Journal of International Social Studies, v. 8, n. 1, 2017, pp. 4-36

From Empathy to Critical Reflection: The Use of Testimonies in the Training of Holocaust Educators

Lilach Naishtat Bornstein
Mofet Institute and Kibbutzim College of Education, Israel

Eyal Naveh
Tel Aviv University and Kibbutzim College of Education, Israel

Abstract: How can we bridge the emotional and cognitive study of Holocaust testimonies in Israel? Can empathy be used as a stepping stone to critical reflection? And how can teachers address the manipulative popular interpretation of these testimonies in Israel, which seemingly place them beyond critical reflection? We examine these questions through an undergraduate course at an Israeli college of education, using the methodology of collaborative self-study. The fostering of empathy was a key component of the course, with students encouraged to share their feelings, personal experiences, and impressions. At the same time, various pedagogical methods were used to elicit critical reflection, allowing us to explore preconceived notions held by the students concerning the preservation and expression of Holocaust memory. The students' close identification with Holocaust victims became in and of itself an effective tool for critical examination. The central foci of the study were the assumptions of Israeli Jewish students with regard to Holocaust memory, and the changes achieved in the course through critical reflection. We conclude with a discussion of future approaches to the teaching of Holocaust studies in Israel and elsewhere, in light of the experiences gained from this course.

Key words: Holocaust education, testimonies, teacher training, empathy, critical pedagogy

Introduction

In her seminal paper "Education and Crisis, or the Vicissitudes of Teaching" (1991), Shoshana Felman describes the emotional upheaval in her class at Yale in the mid-1980s when she screened

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

video testimonies of Holocaust survivors. Felman interpreted her students' identification with the survivors as an educational achievement since the testimony evoked the learners' empathy and engagement. Expanding on Felman's findings, educators have developed a *pedagogy of remembrance* that stresses empathy, in which students identify with a witness and become witnesses themselves (Ben-Pazi, 2017; Farley, 2009; Gross, 2011; Levitt, 2004; Simon & Eppert, 1997; Simon, Rosenberg, & Eppert, 2000). This pedagogical approach aims to address the dangers of repression, alienation, and even denial of the Holocaust. Teaching about the Holocaust in Israel today relies extensively on this type of pedagogy, using firsthand testimonies and transforming learners into witnesses; the experience culminates in a journey to Poland, where students witness survivors' testimonies on the actual sites of the atrocities (Cohen, 2013; Cohen, 2016; Feldman, 2002; Goldberg, 2017; Hoffman, 2016).[i]

This pedagogy of remembrance has steeped the Israeli educational system in Holocaust testimonies. In the classroom, such testimony is treated as a sacred, ultimate source, carrying an undeniable, absolute truth. The desire to achieve affective engagement, on the one hand, and the fear of repression and denial, on the other, has moved teachers to put aside their critical tools when it comes to Holocaust testimonies (Auron, 2005; Barzel, 1997; Ben-Pazi, 2017; Harel, 1994; Naveh, 2017). Yet the teaching of history stresses the notion of *critical pedagogy*, in which students develop the ability to examine informants' interests and situational context with a certain degree of skepticism, and gain insight by understanding historical circumstances and cross-referencing sources. In this approach, the shaping of historical knowledge calls for a critical analytical dimension (Barton & Levstik, 2004; Salmons, 2010; Yogev, 2013). The present paper considers the argument, proposed by Liora Gubkin (2015), that empathetic understanding by itself "may not be our best pedagogical strategy for teaching about historical trauma.... Empathetic understanding that depends on identification creates epistemological and ethical problems when teaching about trauma" (pp. 104, 109).

In Israel, Holocaust education through survivor testimony is marked by a dichotomy between formal, academic critical investigation and informal, personal-emotional experience (Gross, 2013; Keren, 2017). This duality was explored here through an experimental course about Holocaust testimonies, designed specifically to test whether these divergent approaches can be reconciled. The intent was to make space for the students' personal experiences and impressions, while at the same time developing an analytical attitude toward their own assumptions regarding Holocaust memory. The study focused on critical responses in a pedagogical context, examining

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

what takes place in practice as teachers are trained to teach the Holocaust using survivor testimony.

By observing the classroom as a microcosm of Israeli society, we sought to shed light on the way that Holocaust remembrance is perceived in Israel today. Our study, conducted more than 30 years after Shoshana Felman's class, builds on her synthesis of poetic and pedagogical methods, and examines how Israeli teachers-in-training interpret and teach Holocaust testimonies, using a mixture of empathy and critical pedagogy.

Theoretical Framework

Teaching the Holocaust in Israel

Studying Holocaust testimonies is an emotionally charged process. Students often react with anxiety, helplessness, guilt, anger, or, alternatively, defensiveness (Felman, 1991). While Israel's first decades were characterized by evasion and the silencing of survivors, the concern in teaching the Holocaust in Israel today is not the repression of survivors' voices or the denial of the Holocaust. A much more tangible danger is the anachronistic connection made by the learners between the Holocaust and current Israeli Jewish reality. In his critical review of Israeli historical consciousness, Eyal Naveh (2017) cites the oft-heard notion that "every Jewish Israeli citizen is a Holocaust survivor or a potential victim of future Holocaust-like events" (p. 175). This view is reflected in the pervasiveness of the Holocaust in Israelis' everyday lives (Barzel, 1997; Goldberg, 2012; Kidron, 2003; Rothberg, 2009; Steir-Livni, 2014). Israelis who identify with Holocaust victims report experiencing feelings of melancholy, passivity, and victimhood (Auron, 2005; Bar-On, 1998; Goldberg, 2009; Resnik, 2003; Rothman, 1997). Israeli collective memory of the Holocaust promotes a sense of in-group victimhood and righteousness (Goldberg, 2017), suggesting the use of collective trauma as "strategic practice" (Simon, Rosenberg, & Eppert, 2000) and fueling dynamics of competitive victimhood in relation to others' suffering (Klar, Schori-Eyal, & Klar, 2013).

The personal identification of Israelis with the victims of the Holocaust is an intended outcome of Israeli Ministry of Education policies from the late 1970s to the present (Knesset Committee on Education and Culture, 1981; Naveh, 2017; Porat, 2004; Resnik, 2003). Testimonies of survivors are deliberately used as a pedagogical tool in order to "confront the student with the horror, to evoke in him a direct identification with the traumatic experience of the reality of the Holocaust, and the Jewish world which was destroyed and lost" (Schatzker, 1982, p. 81). As we approach an era without eyewitnesses, teachers of Holocaust studies around the globe are

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

obliged, now more than ever, to become the primary ethical authority mediating between the testimonies and the students (Ben-Pazi, 2017; Gray, 2014; Gross & Stevick, 2015; Hondius, 2015).

Pedagogy of Holocaust Teaching

Critical academic study and emotional experiences are both contradictory and complementary aspects of Holocaust education in Israel (Keren, 2017). While only scant classroom data exist, Goldberg's (2017) findings indicate that teachers are enthusiastic about teaching the Holocaust; similarly, Cohen (2013) has found that Holocaust teachers are highly satisfied with their role. Nonetheless, other scholars suggest just the opposite, describing unwillingness and even extreme reluctance on the part of teachers to teach the Holocaust (Ben-Pazi, 2017; Keren 2017). Though history teachers appear highly motivated to impart knowledge and deal with the cognitive aspect of Holocaust teaching, it seems that at least some are hesitant to deal with the emotional challenge of affective engagement. Consequently, many schools choose to outsource Holocaust education to memorial institutions such as Yad Vashem and the Ghetto Fighters Museum (Dor-Shav & Yaoz, 1986; Keren, 1998; Rozenson, 2012; Yaoz, 1999; Yaron, 2004).

Holocaust studies in Israeli schools take place primarily in history classes and informal education settings (ceremonies, field trips, commemoration sites, etc.). In 2014, Israel's Minister of Education and Yad Vashem created a national curriculum on the Holocaust, "Paths of Memory," to be taught from nursery school through 12th grade. Recent educational reforms require history teachers to use various alternative methods, among them experiential learning, when teaching the Holocaust (Israel Ministry of Education, 2015).[ii] As many teachers feel unequipped for this challenge, this new reality calls for the urgent training of teachers of Holocaust studies from a variety of disciplines. This raises the question of what constitutes an ethical engagement of Israeli Jewish students with Holocaust testimonies. Dominick LaCapra (2001) coined the term "empathic unsettlement" to refer to a desirable response to narratives of trauma—in particular Holocaust testimonies—that makes it possible to gain critical distance and distinguish between past and present. Through this construct, he stretches the limits of the pedagogy of empathy, differentiating between empathy and identification. Secondary witnesses (and here he refers to filmmakers or historians) should, in his view, "reactivate and transmit not trauma but unsettlement...that manifests empathy (but not full identification) with the victim..." (LaCapra, 1997, p. 267).

Studying a loaded subject such as Holocaust testimonies evokes certain assumptions, which the German philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer (1998) refers to as "prejudices." In Gadamer's view,

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

prejudice is a "judgment that is rendered before all the elements that determine the situation have been finally examined" (Gadamer, 1998, p. 270). Raising awareness of one's own prejudices and working them through enables one to interpret a text "in all its otherness" (Gadamer, 1998, p. 269). In a dialogue with a historical document or a work of art, the learner develops awareness of his/her own prejudices, reexamines them, and replaces them with a more valid approach. Gadamer calls for a "fusion of horizons" between the interpreter's own knowledge and historical experience in order to create "effective historical consciousness" (Gadamer, 1998, pp. 346-362). In the present article, *personal-emotional* investigation refers to the students' own knowledge, whereas *academic study* is used to denote a broader, more critical historical perspective.

Israeli historian and educator Esther Yogev developed Gadamer's hermeneutic-humanistic philosophy into an educational approach (Naveh & Yogev, 2002; Yogev, 2008). Yogev posits that separation from one's own pre-judgments is essential to the learning process: "A learning encounter that introduces the students to contradictory historical narratives can produce new insights regarding the historical account and its role in their lives…. The inner dialogue with pre-judgments enables the learners to discuss the complexity of their own collective identity" (Yogev, 2008, pp. 224-225). The course described in this article addresses this need by fostering students' capacity to "fuse the horizons" of personal knowledge and academic study, between the learner and the testimonies studied (Gadamer, 1998; Naveh & Yogev, 2002).

Methodology

The study was conducted within the framework of a course on Holocaust testimonies taught by the lead author at the Kibbutzim College of Education in Israel. The course participants engaged in comparative analysis of a variety of testimonies, mostly on video, moving from the closest circle of Holocaust survivors, perpetrators, and bystanders (the firsthand witnesses) to family members, interviewers, and teachers (the second circle) to artistic, popular, and academic works (the farthest removed). The testimonies were chosen because they shaped the collective commemoration of the Holocaust, connected in a personal or professional way to the teacher and the students, and could serve the latter in their work as teachers. Testimonies used in the course included those with intertextual connections as well as meta-testimonies, which deal with collecting testimonies and teaching them.

The students in the course (16 women and 2 men) were Jewish pre-service teachers, born and raised in Israel, aged 25-30, and in their third year of undergraduate education studies. The course is part of the Outstanding Students program, in which students from various disciplines

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

(humanities, sciences, special-needs children, preschool children, sports, dance, theater, cinema, and communications) study together. The course consisted of 12 sessions between February and June, 2016, as part of a year-long seminar dealing with the transformative power of narratives (see Appendix A for syllabus and course content).

Since the research was conducted in a class taught by the study's lead author, we took several steps to ensure compliance with ethical standards. The students gave their written consent to participate in the research, and their evaluation was based on the completion of assignments without regard to content.[iii]

The first semester of the seminar was devoted to reading and discussion of texts drawn from Hebrew and world literature from different periods and genres. The learning process combined an examination of the texts themselves with observation of the students' reactions to them, and included reading and writing assignments, class discussions, student presentations, and a final essay. The second semester, which we will discuss here, dealt specifically with Holocaust testimonies. The course did not teach the historical events of World War II but focused instead on Holocaust testimonies and the responses they elicited among the students. It included three lessons by guest lecturers (literary scholars and a sociologist) and student participation in a memorial ceremony. Each of the 12 lessons was recorded on video, in addition to which personal diaries, a class diary, and a teacher's diary were kept. This material, which formed the basis of the study, was subsequently examined by the authors for presuppositions regarding Holocaust memory.

Our approach was to investigate the personal, unmediated experience of the students, meaning that the way they understood and reacted to the lesson was itself considered significant information for purposes of the study. A prime example of this was the "viewer's report," produced by two designated student-observers each week, which detailed what happened in the lesson and what the students gained from it. This recounting of what took place in the class became its own form of testimony. The students were encouraged to draw connections between Holocaust testimonies and their own experience. For example, when Felman's paper was discussed, the teacher relied on the students' personal experience as pre-service teachers, asking them: "Did something like this ever happen to you when teaching a class? Something that could evoke this kind of response?... If she [Felman] would prepare a lesson plan, what would its educational objectives be?" Weekly entries in the personal diary emphasized this dimension. In many cases, lack of knowledge emerged as an actual advantage. For example, the students watched a segment of German video testimony (Karla-Raveh-Gesamtschule, 2008) without

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

understanding the spoken language, and were asked to describe the body language of the witness and the audience.

Students were encouraged not to confine themselves to being passive spectators but to participate actively in designing the lesson. The teacher asked for their feedback and was open to making changes based on their suggestions. For example, before screening testimonies, the teacher consulted with the students regarding the choice of material and the ways of approaching it. The students felt free to criticize the teacher's selections and to suggest alternatives. One of the students described this active participative method as follows: "This class started very much with you [the teacher] as the focus, and became more and more ours. Now we have a stake in this class, too."

The students were encouraged to reflect on their own perceptions regarding Holocaust memory. When they received the final essay assignment, one of the students asked if she could write about a "Holocaust memorial room" that she had created during her military service. The teacher's response was: "You can take this experience and analyze it. But I want you to add another level, a critical component. Meaning, what were your motivations in doing it? What did you achieve through it? And where did you not succeed? How would you do it today? In the present context with pupils, maybe in a better way? In a manner that enables more perspectives?"

Students were urged to share their experiences and feelings, in contrast to the usual rigidity of Holocaust studies. The teacher and students knew each other from the first semester, and the lessons were conducted in a warm, intimate atmosphere. The lessons included eating together, and some of the participants took off their shoes in class. The teacher encouraged the students to share a range of emotions, spoken of less frequently in the context of Holocaust memory, such as boredom, confusion, and laughter**.** A somewhat humorous orientation was fostered, with the students invoking their own brand of "Holocaust humor." On numerous occasions, the participants laughed loudly and applauded to express appreciation. One student commented: "This class is so heavy for us. Dealing with such serious stuff. But we started the class with encouragement, applause, and laughter. Now we're ending it the same way."

The teacher constantly connected the study of the Holocaust with the students' everyday lives. Discussions often referred to experiences outside the classroom, and students frequently invited the class to outside events. One of the high points of the course was when the entire class went to hear the testimony of a student's grandfather at a Holocaust ceremony. On a different occasion, when a student who brought her baby to class apologized for the child's crying, the

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

teacher responded by emphasizing the value of bringing outside life into the classroom, citing the joy of including both a grandfather and a baby.

Data Collection and Analysis

The study was conducted in the ethnographic tradition, utilizing the methodology of collaborative self-study (Bray, Lee, Smith, & Yorks, 2000). In keeping with Lunenburg and Samaras (2011), the subject of the study was the participants' practices; however, its collaborative framework enabled the participants to develop a reflective approach, enhance their teaching skills, understand the context of their work, and explain their reactions to the testimonies studied (Henry & Kemmis, 1985; Whitehead, 2009; Zellermayer & Tabak, 2006). The data collection and analysis included three main phases:

Phase A. All 12 lessons were recorded on video by a professional videographer who attended the class. The students consented to participate in the study and have the classes recorded. All video recordings were uploaded to the course website, accessible exclusively to course participants. Each lesson was documented by the two student "viewers" who were chosen at the beginning of each class to observe and document the dynamic in the classroom, the content studied, the reactions of the students, etc. At the end of the lesson, the viewers presented their impressions, which were then published in the class diary on the course site.

Each student also kept an online personal diary, which only they and the class instructor could read. Every week the students received an assignment to read texts or watch videos and compose an essay for their diary, on which the teacher provided written feedback. The final assignment involved independent study of Holocaust teaching through testimonies. The participants worked in teams of 2-4 people or by themselves. The process of writing the essays (from proposal to research plan, progress report, and final product) was uploaded to the class diary, which was open to all the students. The teacher also kept a research diary that the students could not read.

Phase B. In the second phase, 7 of the 12 video recordings were transcribed by a professional (not all could be selected for transcription due to budgetary restrictions). The teacher watched all the recordings and read the transcripts to validate their accuracy. Students' names and descriptions of visual information not included in the transcript (movement in the classroom space, changes in body position, facial expressions, crying or laughing, tone of voice, etc.) were inserted. The teacher also added contextual explanations for events mentioned in the video that occurred outside the classroom but affected or involved participants in the course (for example,

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

a student's dance performance, various issues from the first semester, or students' presentations at a conference).

The personal diaries, class diary, and teacher's diary were retrieved from the course website and organized in chronological order along with the transcribed lessons, with the transcriptions comprising the "class discourse." The personal diaries were also organized separately, enabling the teacher to follow the students' personal development.

Phase C. This phase of the study consisted of three parts:

a. In the first stage, the teacher analyzed and conceptualized the transcribed lessons and the diaries (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), looking for statements that expressed one or more of the following thematic categories: personal/collective, past/present, emotional/critical, artistic/historic.

b. In the next stage, the statements were checked by the course teacher for prejudgments or prejudicial notions of Holocaust memory and Holocaust teaching, focusing on the following areas: emotional vs. cognitive, experience vs. study, idolization vs. criticism, victimization vs. heroism.

c. Finally, the teacher looked at agreement or disagreement with these approaches during class discussions, searching for turning points in the class discourse and the students' personal process based on the following questions: Was there a change in the collective discourse or in their personal approach? What caused this change? Are the students aware of it? How did they explain it?

In the next section, we will present the key assumptions distilled from the above process.

Findings

Assumptions

Identification with Holocaust victims. A major underlying assumption expressed in the class (both implicitly and explicitly) was the identification with Holocaust victims and survivors. The students merged the Holocaust with their own personal lives: "The Holocaust is an integral part of my life"; "I experience the effects of the Holocaust every day"; "The Holocaust is always there. It has always been part of me, of who I am. I grew into it and was born with it… It had, and still has, a strong influence on our nuclear family. It influenced our growth, who we are today, how we will educate our children."

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

All of the students mentioned a strong personal connection to the Holocaust through a specific survivor, in most cases a grandparent. The Holocaust was described as a genetic burden: “The story of my grandfather is a part of my identity. It is in the family genes”; “I was always exposed to the Holocaust horrors, the stories, the tattooed number on my grandmother’s arm.” The Holocaust was described as a model embedded in everyday life: “Whenever things are difficult for me, when I’ve had enough and want to give up, I hear my grandmother’s voice and see her face in my mind. She survived the Holocaust and then Stalin. So I try not to complain.”

Students who did not have a Holocaust survivor in their family reported “adopting” a survivor as a significant figure in their life. One student described an annual ritual she had from early childhood with a survivor neighbor: “Each year on Holocaust Remembrance Day, she would take me to her apartment and reminisce, telling me: ‘I was your age when the Nazis came.’” Another student spoke of a unique relationship with a Holocaust survivor she had met on her school’s trip to Poland. (This experience was not confined to the students; the three guest lecturers in the course, as well as the teacher, opened their lessons by describing their personal connection with the topic.)

In the view of the students, it is this personal identification that generates the deep commitment to Holocaust memory on the part of Israelis in general. They themselves expressed an obligation to hear and watch testimonies despite the emotional burden. This was especially true on Holocaust Remembrance Day: “On Remembrance Day, I always watch television, see films, listen to stories.” This commitment was also reflected in the organizing of memorial ceremonies by some of the students. A personal association with Holocaust victims was likewise perceived as a source of commitment. The students saw themselves and other Israelis as personally connected with the Holocaust, and hence more obligated to watch or listen to testimonies, and to preserve and promote the memory of the Holocaust, than people who are not Israeli Jews.

The traumatic imperative. Another key assumption expressed in class concerned the manner in which testimonies should be listened to. In the eyes of the students, Holocaust testimonies should be experienced in a sad, dramatic, serious way: “You must be sad on Holocaust Remembrance Day, and whenever you talk about the Holocaust. I remember as a child I tried hard to uphold this standard. I drew a direct connection between ‘being a good boy’ and ‘being sad on Holocaust Remembrance Day’”; “Humor and jokes about the Holocaust make me furious. I do not accept laughter or anything that normalizes the Holocaust.”

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

The ceremonies were presented as a trauma in themselves, from very early childhood. As recounted by the students, the heavy emotional burden was intensified by pressure from the teachers. The students described their own experiences, as well as those of their pupils: "I remember the long, exhausting ceremonies and the fear that I would laugh and the teacher would get upset"; "The teacher asked the [second grade] pupils, 'How did you feel [during the ceremony]?' And one girl said: 'I was bored.' So the teacher reprimanded her: 'It's a pity you think so, because it's a very important ceremony and we must respect it…. Next week we'll have the ceremony for the fallen soldiers [of Israel's wars], so you'd better change your behavior.'"[iv]

The expectation to appear sad was not exclusive to the viewers of Holocaust testimonies. According to the students, Holocaust survivors should also express horror when bearing witness: "A testimony should include this painful emotional aspect"; "It doesn't matter how good their life is [now]…. Holocaust survivors should at least look miserable."

This forced sense of trauma was embodied in particular by the Holocaust Remembrance Day siren. The sound itself was described as a metonymic representation of the Holocaust, symbolizing trauma and, in turn, evoking other traumas. The students showed no awareness of the irony of the implied analogy between the trauma of Holocaust victims and the secondary trauma they experienced in memorial ceremonies. This assumption was demonstrated by a student who lives with her family in southern Israel. Over the past decade, this student and her family had suffered from frequent rocket and mortar attacks from the Gaza Strip, which are generally accompanied by a warning siren. The student shared with the class her experience on the most recent Holocaust Remembrance Day:

> My son is 4 years old, and goes to nursery school. His teacher decided that the children should not stand quietly [during the siren on Holocaust Remembrance Day] but should express positive energy toward the State of Israel. So they stood around the flag...and sent out good energy.... The teacher sent photos to our WhatsApp group to show the concerned parents that everything was okay and it went just fine. In one of the photos all the kids are like this [demonstrating "good energy"], and my son has his hands over his ears [crying].

The student shared her distress at witnessing her young child's suffering. It seemed that the main source of her concern lay in the fact that the child could not choose not to hear the siren. His mother could not protect or spare him from it. The student brought up the notion that Israeli children cannot escape the reality of rocket and mortar attacks, on the one hand, and the

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Holocaust Remembrance Day siren, on the other. Like this child, the students did not choose to be born in Israel, be exposed to Holocaust content, take part in ceremonies, or study Holocaust testimonies.

The course, like the Holocaust Remembrance Day ceremony, was seen as a traumatic obligation, something an Israeli is not free to avoid. It was perceived by the students as a cumulative burden, increasing each week and coloring their total experience in and out of class: "It's not like you're studying about the Holocaust one day a week. It stays with you the entire week." Nevertheless, the students asserted that their identification with the Holocaust demanded a personal-emotional approach to the material. At the end of the first lesson, the "viewer" said that the lesson included "few expressions of personal experiences and more analysis of artistic concepts in the text." In his personal diary, he expressed the hope that "later on in the course...we'll hear more personal stuff." Students criticized the academic nature of Bilsky's paper (2010) analyzing Hannah Arendt's (1963) interpretation of the Eichmann trial, and suggested instead that Holocaust testimonies should be discussed utilizing emotional tools: "It [Bilsky's paper] is written with a very, very cold approach…like scholars, legal people, and academics use."

This argument is repeated in other contexts as well, such as literature and art (also taught by the study's lead author), where students often express the notion that the academic analytical discussion is a threat to the holistic, unmediated experience. In the case of Holocaust testimonies, the traumatic nature of their personal reaction did not alter the students' preference for personal-emotional inquiry over critical study. The students' emotional burden reached its peak following the third lesson, when they received an assignment to watch *Schindler's List* (Spielberg, 1993). After privately expressing anxiety to the class teacher in the wake of the film, one of the students agreed to share her distress with the class. In response to her disclosure, most of the students affirmed that they were experiencing emotional difficulties at this point. The timing of the crisis was explained by them as the result of two factors: first, that "the novelty of the first lessons had dissipated, and the burden began to accumulate"; and second, the viewing of *Schindler's List*, which marked the first time during the course that they were confronted with graphic images. Though it was not historical documentation, the students were evidently strongly influenced by the seductive power of images in a cinematic context. The effect may have been intensified since they watched the film by themselves at home and could not rely on the collective framework, which offered the chance to share and "vent" their emotions.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Despite their distress, students pointed to the emotional approach as a source of profound learning. The critical work, by contrast, was described as a formal obligation that did not generate a meaningful process: “Here [in class] something really good is happening, and then when I go home and have to read an academic paper, it brings me back to all the courses where I’ve had to read papers and summarize them just for the sake of an assignment.”

Critical reflection

Along with revealing their own assumptions, the students reflected critically on collective Israeli attitudes that inform these very beliefs. They were able to see beyond the common presumptions in Israeli Jewish discourse with regard to Holocaust remembrance, allowing themselves to express boredom and even indifference, and thus making room for sincere discourse and a critical reflective approach.

For example, in survivor Karla Raveh’s (2008) testimony in front of a German audience, both the witness and the audience did not follow the “traumatic imperative” posited by Israeli Jewish norms. A segment from this video testimony evoked strong feelings of disapproval among the students. They claimed that the relaxed atmosphere was not appropriate to Holocaust testimony. At the same time, they reflected critically on their own assumptions as Israeli Jews: “Here in our country, we take the Holocaust very seriously. You have to be sad, wear a white shirt with a [remembrance] sticker, stand at attention. This is how we relate to the Holocaust. Other approaches seem to us inappropriate and disrespectful”; “We’re used to instinctively safeguarding our myth. If we see [the Holocaust presented with] a happy ending, or it seems to be taken too lightly..., it undermines our ritual.”

The expectation of maintaining a sad appearance on Holocaust Remembrance Day, expressed in the early lessons, was later accompanied by a reflective approach that allowed room for a broader range of responses. The student who took a strong stand against Holocaust humor in the beginning of the course subsequently admitted: “[When I was in high school] I didn’t understand the siren [on Holocaust Remembrance Day]. It was hard for me not to laugh. The films bored me, and the descriptions of atrocities were hard for me to listen to.” Another student apologized at the beginning of the course in case she laughed (“If I smile or giggle, it’s only because I’m uncomfortable..., not because I’m disrespectful, God forbid”). Over the course of the semester, this student came to reexamine the issue of laughter in the context of the Holocaust. In the final lesson, she asked: “What would have happened if I would have laughed during the siren? A lot of children laugh because of it.” What began as a source of fear and embarrassment for her became

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

an issue for critical reflection. She even allowed herself to consider where a change in the conventional educational approach to the Holocaust might lead: "I wonder what would have happened if there had really been laughing, though."

During the first few lessons, we were still under the impression that Israelis are keenly interested in Holocaust testimonies. Later on, an opposing view surfaced as students confessed: "None of us went looking for Holocaust testimonies on YouTube on our own initiative"; "We don't go and look for Holocaust testimonies in our spare time"; "We didn't have the emotional space to experience Holocaust Remembrance Day"; "On the journey [to Poland], I was not excited. I saw all the shoes; I saw the crematoria. And I'm like: Why am I not crying?"; "Many times I feel like the Holocaust is far removed from me, intellectually and emotionally."

Students questioned the Israeli collective narrative focused exclusively on the fate of the Jewish people: "What do we learn from this terrible crime that happened to the Jewish people? How can we connect it to the rest of the world?" Students dismissed the notion that Jewish Israelis are committed to Holocaust memory and expressed critical views of Israeli society and its educational policy: "On Holocaust Remembrance Day, I was talking with a [Jewish Israeli] guy my age, and he told me: 'The Holocaust doesn't mean that much to me.' And I said to myself, what is he trying to say? Why doesn't it mean that much to him? Because he doesn't have grandparents who survived the Holocaust? It raised a lot of questions"; "The journey to Poland didn't really speak to me. The sessions we had in high school destroyed the experience"; "Something about the trip to Poland…is, in my opinion, a bit problematic. It's not well-thought-out enough. It somehow misses the mark."

As a result of their critical reflection, the students moved beyond the notion of "competitive memory," in which the Holocaust is an exclusively Jewish trauma supported by a rhetoric of uniqueness that marginalizes other traumas, to the realm of "multidirectional memory," which relates to the confrontation of multiple narratives in situations of extreme conflict (Rothberg, 2009). Indeed, in the final sessions of the course, the Holocaust was no longer perceived solely as the domain of Israeli Jews. A student who used to avoid talking about the Holocaust with a close relative who was not Jewish made the comment: "I never cared at all what she thought [about the Holocaust]. I remember as a child, I once asked her, 'Your family doesn't..., you don't have relatives [who are Holocaust victims or survivors]? And she said, 'No.' Since then, it was as if she was not connected [to the Holocaust]." Yet for the final essay, it was this relative whom she interviewed about the youth trips to Poland.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

A student who was surprised to see non-Jewish children touring a Holocaust memorial site commented: “Just to see these kids—they’re British Christian high school kids. And they were really interested. It really touched them.” Even students who were unwilling to abandon the assumption of exclusivity agreed to reconsider it: “On the one hand, I see it [the Holocaust] as my property. It’s mine. It’s my people’s…. It’s like, don’t touch it! On the other hand, though, Yes, do touch it! You should touch it. So where is the balance between the extremes? Where do I loosen my hold? And how do I loosen it? How much do I let go of it?”; “It’s like, we want the world to know, but we always say it’s ours.”

The sense of criticism toward “others” (such as Americans, Germans, and Arabs) was balanced with self-criticism of Israeli Jewish individuals as well as state institutions. The students discussed formative moments in Israel’s approach as a country toward Holocaust survivors: “The Eichmann trial was a performance organized by the State of Israel. It had goals. One goal was to create some kind of narrative in which the sovereign State of Israel judged this terrible criminal”; “Where was the State of Israel in the Eichmann trial? Israel was very judgmental toward survivors who were forced to join Judenräte [Jewish community councils under the Nazis], and in general.”

Notions widely accepted by Israeli Jews—such as competitive memory, exclusiveness of the Holocaust, the traumatic imperative, the need to maintain a somber appearance when commemorating or discussing the Holocaust, and the devoted commitment to Holocaust memory—gradually broke down as the course progressed. The reflective process sparked critical thinking about the collective Israeli narrative of the Holocaust as the sole province of Israeli Jews, the focus on the fate of the Jews, and the discrepancy between the Zionist collective narrative and Holocaust survivors’ private narratives. The tendency to regard Holocaust testimony as monolithic, static, and “sacred” was ultimately replaced by the realization that it is affected by multiple circumstances contexts. This shift was manifested in a student’s remarks comparing the setting of the course and the settings of Holocaust testimonies: “Circumstances play a great role [in shaping the final product]. If we change our places in the classroom, it influences the class discourse. And the same with the person who interviews a witness. Gideon Hausner [the prosecutor in the Eichmann trial] had a very precise goal he wanted to achieve…. So the way he chose to do it was through personal testimonies. He directed very specifically what the witnesses would say, and how they would say it.”

The course presented a range of interpretations and attitudes. Critical consideration of key junctures in the Israeli collective narrative raised the notion that the non-Israeli perspective is not only legitimate but can expand the Israeli view. One of the students expressed this shift: “For

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

many years, I attended a lot of memorial ceremonies, and even organized many of them…. I was operating on automatic pilot. I knew what I was supposed to be feeling, but I didn't think about what I wanted to transmit. This course raised many questions for me about collective memory...and the desire to commemorate the past. Now I watch Holocaust memorial ceremonies and examine them from a critical perspective."

Discussion

Emotional identification with Holocaust victims is described in the research not only as an effective tool in Holocaust education in both the long (Schatzker, 1982) and short terms (Romi & Lev, 2007) but also as problematic (Ben-Peretz, 2003) and challenging (Gross, 2010). For some of the students, the study of Holocaust testimonies evoked feelings of aversion and avoidance, while others described the difficulties encountered during the process as significant in and of themselves. One student pointed to the emotional struggle as an aspect that needs to be heightened: "I need it to be difficult. It *should* be difficult for us! Let's not make it just another course about the Holocaust."

As educators, we strongly reject the use of survivor testimony to produce or intensify identification with the trauma of the Holocaust, resulting as it does in a simultaneous sense of victimhood and privilege among many Israelis. We are critical of the manipulative use of Holocaust testimony that places it outside the bounds of critical reflection, often for political ends. However, we wish to emphasize the distinction between the problematic political manipulation of empathy and the constructive aspects of empathy.

According to LaCapra (2001), Holocaust testimony must be emotionally and intellectually disruptive in order to evoke responsiveness to the traumatic experience of others. "[Insisting on an empathy that] resists full identification with, and appropriation of, the experience of the other would depend both on one's own potential for traumatization...and on one's recognition that another's loss is not identical to one's own loss" (p. 79). In our opinion, empathy has a profound role to play as a means of engagement en route to critical reflection. Empathy was used in the course to encourage sharing of feelings, experiences, and impressions. The uncovering of assumptions such as identification with Holocaust victims, exclusivity of suffering, behavioral codes surrounding the Holocaust, and the like allowed students to criticize their own contemporary culture of commemoration.

Israeli students are saturated with Holocaust educational experiences in school, ceremonies, organized trips to Poland, and everyday discourse. Their responses are characterized by over-

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

identification, over-involvement, and reverence (Auron, 2005; Barzel, 1997; Harel, 1994; Schiff, Bar-Zohar, Kfir, & Zieger, 1996). Against this backdrop, teachers must find a way to moderate a productive learning process that is relevant to the everyday lives of their students.

Liora Gubkin asserts that "engaged witnessing recognizes emotion as an important and fragile source of knowledge and provides structured opportunities for analysis of affect without exploiting students' emotional vulnerability" (Gubkin, 2015, p. 113). Building on her approach, the pedagogical methods employed in the course emphasized maintaining an open atmosphere that promoted the sharing of personal experiences; encouraging the students' active participation in designing the learning process; connecting class interactions with course content using literary, historical, and educational tools; and reflecting critically on the learning process. In sharp contrast to the general tendency in Israeli Holocaust education, the emotional experiences in the course served as a springboard to academic study. The identification with Holocaust victims was utilized as a subject for reflective learning, thus enabling the students to go beyond passivity and victimhood.

Conclusions

Our study found that the initial predisposition of Israeli students when discussing Holocaust testimonies is to prefer personal knowledge and emotional investigation over a critical perspective and academic study. The course addressed this dichotomy, suggesting a "fusion of horizons" in which emotional responses serve as an entry point for critical academic study, combining attitudes and beliefs from the students' own lives with knowledge grounded in a universal context. Students overcame their total identification with Holocaust victims and developed "openness to the other" (Gadamer 1998, p. 361). In going beyond their personal horizons, they were able to break free of the "identification trap" and respond to the traumatic experience of other groups and individuals, as discussed by LaCapra (2001).

The Holocaust is a traumatic topic for Israelis. Our study found that emotional and personal identification can be a fruitful subject for reflective learning, enabling students to go beyond passive, futile reactions to the Holocaust such as traumatic regression, horror, and veneration. The study highlights the choices made during the creation and consumption of testimony, expanding the students' decision-making space and encouraging them to be active agents. The observation of learners' reactions and practices can serve as an effective springboard for teaching the Holocaust and for training future Holocaust educators.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

As we near the time when there will no longer be eyewitnesses, teachers must learn how to mediate testimonies. Studying Holocaust testimonies in Israel today is already a complicated task and will become even more so in the near future. Teachers cannot serve as semi-authoritative or passive vehicles for the transmission of processed knowledge. They must function not only as knowledge agents but as facilitators of knowledge construction (Naveh & Yogev, 2002). In Israel in particular, given the country's educational policy, teachers need the tools to build independent, unique Holocaust study programs for their pupils.

However, as noted by Stevick and Michaels (2013, p. 10): "Our moral orientations [in Holocaust education] need to be in dialogue with the empirical realities of the classroom." Teaching the Holocaust in the context of students' everyday lives produces a meeting point between past, present, and future, and constructs a meaningful educational process. Connecting the study of Holocaust testimonies to the surrounding reality, and using the classroom setting to reflect and deepen the meaning of testimonies, also mitigates feelings of privilege and victimhood. The creation of "multidirectional memory" takes the Holocaust out of the realm of an exclusive concern of Israeli Jews, framing it in universal ethical terms. As this study demonstrates, personal and emotional experiences can serve as an opening to academic learning. The knowledge created in the course examined here not only shed light on the strengths and weaknesses of different teaching methods and materials, it also intensified students' involvement and critical thinking skills, thereby constructing and fostering an active multidimensional awareness of this very challenging topic.

NOTES

[i] Many high schools in Israel encourage students to visit concentration camps in Poland as part of a comprehensive, professionally led program that includes preparation and assignments beforehand and group processing of the experience both during and after the trip.

[ii] Since 2015, Israeli high school students are not tested on the Holocaust as part of their matriculation exams; instead, alternative assessments are conducted individually by teachers. In a replacement of frontal learning, the pupils structure the knowledge for themselves through alternative learning processes in a constructivist and interdisciplinary manner.

[iii] The study followed the American Educational Research Association Code of Ethics (2011) and met the requirements of the MOFET Institute and the Kibbutzim College of Education Review Board for the Protection of Human Participants in Research.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

[iv]Guilt at not experiencing the expected emotions is not unique to Israeli students: Eckmann et al.'s comprehensive 2017 study (pp. 263-264) points to Kverndokk's (2011) description of a Norwegian student on a school trip to the Auschwitz-Birkenau Memorial and State Museum who felt distressed because she could not produce the expected emotional reaction. The same study cites Marion Klein (2013), who referred to this phenomenon as the "sorrow imperative;" she discusses students' expectations to feel certain emotions in connection to visiting memorial sites, and the strategies they develop to cope with this challenge. We thank our anonymous reviewer for pointing us to these studies.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Appendix A. A Course Sylalbus Paper

Lesson No.	Texts discussed					Subject	Homework assignment
	Holocaust testimonies	Academic research	Documentary and artistic texts	Field material	Students' texts		
1	Srebrnik, 1962 Srebrnik, 1985	Felman, 1991a				• Crisis in class watcing Holocaust testimonies • Comparative study of testimonies of same witness • Ethical limits in creating effective testimony	Write an essay ”The Holocaust and Me”
2	Srebrnik, 1962 Srebrnik, 2002 Bomba, 1985 Polish bystanders, 1985		Segments from Lanzmann, 1985		Students' essays “The Holocaust and Me”	• Private and public testimony • Institutionali-zation of the term “Holocaust” • Lanzmann's motivations in creating *Shoah*	Read and respond to one of three texts: Felman, 1991a; Benzine, 2015; Bilsky, 2010
3	Lanzmann, 1985 Benzine, 2015	Felman, 1991b Bilsky, 2010	Benzine, 2015 Spielberg, 1993		Students' response to the academic papers	• Effect of classroom's physical structure on lesson contents • Ethical boundaries of intereviewer in taking testimony • Influence of collective memory on testimonies	Watch *Schindler's List* and write an essay about the film in relation to collective memory

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

4		Dudai, 2015	Keneally, 1982 Spielberg, 1993 Fast, 2003			• Memory, testimony and poetic representation in *Schindler's List* • Credibility of historical cinematic representation • Testimony, the structure of human memory, and Aristotelian catharsis • Artistic manipulations and emotional effects in *Schindler's List*	
5	Raveh, 1986 Raveh, 2002 Raveh, 2012		Lübke & Naishtat-Bornstein, 2012 Gera, 2002		Students' emotiona l distress caused by Holocaust testimoni es	• Purpose of studying Holocaust testimonies • Differences between German and Israeli interpretations of Holocaust testimony • Repeated patterns and anomalies in Holocaust testimony • Multiplicity of meanings and voices in the testimony	Write a proposal for the final essay, on the use of testimonies in Holocaust education

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

6	Raveh, 1986 Raveh, 2002 Raveh, 2012	Naishtat-Bornstein, 2016; Naishtat-Bornstein, 2017 Kaniuk, 2012				• Does Holocaust memory commemorate death or life? Jewish or universal event? Focus on past or present? • What are the expectations from Holocaust testimony? • What options are open to survivors in shaping their testimonies in relation to the Israeli narrative?	Read one of the following papers and write an essay expressing your thoughts on this case study: Naishtat-Bornstein, 2016a; Naishtat-Bornstein, forthcoming
7			Harel, 1990 Yeshurun, 2009			• Avot Yeshurun's poetry as Holocaust testimony • Archaeological meanings in Yeshurun's poems • Influence of the Yom Kippur War on Yeshurun's poetry • Who will carry the memory after his departure? • What does the poetry of Yeshurun testify to?	

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

8	Testimony of Mossad agent who participated in Eichmann's capture		Barbash & Lerner, 2015	Teaching Holocaust curricula in Israel; interviews and questionnaires with pupils, teachers, students, pedagogical instructors, and school principals; Holocaust Remembrance Day ceremonies at high schools and community centers; interviews with three generations of a Holocaust survivor's family		• Teaching the Holocaust in different Israeli sectors and disciplines: Israeli-Palestinian pupils, pre-school pupils, special-needs pupils, dance, sports, and cinema classes • Youth journeys to Poland • Holocaust Remembrance Day ceremonies • Concept of Holocaust testimony in *Kapo in Jerusalem*	Write research plan for final esssay
9				Cohen & Liss, 2016	Students' final essays	• IDF Deputy Chief of Staff Yair Golan's speech at Holocaust ceremony, likening recent developments in Israeli society to processes in Europe before the Holocaust • Progress and difficulties in writing their final essays	

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

10		Ben-Amos & Hoffman, 2010 Hoffman, 2016		Diaries and commanders' speeches from IDF journeys to Poland	Students personal experiences from journeys to Poland	• IDF journeys to Poland ("Witnesses in Uniform") • Shaping the ideal IDF commander through these journeys • IDF as a "memory agent" influencing school system and Israeli society	Read Felman's paper, which opened the course, and write an essay on the question: What happened in Felman's class?
11	Menachem S., 1988 Laub, 1988	Laub, 1992 Felman, 1991a				• Different levels of witnessing: first-, second- and third-hand witnesses • How will viewers perceive the testimony in future, when there will be no live eyewitnesses? • Instigation of crisis as a legitimate classroom tool • Multiple meanings and functions of Holocaust testimony	
Ceremony honoring Japanese Righteous Among the Nations, Chiune Sugihara, at Tel Aviv University	Sugihara survivor - Schor, 2016 Sugihara's son, 2016						

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

12				Ceremony, Tel Aviv, 2016	Student' impressions of the ceremony Students' final essays	• Ceremony as a performance that reaffirms social conventions • Reflection and conclusions from the course	

References:

American Educational Research Association. (2011). Code of Ethics. http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/About_AERA/CodeOfEthics(1).pdf

Arendt, H. (1963). *Eichmann in Jerusalem: A report on the banality of evil*. New York: Viking Press.

Auron, Y. (2005). *The pain of knowledge: Holocaust and genocide issues in education*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Barbash, U., & Lerner, M. (Directors). (2015). *Kapo in Jerusalem* [Documentary].

Bar-On, D. (1998). Multigenerational perspectives on coping with the Holocaust experience: An attachment perspective for understanding the developmental sequelae of trauma across generations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *22*, 315-338.

Barton, K. C., & Levstik, L. S. (2004). *Teaching history for the common good*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Barzel, N. (1997). The influence of Holocaust memory culture on Holocaust teaching. In N. Efrati & R. Lidor (Eds.), *Teacher training: Conservation, progress, and innovation* (pp. 215-224). Tel Aviv: MOFET Institute (Hebrew).

Ben-Amos, A., & Hoffman, T. (2010). We came to liberate Majdanek: The Israeli Defense Forces delegations to Poland and the military usage of Holocaust memory. *Soziologia Israelit*, *12*, 331-354 (Hebrew).

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Ben-Pazi, H. (2017). Bearing witness and responsibility in education. In S. Geva (Ed.), *The Shoah: An educational lesson*. Tel Aviv: MOFET Institute & Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).

Ben-Peretz, M. (2003). Identifying with horror: Teaching about the Holocaust - A response to Simone Schweber's "Simulating survival." *Curriculum Inquiry*, *33*(2), 189-198.

Benzine, A. (Producer & director). 2015. *Claude Lanzmann: Spectres of the Shoah* [Documentary].

Bilsky, L. (2010). The Eichmann trial and the legacy of jurisdiction. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), *Politics in dark times: Encounters with Hannah Arendt* (pp. 198-218). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bomba, Abraham (1985). In Claude Lanzmann (Director), *Shoah* [Documentary].

Bray, J. N., Lee, J., Smith, L. L., & Yorks, L. (2000). *Collaborative inquiry in practice: Action, reflection and making meaning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chomsky, M. J. (Director). (1978). *Holocaust*.

Cohen, E. H. (2013). *Identity and pedagogy in Shoah education: The case of Israeli state schools*. Boston, MA: Academic Studies Press.

Cohen, E. H. (2016). Teacher autonomy within a flexible national curriculum: Development of Shoah (Holocaust) education in Israeli state schools. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, *48*(2), 167-191.

Cohen, G., & Liss, Y. (2016, May 4). Yair Golan's speech at Holocaust ceremony. *Haaretz* (Hebrew).

Dor-Shav, Z., & Yaoz, H. (1986). The effect of teaching the Holocaust in literature classes on pupils' empathy with the suffering of the Jewish nation and Holocaust survivors. *Iyunim Bechinuch*, *43-44*, 219-228 (Hebrew).

Dudai, R. (2015). Pain and pleasure in the poetic representation of the Holocaust. In A. Goldberg & H. Hazan (Eds.), *Marking evil: Holocaust memory in the global age*. New York: Berghahn.

Eckmann, M., Stevick, D., & Ambrosewicz-Jacobs, J. (2017). *Research in teaching and learning about the Holocaust: A dialogue beyond borders*. Berlin: Metropol Verlag.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Eulenstein, D., & Wedeking, K. (Producer & director). (2011). *RÜCK-SICHT*. Theaterlabor Bielefeld & Karla-Rave-Gesamtschule.

Farley, L. (2009). Radical hope: Or, the problem of uncertainty in history education. *Curriculum Inquiry*, *39*, 537-554. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2009.00456.x

Fast, O. (Producer & director). (2003). *Spielberg's list* [Video installation].

Feldman, J. (2002). Marking the boundaries of the enclave: Defining the Israeli collective through the Poland 'experience.' *Israel Studies*, *7*, 84-114. doi:10.2979/ISR.2002.7.2.84

Felman, S. (1991a). Education and crisis: or the vicissitudes of teaching. *American Imago*, *48*(1), 13-73.

Felman, S. (1991b). In an era of testimony: Claude Lanzmann's *Shoah*. *Yale French Studies*, *79*, 39-81.

Gadamer, H. G. (1998 [1960]). *Truth and method*. New York: The Continuum Publishing Company.
Gera, A. (Director). (2002). *Communities in the Holocaust* [Short TV film]. Gera Productions.

Goldberg, A. (2009). The victim's voice and melodramatic aesthetics in history. *History and Theory*, *48*(3), 220-23.

Goldberg, A. (2012). The "Jewish narrative" in the Yad Vashem global Holocaust museum. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *14*(2), 187-213.

Goldberg, T. (2017). Between trauma and perpetration: Psychoanalytical and social psychological perspectives on difficult histories in the Israeli context. *Theory & Research in Social Education*, *45*(3), 1-29.

Gray, M. (2014). *Contemporary debates in Holocaust education*. Basel: Springer.

Gross, Z. (2010). Holocaust education in Jewish schools in Israel: Goals, dilemmas, challenges. *Prospects*, *40*(1), 93-113.

Gross, Z. (2011). A typology for the development of Holocaust education scholarship: Coping with a national trauma. *Curriculum and Teaching*, *26*, 73-86. doi:10.7459/ct/26.1.05

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Gross, Z. (2013). Teaching about the Holocaust: Major educational predicaments, proposals for reform, and change – An international perspective. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, *22*(2), 137-151.

Gross, Z., & Stevick, E. D. (Eds.). (2015). *As the witnesses fall silent: 21st-century Holocaust education in curriculum, policy and practice*. Basel: Springer International Publishing.

Gubkin, L. (2015). From empathetic understanding to engaged witnessing: Encountering trauma in the Holocaust classroom. *Teaching Theology & Religion*, *18*(2), 103-120.

Harel, A. (Producer & director). (1990). *Avot Yeshurun* [Documentary].

Harel, M. (1994). Coping with teaching the Holocaust: Documentation & analysis of a teachers' college on Kibbutz Beit Lochamei Hagetaot. *Galei Iyun Vemechkar*, *3*, 12-18 (Hebrew).

Henry, C., & Kemmis, S. (1985). A point-by-point guide to action research for teachers. *The Australian Administrator*, *6*(4), 1-4.

Hoffman, T. (2016). Today a pupil, tomorrow a soldier: The journey to Poland as an educational setting for IDF recruitment. In N. Galit & Y. Levi (Eds.), *An army educating people: The IDF and civil education system in Israel*. Raanana: Open University (Hebrew).

Hondius, D. (2015). Learning from eyewitnesses: Examining the history and future of personal encounters with Holocaust survivors and resistance fighters. In Z. Gross & E. D. Stevick (Eds.), *As the witnesses fall silent: 21st-century Holocaust education in curriculum, policy and practice* (pp. 81-94). Basel: Springer International Publishing.

Israel Ministry of Education. (2015). History education program for secondary schools. http://cms.education.gov.il/EducationCMS/Units/Mazkirut_Pedagogit/History/hativa_elyona (Hebrew)

Kaniuk, Y. (2012, April 18). Stop mourning and start celebrating Holocaust Day. *Haaretz* (Hebrew). Retrieved from http://www.haaretz.co.il/opinions/1.1688165

Karla-Raveh-Gesamtschule (Producer). (2008). *Karla as a guest at Karla Raveh Gesamtschule*. Lemgo & Detmold.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Keneally, T. (1982). *Schindler's Ark*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Keren, N. (1998). Preserving memory within oblivion: The struggle over teaching the Holocaust in Israel. *Zmanim*, *16*(64), 56-64 (Hebrew).

Keren, N. (2017). Teaching the Holocaust: A mission. In S. Geva (Ed.), *The Shoah: An educational lesson*. Tel Aviv: MOFET Institute & Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).

Kidron, C. A. (2003). Surviving a distant past: A case study of the cultural construction of trauma ascendant identity. *Ethos: Journal of the Society for Psychological Anthropology*, *31*(4), 513-544.

Klar, Y., Schori-Eyal, N., & Klar, Y. (2013). The "Never Again" state of Israel: The emergence of the Holocaust as a core feature of Israeli identity and its four incongruent voices. *Journal of Social Issues*, *69*(1), 125-143.

Knesset Committee on Education and Culture. (1981, March 23). A study day on Holocaust education. Jerusalem: Knesset.

LaCapra, D. (1997). Lanzmann's *Shoah*: Here there is no why. *Critical Inquiry*, *23*(2), 231-269.

LaCapra, D. (2001). *Writing history, writing trauma*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Lanzmann, C. (Director). (1985). *Shoah* [Documentary].

Laub, D. (1988). Video testimony. Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University.

Laub, D. (1992). An event without a witness: Truth, testimony, and survival. In S. Felman & D. Laub (Eds.), *Testimony: Crises of witnessing in literature, psychoanalysis and history* (pp. 75-92). New York: Routledge.

Levitt, L. (2004). Intimate Engagements: A Holocaust Lesson. *Nashim: A Journal of Women's Studies and Gender Issues*, *7*, 190-205.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Lübke, H. P., & Naishtat-Bornstein, L. (Producers and directors). (2012). *Between home and homeland*. Germany/Israel: Lupro Films & Your Story Group.

Lunenberg, M., & Samaras, A. P. (2011). Developing a pedagogy for self-study research: Lessons learned across the Atlantic. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *27*, 841-850.

Menachem S. (1988). Video testimony. Fortunoff Video Archive for Holocaust Testimonies, Yale University.

Naishtat-Bornstein, L. (2016). "The listener I chose to be shed new light on the testimony": Questioning the memory of the Holocaust through autoethnographic methodology. *Gilui Daat*, *9*, 15-44 (Hebrew).

Naishtat-Bornstein, L. (2017). Holocaust survivor as a witness: Silence and witness in Israel and Germany. In S. Geva (Ed), *The Shoah: An educational lesson*. Tel Aviv: MOFET Institute & Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).

Naveh, E. (2017). *Past in turmoil: Debates over historical issues in Israel.* Tel Aviv: MOFET Institute & Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).

Naveh, E., & Yogev, E. (2002). *Histories: Towards a dialogue with the Israeli past*. Tel Aviv: Babel (Hebrew).

Polish bystanders (1985). In C. Lanzmann (Director), *Shoah* [Documentary].

Porat, D. A. (2004). From the scandal to the Holocaust in Israeli education. *Journal of Contemporary History*, *39*(4), 619-636.

Raveh, K. (1986). In J. Scheffler & U. Veith (Directors), *Karla Raveh: Lebensstationen einer Lemgoer Jüdin* [Documentary]. Köln/Lemgo.

Raveh, K. (2002). In A. Gera (Director), *Communities in the Holocaust* [Short TV film].

Raveh, K. (2012). In H. P. Lübke & L. Naishtat-Bornstein (Producers and directors), *Between home and homeland* [Documentary]. Germany/Israel: Lupro Films.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Resnik, J. (2003). Sites of the memory of the Holocaust: Shaping national memory in the education system in Israel. *Nations and Nationalism*, *9*(2), 297-317.

Romi, S., & Lev, M. (2007). Experiential learning of history through youth journeys to Poland: Israeli Jewish youth and the Holocaust. *Research in Education*, *78*(1), 88-102.

Rothberg, M. (2009). *Multidirectional memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the age of decolonization*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Rothman, R. (1997). Mourning and mania: Roee Rosen's *Live and Die as Eva Braun* (exhibition catalog). Jerusalem: The Israel Museum (Hebrew and English).

Rozenson, Y. (2012). Remember to educate, educate to remember: About the tension between memory and education - the Holocaust as a case study. In M. Rachimi (Ed.), *From Orot to Yehuda: On Philosophy and Education*. Tel Aviv: MOFET Institute (Hebrew).

Salmons, P. (2010). "The universal meaning or historical understanding? The Holocaust in history and history in the curriculum." *Teaching History*, *141*, 57.

Schatzker, C. (1982). The Holocaust in Israeli education. *International Journal of Political Education*, *5*(1), 75-82.

Schiff, O., Bar-Zohar, Y., Kfir, D., & Zieger, T. (1996). Teacher training to handle the subject of the Holocaust: Program evaluation and proposal for a new model. *Dapim*, *23*, 7-26 (Hebrew).

Simon, R. I., & Eppert, C. (1997). Remembering obligation: Pedagogy and the witnessing of testimony of historical trauma. *Canadian Journal of Education/ Revue Canadienne de L'éducation*, *22*, 175-191. doi:10.2307/1585906

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

Spielberg, S. (Director). (1993). *Schindler's List* [Motion picture].

Srebrnik, S. (1962). Video testimony. Eichmann trial. Jerusalem: Israeli State Archives.

Srebrnik S. (1985). In C. Lanzmann (Director), *Shoah* [Documentary].

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Srebrnik, S. (2002). Video testimony. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem Archives.

Steir-Livny, L. (2014). *Let the Memorial Hill remember*. Tel Aviv: Resling (Hebrew).

Stevick, E. D., & Michaels, D. L. (2013). Empirical and normative foundations of Holocaust education: Bringing research and advocacy into dialogue. *Intercultural Education*, *24*, 1-18.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). Grounded theory methodology: An overview. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (pp. 58-183). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Tel Aviv University (2016, June 15). Ceremony honoring the Japanese "Righteous among the Nations," Chiune Sugihara (Hebrew).

Whitehead, J. (2009). Self-study, living educational theories, and the generation of educational knowledge. *Studying Teacher Education*, *5*(2), 107-111.

Yaoz, H. (1999). Changes in Holocaust education in high school literature, 1950–1995. In R. Globman & Y. Eiram (Eds.), *Teaching developments in Israeli educational institutions* (pp. 391-401). Tel Aviv: Ramot (Hebrew).

Yaron, M. (2004). Holocaust education in high school history lessons. Research report. Jerusalem: Yad Vashem (Hebrew).

Yeshurun, A. (2009). Milvadata: Selected poems. H. Yeshurun & L. Lachman (Eds.). Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).

Yogev, E. (2008). The Gadamerian dialog. In N. Aloni (Ed.), *Empowering dialogues in humanistic education* (pp. 214-235). Tel Aviv: Hakibbutz Hameuchad (Hebrew).

Yogev, E. (2013). On the need to strengthen political-critical thinking in history education. *International Review of Education*, *59*(5), 627-645.

Zellermayer, M., & Tabak, E. (2006). Knowledge construction in a teachers' community of inquiry: A possible road map. *Teachers and Teaching Theory and Practice*, *12*(1), 33-49.

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585

Acknowledgement:

This study was conducted as part of the MOFET post-doctoral fellowship (2015-2017). The authors would like to thank the Heads of the program, Prof. Elite Olshtain and Dr. Liat Josefsberg Ben-Yehoshua, for their dedicated, generous hel; the students who participated in the course; the research assistants, Mr. Yonatan Kanonitch and Mr. Yaron Adini; Head of the Research department in Kibbutzim College of Education, Dr. Rinat Arviv-Elyashiv; Dr. Tsafrir Goldberg, Dr. Tammy Hoffman, Dr. Rina Dudai, Ms. Karen Gold and Ms. Ravit Inbar.

About the Authors:

Lilach Naishtat-Bornstein is a literary scholar and an activist. Teaches at the Kibbutzim College of Education. She holds a PhD from Tel Aviv University (2010). She was a research associate at Five College Women's Studies Research Center (Amherst, Mass. 2011) and was a post-doctoral fellow at the MOFET institute for teacher education (2015-2017). Naishtat-Bornstein directed a documentary film (*Zwischen Heimat und zuhause*, 2012. With Hans-Peter Lubke) and published the first Hebrew translation of Coleridge's *Christabel* (Even Hoshen, 2011). Her recent books are *Their Jew: Right and Wrong in Holocaust Testimonies* (Hebrew University & MOFET institute, 2016), *Who's Afraid of Christabel? The Story of a Reading Group* (Gama & Hakibbutz Hameuchad press, 2017), and *Poetics of the Fragment* (Resling, in press).

Eyal Naveh is a professor of history. He served as the chairperson of the Department of General History, at Tel Aviv University in 2012-2016. He heads the Academic Council at Kibbutzim College of Education. Alongside his academic publications, Professor Naveh wrote seven textbooks for the Israeli K-12 education system. He also coordinated and advised the Israeli-Palestinian Two Narratives history project. His latest book is Past in Turmoil: Public Debates over Historical Issues in Israel (MOFET Institute & Hakibbutz Hameuchad 2017).

Corresponding author: Lilach.Naishtat@smkb.ac.il
©2012/2018 National Council for Social Studies International Assembly
http://www.iajiss.org ISSN: 2327-3585