazi party. Hitler's charm persuaded them to believe in his ideals and the importance of Germany as the motherland. As a result of World War I and the economic downturn that Germany had experienced, Germans were looking for something to believe in, something that would turn their situations around. The Nazis targeted the Jews, allowing the rest of Germany to unite under a common umbrella and see the Jews as the outcasts and how they were used as the reason for

World War I and why Germany lost the war. The Nazis told people to blame the Jews because a few Jewish citizens were still wealthy, whereas everyone else was suffering. Hitler was able to unify Germany based on a common enemy. As a result, a new form of German nationalism was born, one that hated the other, and a government that told the people to represent and preserve national interest first and foremost. At the time, German citizens were being told that the Jewish people threatened national security.

The Third Reich was an immeasurably strong nationalist government. Germany sought to create an empire of people that all looked, sounded and acted alike. Delving more into ideas of statehood and nationalism helped me make sense of some of the politics surrounding Auschwitz, for which both Jewish and Polish people have wanted to take ownership of. All victim groups were in a sense nations or part of a nation and each one wanted to take ownership of the Holocaust, claim it as its own tragedy, and represent the event as if no one else could possibly understand. As a result of the strong nationalistic ideals that have existed in Europe, it is easy to see why Holocaust history is as complicated and political as it is. Throughout researching and visiting the history of the memorials, I was able to learn about the role that nationalism played during the Holocaust and its aftermath.

Nationalism, also plays an important role when trying to understand Canada's role in the Holocaust and its relationship with Jewish people. Canada, at the time of the war was being run by an extremely right wing government who believed that anyone not from Northern Europe was not suitable to be a Canadian citizen. Canada's immigration policy was such that only very specific people were granted entry, and even then had to pay a large head tax. While Canadians have been very receptive to Holocaust education, there are still a number of aggressive deniers living in Canada. In June of 2016 a Jasper, Alberta, resident published a Youtube video that tells

viewers why the Holocaust did not happen. A few years ago, this particular Holocaust denier was a Green Party candidate in Jasper spewing this hatred throughout her political campaign (Clarke, 2016). A friend of mine, the grandchild of two Holocaust survivors lives in Jasper. Every day when this woman passes by her, she tells her that her family is composed of liars, and refers to the Holocaust as "6 million lies." These people are the reason that we must look at Canada as a nation, and what kind of identity as a nation we want to portray. Illustrating the importance of understanding past policies so that we may change the future. In April of 2014 the Conservative government of Canada agreed to fund a national Holocaust monument in Ottawa to help change our narrative of remembrance to a positive one. And yet, despite this massive undertaking, there are still citizens telling my friends and family that the stories are not real; however, the Holocaust was, and is one, of the most highly researched and empirically substantiated events in history.

People who choose to spend time experiencing memorials are the only ones who experience them. Unlike taking a mandatory history course to learn about the Holocaust, people choose to participate in public education through memorials. Visitors make a deliberate decision to enter the space and spend time trying to understand it. Of course, many of the memorials dedicated to the Holocaust are in public spaces in which connects parts of the city together; making it impossible to avoid. However, not everyone who walks by will make an effort to engage with the space. When thinking about memorials, it is critical to remember that it is always related to the present and as such it is always changing. I have been to these memorials several times, and every time I am able to engage with them in a slightly different manner because I myself am in a different space in my own life. Each time I come back with new understandings of the past, and connect that to the memorials. The first time I visited Majdanek I was still a teenager, and I laughed my way through the site because I did not know how to react. I recall leaving the gas

chambers and my only reaction was to run away and laugh. It was all far too overwhelming. I was immature and had not quite learned to make sense of my own emotions. The next time I visited Majdanek, five years had passed and I was able to look at the entire experience through new eyes. I had more control of my emotions and was able to encounter the space in a more profound way. I recall slowly making my way through the gas chambers and crematorium. This time I was thinking of survivor stories and their families who were murdered there. My most recent visit to the camp was in May 2016, and part of working on this thesis for a few years. I was able to have a deeper experience by recalling theories of memory, memorials and public education.

Also, in May 2016, I noticed more Polish school groups at the camps and asked my tour guides about the ages of the students and theories of why children as young as 12 year olds were visiting. My tour guide, with a thick Polish accent, told me that in order to learn from the horrors of the Holocaust we must educate young. We must also allow students to visit multiple times so that each time they are faced with new knowledge to scaffold their education. The first time they visit the Auschwitz guides take them into a couple of the barracks and explain the significance of them, and the second time they visit they can learn about Dr. Mengele and the evil medical experiments he performed on twins and prisoners alike. Finally, in their high school years they enter the gas chambers, and go to Birkenau to see the decimated crematoria. Through these very carefully planned out visits, Polish students are able to slowly gain an appreciation of what their country has gone through. The role of public pedagogy allows visitors to memorials to connect classroom learning with real life engagement.

Collective memory has the ability to be shared and constructed by small groups. Memory is not stagnant and because it can be transformed and changed by new experiences it affords people the opportunity to grow with each life event. My Holocaust education journey started

before I can even remember. My mother likes to say that I knew that Hitler was evil before I knew what evil meant. My memories of learning about the Holocaust all blend together. The one continuity my memory retains is with my mother, my grandmother and the faces of the family that I never had the opportunity to meet. As I got older Holocaust education shifted from story books about German and Jewish girls who could not be friends anymore to making sense of zyklon B poisoning thousands of people at once. The letter that my mother found that my great-grandmother had written to my grandmother in 1942 has stuck with me since the first day my mother showed it to me when I was ten years old. It is the personalization of the letter that brings The Holocaust to life for me. I have been at events where my mother has shared the letter with hundreds of people, and I have been places where there are only twenty- five people around. Each time the collective group reconstructs my grandmother's story for me. I am able to think about my own connection to the Holocaust in a new way. The letter, which is my only tangible connection to the Holocaust, has become a part of my identity.

I have been privileged enough to have led Holocaust education trips for several years. My groups and I travel through Germany and Poland learning about the Holocaust, and trying to bring its undeniable lessons back to our own communities in Canada. In May of 2016 I was granted the opportunity to be the lead staffer on the program after many years of being a supporting member. My very first thought was that I was now going to be responsible for reading my great-grandmother's letter. My mother, the director of the program, would not be with us. I wondered if I could do this, and if my voice would be as connected to it as my mother's. I did not know if I had earned the opportunity, my mother told me it was just as much my story as hers and I would be fine. The first few days of the trip I was focused on my students, and all of the sites we were going to be visiting. On my reflection time I could not help but think about how I was going to

read this letter, and if I could get through it without being emotional. It was a chilly May day as we boarded the bus from Warsaw to Rabka. Driving through Poland, most people would not even know they had passed Rabka. It's a small town right off the highway. However, this town was where Nazis trained their soldiers in how to kill people.

In the forest in Rabka is a fairly large fenced off area where thousands of Jews were shot into open graves. This place was very similar to where my great-grandmother was murdered. I gathered my group and I began to read the letter. I spoke two words out loud before I began to cry. With the emotional support of my co-staff, one Holocaust survivor and thirty incredible students I was able to finish reading. I looked up and did not see a dry eye surrounding me. Using personal stories within a place of remembrance really helps to being history alive. Memorials can be used to affect people in several ways, including an emotional one. The Holocaust survivor on my program told me that even though most of the students with us did not have a personal connection to the Holocaust, I had just provided them with one. My own ability to be vulnerable allowed people to connect to a space in an intangible way. Memorials have the ability to transform us, and standing in the Rabka forest illustrated that for me. The Holocaust cannot be taught without emotion, because the greatest teachers we have are those that were there. The small group that I was with that day taught me the value of vulnerability, and how educating the public through the use of important spaces is irreplaceable.

Pierre Nora discusses the *les lieux de memoire* or the moment where history becomes transformed through memory into something; where memory becomes magic. I feel as though walking the road from Auschwitz to Birkenau, the same road that prisoners marched on their way to the deaths, allowed me to fully understand Nora's theory and beliefs about memory. The historical significance of the death marches, and all the books that I had read, documentaries that

I watched, and survivor stories that I had listened to were finally beginning to make sense to me. I was able to take the importance of the historical space and event and with my own memories of survivors stories create this magical place between history and memory. I was able to develop a new understanding of history itself, by not placing myself in the shoes of the prisoners, but rather establishing a relationship with the space. The relationship between history and memory is a struggle between the objective and the subjective feelings. However, memorials provide the perfect example that they can coexist in an academic and emotional world. Together, the two provide the (in) complete stories of our past. For, without a historical understanding of a memorial it would be hard for visitors to make sense of what they were looking at and experiencing. Additionally, without stories of the past, it can be difficult to connect with history.

Although the Berlin Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe does not have an information plaque nearby, the name of the memorial allows visitors to connect with its historical significance. The Berlin memorial, in particular, creates a prime example of where memory and history meet because it is so abstract. The space gives visitors the opportunity to use their own Holocaust history knowledge to create a personal narrative that they can connect strongly with. Holocaust education with textbooks is a slew of numbers and death statistics, policies that can be difficult to understand, and political ideologies and facts. Holocaust education through memorials is connected, personal, and brings the stories to life of those involved in it. The train tracks at Grunwald station in Berlin, where Jews were deported is a memorial today. The tracks are no longer in use, and instead there are plaques up and down with the deportation destination and numbers engraved on them. The numbers are able to come to life when visiting the train tracks because it is easy to imagine cattle cars filled with people leaving the city. In history, the bare

facts and raw numbers do not provide the same opportunity as the lived-experience for people to engage with them with all their senses, cognitions and feelings in context.

The idea of "What is 6 million?" has come up several times within field of Holocaust education. People cannot visualize what it means, because the number is so vast and massive it can be difficult make sense of it. However, when the number is broken down into individual stories and the memories of people who were there it becomes more manageable to understand. Public pedagogy that focuses on the teaching and learning in various public spaces and, according to Ellsworth (2004) "encourage[s] us to think of pedagogy not in a relation to knowledge as a thing made but to knowledge in the making, which opens an exploration into the experiences of the learning self" (pp. 1- 2).

Through visiting memorials, visitors are encouraged to explore their own narratives, and their own understandings of history, thus creating new knowledge of a specific space. Ellsworth's idea of creating new knowledge is beneficial when it comes to making sense of the statistics of the Holocaust. By using the space provided to consider non traditional education, it is clear that learning becomes more reflective and meaningful.

The weight that public places of memory carry is immeasurable and depends entirely on those who occupy the space at any given time. For descendants of Holocaust survivors, like myself, they represent the complete narratives of our ancestral past. On both sides of my family, I lost hundreds of relatives. Visiting these sites is therapeutic it and afforded me a special opportunity to speak to those whose genetics I share but who I will never know. It connects me to a past so rich in heritage and understanding. Memorials provide us space to explore our own identities as descendants of survivors. They allow us to connect with faces that we will never know, and voices that we will never hear.

When I was born my parents wanted to give me a name with meaning, one that was strong and carried with it significance. They bought a book about unsung heroes of the Holocaust where they read about a Soviet POW who lead the Sobibor revolt by the name of Alexander (Sasha) Perchersfky. Sobibor, one of the six death camps, located in Eastern Poland near the Ukrainian border carries a big weight on my heart. Sobibor was operational from April 1942 until October 1943. Sobibor is famous for the huge revolt that the prisoners planned. One half of the rebels survived. Upon reading about Alexander, my parents decided Perchersfky probably did not have anybody to remember him and they would give their child his name. Having such a meaningful name has been something I have carried with me most of my life, and I believe the memory of Sasha standing up for the good of humanity has impacted my own identity for the better. Visiting the Sobibor camp was a humbling experience for me. I felt for the first time I could connect with my namesake.

For those without a personal connection to the Holocaust, memorials provide an open platform to engage with it in a way that is meaningful for them. Memorials are designed to commemorate or show respect for an event in history. For deniers of the Holocaust, they symbolize a place to be critiqued and revised. Holocaust deniers use evidence at sites of memory such as Auschwitz and Treblinka to prove that it did not happen. The Allies bombed Auschwitz in 1944 and there are frames and rubble where the crematoria used to be. The Nazis bombed Treblinka to rubble and is just a place of remembrance now. Dickinson, Blaire, & Ott (2010) comment that, "public memory is typically understood as animated by affect" (p. 7). As such memorials are designed to be emotional, and affective regardless of whether one has come to learn from the past, deny the past, or connect to their own past. Regardless, memorials are

designed to educate those that come through them about their own narratives and what they represent.

Throughout this experience I have not only grown as a writer, but also as a thinker and made sense of my own identity as the granddaughter of a Holocaust survivor. I have come to learn and appreciate the importance of public education and how spaces can be transformational. Throughout this process I visited each of my sites a few times and noticed that with each trip I was able to analyze the memorial even more as a result of my previous knowledge as well as my new found interest in collective memory and the purpose of memorials. There is more to understanding Holocaust memorials than just learning about Holocaust history, I had to take past and present politics into account, my own narrative, and learning how to define what made the Holocaust "the Holocaust." The Holocaust can be taught and learned in so many ways that it can be difficult to say which is best. However, I believe that the use of public spaces and memorials is unmatched and what can be learned while being in those places has the ability to change how the genocide is looked at, and analyzed.

Final Reflections

We Remember Them

In the rising of the sun and in its going down, we remember them.
In the blowing of the wind and in the chill of winter, we remember them.
In the opening of the buds and in the rebirth of spring, we remember them.
In the blueness of the sky and in the warmth of summer, we remember them.
In the rustling of leaves and in the beauty of autumn, we remember them.
In the beginning of the year and when it ends, we remember them.
When we are weary and in need of strength, we remember them.
When we are lost and sick at heart, we remember them.
When we have joys we yearn to share, we remember them.
So long as we live, they too shall live, for they are now a part of us, as we remember them.

- Jack Riemer and Sylvan D. Kamens

My experience in the several memorials that I have visited has had a profound impact on me. Often, when I close my eyes I see the train tracks leading to Auschwitz, or the haunting art installation at Belzec and I cannot help but shiver. Walking through where the Warsaw Ghetto was located, I question humanity and I question everything I know. Visiting memorials, and learning from them has the capability to generate new stories, and raise new questions about history, human rights, and global citizenship. Using memorials as educative tools has the ability to develop more reflective and meaningful understandings of the Holocaust. Through understanding memory studies and public pedagogy; the purpose of memorials as educative tools becomes clear. They exist in order to teach today about yesterday. Not all forms of education are clear cut such as traditional schooling. Sometimes, in order to really understand the past; it must be experienced. While it is impossible to physically go back into time, memorials afford us the space to be in the past, while holding onto what we know from it.

The connections that I have been able to make between Canadian immigration policies past and present, as well as Jewish assimilation within Canada could be relevant for other discriminated groups as they try to understand their own histories and connections to the old and new worlds. The study of antisemitism is so detailed, and requires a deep understanding of Jewish-Christian relations that this research could fuel links to other minorities and their own identities within mainstream society.

I believe that this study presents itself to many further opportunities for research in Holocaust education. While this particular thesis focused on my own experiences at memorials, I think that a really interesting follow up study would be to interview others who have visited Holocaust memorials. Both students from the trip I lead, as well as people who go on their own as interested and engaged citizens. It would be worthwhile to compare the two experiences and explore whether being part of a group has a bearing on the ability to engage with memorials in meaningful and reflective ways. Within this research, I could discuss my role as a group leader, and how group identities are formed through visiting Holocaust sites.

Another study that could be undertaken is once the Holocaust memorial is built in Ottawa to explore how the memorial engages people when it is built in a neutral location with no historical significance to the Holocaust itself and how that may impact the public's interaction with it. Especially, focusing on visitors who have no invested interest in the Holocaust and what they perceived the purpose of memorials to be.

I would be very interested in talking to guides at the camps and learning how they interact with devastating parts of history everyday as their job. Is it still meaningful, after they do several tours a day? Are they able to separate themselves from the history surrounding them or does the memorial still speak to them and continue to educate them?

I began this research to learn more about how memorials can serve to educate the people and what their purpose was. Throughout my research, I learned very quickly that very few people have explored this topic, allowing me to really draw my own conclusions based on my own narrative. I was able to gain a solid understanding of how memorials are so dependent on the political culture that surrounds them, the history of the land that they are built upon, and the people who designed them. Memorials tell their own story, and are very much a product of their time. I set out to learn what constituted the Holocaust and through reading several prominent Holocaust scholars I was able to draw my own conclusions and definitions. As a Canadian, I feel it is critical for Canada's poor history with refugees specifically during the Holocaust to be told, and how despite Canada having the highest percentage of Holocaust survivors, is the Western home of Holocaust deniers. Canada, finally seems to be recognizing their past by creating a Holocaust memorial in the capital city of Ottawa. My research has taken me through Holocaust history, and understanding and allowed me to connect to the family members that I will never know.

Through memory we ensure that certain events, eras, people and experiences are remembered. Every memory is a product of social interaction (Stevick & Gross, 2010). As educators and researchers, we seek to understand how education shapes our awareness of the past. The conflicting ideas of history as memory, and memory as history, effect how the past is constructed and reconstructed. Historical books, lessons and information have a profound influence on how history is interpreted. History is not just about the facts, the chronology, and in essence what happened; rather, it is how the ideas of the past are presented, what history we are learning, who wrote it, who the audience is, and what biases exist within. The subject of history is not as a simple as recounting the past, it is also how the events are presented within historical

discourses (Stevick & Gross, 2010). Memorials are created in order to remember more than the facts of history, but to recall the people that died during it or who lived through it. Memorials have the ability to tell a story about what they are commemorating, generate discussion amongst visitors, and provide time for reflective learning.

Public pedagogy encourages non-traditional forms of learning. Gruenewald (2003) states that "places teach us about how the world works and how our lives fit into the spaces we occupy. Further, places make us: As occupants of particular places with particular attributes, our identity and our possibilities are shaped" (p. 621). Chambers (2006) writes that a pedagogy of place "brings students in proximity to the past...to face the precariousness of life and our responsibility to ensure it may go on" (p. 36). In turn, Basso (1996) describes that we are also involved in place making, a type of retrospective world building where questions such as "what happened here? Who was involved? What was it like? Why should it matter" to develop the place as we understand it" (p. 5). Learning from public spaces creates a more meaningful sense of appreciation and understanding of suffering, oppression and destruction of humans by human culminates with personal stories, and engaging with space.

As an event, the Holocaust has the capacity and ability to teach about the important resistance, solidarity, resiliency, and survival, even in the face of unimaginable horrors. It is imperative that we remember the Holocaust, the international complacency, and social and political conditions that allowed it to occur in order to ensure that "never again" becomes a reality (Bergen, 2009). Such an education it seems, is one that harbours hope that the people of the world might come to care more deeply about their fellow humans, and begin to act upon it in order to protect the fragility of all human life. Democratic education is the backbone of a democratic society, one that fosters the underpinning values of respect, morality, and citizenship. Through

understanding of the events, education surrounding the Holocaust has the ability to broaden students understanding of stereotyping and scapegoating, ensuring they become aware of some of the political, social, and economic antecedents of racism and provide a potent illustration of both the bystander effect, and the dangers posed by an unthinking conformity to social norms and group peer pressure. In the last two decades, North Americans have witnessed a rise in the spread of antisemitism and hate propaganda that is unprecedented since before World War II.

Memorials are impossible to prepare for. It does not matter how much reading, watching documentaries or listening to lectures has been done. No one can be prepared for anguish and profound sadness that is felt standing in front of an execution wall in Auschwitz. Walking the death march patches, stepping into the gas chambers, and staring deep into the abyss of the crematoria at Majdanek is beyond the realm of academia. There are not words that could be used to explain what it is like when entering these sites by *choice*, unless you have been there. Walking through the thousands of tombstones and listening to the prayers around you from other visitors is an experience that is unique to memorials of human horror. The mausoleum at the back of Majdanek reminds me time and time again that these victims have no tombstones, no names, and no one to remember them. Nobody has lit candles for them on the anniversary of their deaths; there is only silence.

Bibliography

A., D. (1995). *Rwanda and Genocide in the Twentieth Century.* New York: New York University Press.

Abella, I., & Troper, H. (2012). *None is Too Many: Canada and the Jews of Europe 1933-1948.* Toronto, Ontario: University of Toronto Press.

About the Museum. (2016). Retrieved July 18, 2016 from Polin: Museum of the History of Polish Jews: http://www.polin.pl/en/about-museum

Adams, T. E., Jones, S. H., & Ellis, C. (2014). *Autoethnography : Understanding Qualitative Research.* United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Adrienne, K. (1999). Do You Know What 'Auschwitz' Means?" Children's Literature and the Holocaust. *The Lion and the Unicorn , 23* (2), 238-256.

Annan, K. (2001). *Nobel Laureate.* Retrieved 2013 from Nobel Peace Prize: http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/2001/annan-lecture.html

Antisemitism . (2016). Retrieved November 28, 2016 from CIJA : http://www.cija.ca/category/antisemitism/

(2014). *Antisemitism in Canada.* Anti Defamation League.

Assmann, J. (1995). Collective Memory and Cultural Identity. *New German Critique , 65*, 125-133.

Assmann, J. (1997). *Moses the Egyptian: the Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Basso, K. H. (1996). *Wisdom Sits in Places: Landscape and Language Among the Western Apache.* New Mexico: UNM Press.

Bauer, Y. (1998). *Jewish Identity after the Holocaust*. Retrieved Dec 5, 2012 from yadvashem: www.yadvashem.org/odot_pdf/microsoft%20word%20-%203858.pdf

Bauer, Y. (2001). *Rethinking the holocaust.* New Haven: Yale University Press .

Bergen, D. (2009). *The Holocaust: A Concise History .* Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.

Bialystock, F. (2010). *Delayed Impact: The Holocaust and the Canadian Jewish Community.* Montreal: McGill Queen's University Press.

Brett, S., Bickford, L., Rios, M., & Sevcenko, L. (2008). Memorialization and Democracy: State Policy and Civic Action. *ICTJ* .

Brody, R. (2012, July 12). THE INADEQUACY OF BERLIN'S "MEMORIAL TO THE MURDERED JEWS OF EUROPE". *New York Times* . New York. From New York Times: http://www.newyorker.com/culture/richard-brody/the-inadequacy-of-berlins-memorial-to-the-murdered-jews-of-europe

Burdick, J., & Sandlin, J. A. (2010). Inquiry as answerability: Towards a methodology of discomfort in researching critical public pedagogies. *Qualitative Inquiry , 16* (5).

(1982). *Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms.*

Casey, E. (2000). *Remembering: A Phenomenological Study.* Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Chambers, C. (2006, Fall). The Land Is the Best Teacher I Have Ever Had": Places as Pedagogy for Precarious Times . *Journal of Curriculum Theorizing* , 27-37.

Chang, H. (2008). *Autoethnography as Method.* Walnut Creek, California: Left Coast Press.

Clandinin, J., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research.* California: Jossey-Bass.

Clarke, P. (2016, July 13). *Video denying holocaust causes uproar*. Retrieved July 18, 2016 from Jasper Fitzhugh: http://www.fitzhugh.ca/video-denying-holocaust-causes-uproar/

Cohen-Almagor, R. (2008, Feb). Hate in the Classroom: free expression, holocaust denial and liberal education. *American Journal of Education* , 214-239.

Creswell, J. (Ed.). (2007). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches.* California: Sage Publications Inc.

(1985). *Criminal Code of Canada.*

Darling-Hammond, L., & Snyder, J. (2015, Feb). Meaningful Learning in a New Paradigm for Educational Accountability: An Introduction. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* , 1068-2341.

Davies, N. (2012). Foreward. In R. Lukas, *The Forgotten Holocaust: The Poles Under German Occupation 1939-1944.* New York: Hippocrene Books.

Day, R. (2002). *Multiculturalism and the History of Canadian Diversity.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press .

Dellios, A. (2015). Commemorating migrant camps: vernacular memories in official spaces. *Journal of Australian Studies , 39* (2), 252-271.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1998). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry.* United States of America: Sage.

Destexe, A. (1995). *Rwanda and Genocide in the Twentieth Century.* New York: New York Univeristy Press.

Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and Education.* New York: MacMillan.

Dickinson, G., Blaire, C., & Ott, B. L. (Eds.). (2010). *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials.* Alabama: University of Alabama Press.

Diversity Education. (2007). Retrieved December 15, 2012 from Government of Manitoba: http://www.edu.gov.mb.ca/k12/cur/multic/holocaust.html

Eisenman, P. (1998). The Peter Principles: Interview with Peter Eisenman. *Architecture , 87* (11), 87-93.

Ellis, C. (2004). *The Ethnographic I: A Methodological Novel about Autoethnography.* California: Alatamira Press.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Ethnographically Speaking: Autoethnography, Literature, and Aesthetics.* Walnut Creek: Altamira Press.

Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). utoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity. In N. K. Lincoln (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed)* (pp. pp.733-768)). California: Sage Publications Inc.

Ellsworth, E. (2004). *Places of Learning: Media, Architecture, Pedagogy.* United Kingdom: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (1993). *Discourse and Social Change.* Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Inc.

Fairclough, N. L., & Wodak, R. (1997). Critical Discourse Analysis. In T. A. Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse Studies. A multidisciplinary introduction. Vol. 2. Discourse as social interaction.* (pp. 258-284).

Fein, H. (1987). *The Persisting Question: Sociological Perspectives and Social Contexts of Modern Antisemitism.* New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Foster, K., McAllister, M., & O'Brien, L. (2005). Coming to Autoethnography: A Mental Health Nurse's Experience. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods , 4* (4), 1-24.

Friedlander, S. (2009). *Nazi Germany and the Jews: 1933-1945.* New York: Harper Perennial.

Garber, Z., & Zuckerman, B. (1989). Why Do We Call the Holocaust "The Holocaust?" An Inquiry into the Psychology of Labels. *Modern Judaism , 9* (2), 197-211.

Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method .* United States of America : Routledge.

Gergen, K., & Gergen, M. (2002). Ethnographic representation as relationship. In A. Bochner, & C. Ellis, *Ethnographically speaking: Autoethnography, literature, and aesthetics* (pp. 11-33). Walnut Creek: Altamira.

Gilbert, M. (1985). *Atlas of Jewish History.* New York: Hippocrene Books.

Gilbert, M. (1985). *Atlas of Jewish History.* New York: Hippocrene Books.

Gilbert, M. (1982). *The Atlas of the Holocaust.* U.S.A: Viking Penguin.

Gilbert, M. (1989). *The Second World War: A Complete History .* New York: Henry Holt & Co (P).

Giroux, H. (2003). Public Pedagogy and the Politics of Resistance: Notes on a critical theory of educational struggle. *Educational Philosophy and Theory , 35* (1), 5-16.

Grobman, A., & Shermer, M. (2000). *Denying History: Who says the Holocaust never happened and why do they say it?* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Gruenewald, D. (2003). Foundations of place: A multidisciplinary framework for place-conscious education. *American Educational Research Journal, , 40* (3).

Grzyb, A. (2014). From Kristallnacht to the S.S. St. Louis Tragedy: Canadian Press Coverage of Nazi Persecution of the Jews and the Jewish Refugee Crisis, September 1938 to August 1939,. In R. Klein, *Nazi Germany, Canadian Responses: Confronting Antisemitism in the Shadow of War.* Montreal: McGill- Queen's University Press.

Halbwachs, M. (1925/1980). *The Collective Memory.* New York: Harper & Row Colophon Books.

Harvey, M., Coulson, D., & McMaugh, A. (2016). Towards a Theory of the Ecology of Reflection: reflective practices for experiential learning in higher education. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice , 13* (2), 1-21.

Hilberg, R. (1995). *The Destruction of the European Jewry .* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hitler, A. (1999). *Mein Kampf.* (R. Manheim, Trans.) Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Holocaust Monument. (2015). Retrieved July 15, 2016 from National Holocaust Monument : http://holocaustmonument.ca/#about

Hutchinson, J., & Smith, A. D. (Eds.). (1994). *Nationalism.* Oxford: Oxford Press.

Huyssen, A. (1995). *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia.* United Kingdom: Routledge.

Introduction to the Holocaust. (2013). Retrieved January 26, 2013 from United States Holocaust Memorial Museum: https://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10005143

Jager, S. (2001). Discourse and Knowledge: Theoretical and Methodological Aspects of A Critical Discourse and Dispositive Analysis. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer, *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* California: Sage Publications Inc.

Jones, A. (2010). *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction.* U.S.A: Taylor and Francis.

Jupp, V. (2006). *The SAGE Dictionary of Social Research Methods.* California: Sage Publishers Inc.

Kansteiner, W. (2002). Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies. *History and Theory , 41* (2), 179-197.

Katz, S. (1994). *The Holocaust in Historical Context Volume 1.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Kertész, I., & MacKay, J. (2001). Who owns Auschwitz? *The Yale Journal of Criticism , 14* (1), 267-272.

Klein, R. (2014). *Nazi Germany, Canadian Responses Confronting Antisemitism in the Shadow of War.* (R. Klein, Ed.) Montreal: McGill- Queen's University Press.

Lee, R. M. (1985, May). Keegstra's children: Jewish conspiracy as high school social studies class. *Saturday Night Magazine* .

Lemkin, R. (1944). *Axis Rule in Europe.* Washington: Carnegie.

Lipstadt, D. (1994). *Denying the Holocaust: The Growing Assault on Truth and Memory.* United States of America: Plume .

Lukas. (2012). *Forgotten Holocaust: The Poles under German Occupation 1939-1944.* New York: Hippocrene Books.

Mann, M. (2004). *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing .* England: Cambridge University Press.

Marcuse, H. (2010). Holocaust Memorials: The Emergence of a Genre. *American Historical Review , 115*, 53-89.

Matatyaou, U. J. (2008). Memory Space Politics: Public Memorial and the Political Judgement. Evanston, Illionois.

Mayer, A. (1993). Memory and History: On the Poverty of Forgetting and Remembering about the Judeocide". *Radical History Review , 56*, 5-20.

Merriam, R. (2009). *Qualitative Research: A Guide to Design and Implementation .* New York: Jossey-Bass.

Mock, K. (2000). Holocaust and Hope: Holocaust Education in the Context of Anti-Racism Education in Canada. In D. Decoste, & B. Schwartz (Eds.), *The Holocaust's Ghost* (pp. 465-482). Canada: University of Alberta Press.

Moore, F. L. (2010). Tales from the Archive: methodological and ethical issues in historical geography research. *The Royal Geographical Society , 42* (3), 262-270.

Munchey, T. (2005). Doing autoethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods , 4* (1).

Nash, R. (2004). *Liberating scholarly writing: The power of personal narrative.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Niewyk, D. (2010). *The Holocaust: Problems and Perspectives of Interpretation.* New York: Wadsworth Publishing.

Nora, P. (1989). *Les Liuex de Memoire.* (Gallimard, Trans.) New York: Columbia University Press.

Olick, J. (1999). Collective Memory: The Two Cultures. *Sociological Theory , 17* (3), 338-384.

Olick, J. (2007). *The Politics of Regret: On Collective Memory and Historical Responsibility.* New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis Group.

Olick, J., Vinitzky, V. S., & Levy, D. (Eds.). (2011). *The Collective Memory Reader.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Oxford Dictionary. (2012). *Commemoration* .

Ozkirimli, U. (2010). *Theories of Nationalism: A Critical Introduction .* New York, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pedagogy, T. H. (2010). (J. A. Sandlin, B. D. Schultz, & J. Burdick, Eds.) New York: Routledge.

Petrie, J. (2000). The secular word HOLOCAUST: scholarly myths, history, and 20th century meanings. *Journal of Genocide Research , 2* (1), 31-63.

Phillips, N., & Hardy, C. (2002). *Discourse Analysis Investigating Processes of Social Construction.* California: Sage Publications Inc.

Pinar, W. (2006). *Race, Religion, and a Curriculum of Reparation: Teacher Education for a Multicultural Society.* New York, New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Postone, M. (2003). The Holocaust and the trajectory of the twentieth century. In M. Postone, & E. Santner (Eds.), *Catastrophe and Meaning.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Postone, M., & Santner, E. (Eds.). (2001). *Catastrophe and Meaning.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rapoport, L. (1997). *Jews in Germany after the Holocaust: Memory, Identity and Jewish German Relations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Reed, C. A., & Short, G. (2004). *Issues in Holocaust Education.* England: Ashgate Publishers.

Reed-Danahay, D. (1997). *Auto/ethnography: Rewriting the Self and the Social (Explorations in Anthropology).* United States of America: Bloomsbury Academic .

Robinson, I. (2015). *A History of antisemitism in Canada.* Waterloo: Wilfred Laurier University Press.

Rogers, K. L. (2004). Lynching stories: Family and community memory in the Mississippi Delta. In S. L. Kim L. Rogers (Ed.), *Trauma: Life stories of survivors* (pp. 113-130).

Roth, W.-M. (2005). Ethics As Social Practice: Debating Ethics in Qualitative Research. *Historical Social Research , 30* (1), 157-167.

Sacks, J. (1997). Love Hate and Jewish Identity.

Sandlin, J. A., Wright, R. R., & Clark, C. (2011). Reexamining Theories of Adult Learning and Adult Development Through the Lenses of Public Pedagogy. *Adult Education Quarterly , 63* (1), 3-23.

Sandlin, J., Schultz, B., & Burdick, J. (2010). *Handbook of public pedagogy: Education and learning beyond schooling.* New York: Routledge.

Schwartz, B. (2000). *Abraham Lincoln and the forge of American Memory.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Simon, R., Rosenberg, S., & Eppert, C. (2000). *Between hope and despair: Pedagogy and the remembrance of historical trauma.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Skinner, M. (2005). *Rationale for Teaching the Holocaust.* Yad Vashem, Jerusalem.

Snyder, T. (2015). *The Holocaust as History and Warning.* New York: Tim Duggan Books.

Spiegel, G. (2002). Memory and HIstory: Liturgical Time and Historical Time. *History and Theory , 41* (2), 149-162.

Statement on Research Ethics. (2016). Retrieved July 13, 2016 from Canadian Historical Association: http://www.cha-shc.ca/english/about-the-cha/statement-on-research-ethics.html#sthash.H4pvOCd6.dpbs

Stevick, E., & Gross, Z. (2010). Introduction, Epistemology and Holocaust Education: history, memory and the politics of knowledge. *Prospects , 40* (2), 189-200.

Sullivan, E. T. (1998). The Holocaust in Literature for Youth: A Guide and Resource Book. *Voice of Youth Advocates , 21* (5), 337-339.

The Holocaust. (2013). Retrieved March 15, 2013 from Wikipdeia: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Holocaust

Totten, S. (1997). A Note: Why Teach About the Holocaust? . *Canadian Social Studies* (1997), 176-178.

Tulchinsky, G. (2008). *Canada's Jews: A People's Journey.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Vinitizky, V., & Teeger, C. (2010). Unpacking the Unspoken: Silence in Collective Memory and Forgetting. *Social Forces , 88* (3), 1103-1122.

Wertz, F. J., Charmaz, K., McMullen, L. M., Josselson, R., Anderson, R., & McSpadden, E. (2011). *Five Ways of Doing Qualitative Analysis: Phenomenological Psychology, Grounded Theory, Discourse Analysis, Narrative Research, and Intuitive Inquiry.* New York: The Guilford Press.

What is the Holocaust. (2013). Retrieved January 26, 2013 from Yad Vashem: http://www.yadvashem.org/holocaust/about

Winter, J. (1995). *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis.* California: Sage Publications Inc.

Yerushalmi, Y. (1982). *Zakhor: Jewish History and Jewish Memory.* Seattle: University of Washington Press.

York, M. (2016). *Antisemitic Harassment on the Upswing in Canada: B'nai Brith Audit.* B'nai Brith Canada.

Young, J. E. (1993). *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Zach, A. (2012). Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin: The 'Spectacular [A]ffect' of Vergangenheitsbewältigung. *International Journal of Zizek Studies , 6* (2).