GENDERING THE HOLOCAUST:

REPRESENTATION OF WOMEN IN

COMPULSORY HOLOCAUST EDUCATION IN

ENGLAND.

By

Joanne Wood

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Gender Studies

In partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Masters of Arts in Gender Studies

Supervisor: Andrea Petö

Second Reader: Dorottya Redai

ABSTRACT

In this research, I am arguing that approaching the compulsory study of the Holocaust in England using gender analyses would enrich history education. In order to gain some understanding of the current state of women's history as well as gender analysis in compulsory Holocaust education in England, I conducted an analysis of the two most recently published Key Stage 3 history textbooks. I also undertook interviews with organisations who are involved in various stages of Holocaust education, as well as teachers and students. At the level of the schools and the organisations, my two main findings were that 1) gender analysis is seen as time consuming, and 2) it is not seen as a benefit to history or Holocaust education. Teacher training and a history curriculum which uses a gender analysis approach would be beneficial. However, I conclude by suggesting the importance of bottom-up approaches to education, as changes to existing hierarchies, such as government policy, the curriculum and exam specifications, can be very slow.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to my supervisor, Professor Andrea Petö, for all the meetings, guidance, and many kind words, including “Stop working. Go and have a beer by the river”. Thank you to my second reader, Dorottya Redai, who has been wonderfully resourceful and incredibly patient, even with my many emails and questions. Thank you to the Gender Studies department, headed by Professor Elissa Helms, for a fantastic and challenging year, as well as a great deal of support. Acknowledgements to Central European University who provided such a generous scholarship, as well as funding for this thesis – I hope you haven’t regretted having me here.

I must also thank Joel, for late night calls, listening to endless fears during my ten months here, as well as for visiting me so frequently. It was always a relief to be able to relax and stop trying to sound like I understood Philosophy. Thank you to my sisters, Sara and Anita, for always being there to talk to, rant to, offer advice, remind me how lucky I am, and also that I should probably stop complaining. Sara – I don’t think I would have been able to stay if it wasn’t for your and Sam’s help. Thank you to my parents who generally show only small levels of apprehension before announcing my next plan, and are so, so supportive (this time I think I’ll get a job, in England).

Table of contents

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

KS3 – Key Stage 3, age 11 – 14 level of education in England

HET – Holocaust Educational Trust

HMDT – Holocaust Memorial Day Trust

UCL – University College London (The author acknowledges that the Centre for Holocaust Education is a distinct department at UCL. However, due to an overflowing word count, I will be referring to the organisation simply as 'UCL' in chapter 4)

Introduction

Holocaust Education in England and Gender Analysis

On 27th January 2014, Prime Minister David Cameron announced the formation of a group who would write about the future of Holocaust education and memorialisation in England. One year later, on the 70th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, "Britain's Promise Remember" was published. Research suggested large gaps in young people's knowledge regarding the Holocaust (Pettigrew et al, 2009). Furthermore, anti-Semitism has continued in the UK, with 924 attacks against the Jewish community in 2015 alone, including a 61 per cent increase in London compared to the previous year (The Community Security Trust Report, 2015). Recently, the Labour Party suspended large numbers of staff over anti-Semitic comments. These events are a reminder that the dangers of anti-Semitism cannot be forgotten. Holocaust education is a key component of reducing anti-Semitism, and it is not working. The 'European refugee crisis' has highlighted how discourse surrounding refugees can be similar as was found during the Nazi regime (Linehan, 2012). Students must learn about these parallels, to decrease anti-Semitism and other forms of prejudice, and potentially pressure governments to do more for refugees and asylum seekers.

In the government report, as well as England's National History Curriculum, there is an absence of gender analysis or mention of the experiences of men or women in the Holocaust. In this work I will argue why the inclusion of women's history and gender analysis are linked endeavours, both with the capability to enrich history education. Though much scholarly work has been done on gender analysis in Holocaust studies, which I will outline in the following chapter, this approach in Holocaust education and wider history education has

remained marginalised. Firstly, the absence of the stories of women matters because of the limiting effects of ignoring the hugely varying experiences of women in the Holocaust, as well as throughout history. As Maria Grever puts it, "…our basic aim was to show the often invisible but important role of women in history" (1991, p.72). Often it is seen as simply a 'feminist issue' to worry about the inequality of a male-orientated history, but even when lacking this motivation, a history without women is incomplete. Secondly, I argue that a gender analysis benefits historiography and Holocaust education, as a powerful analytical tool (Scott, 1999), which helps further understand the lives of men and women, and their social relations. Gender studies allows for the infinitely varying lives of women, whilst providing contextualisation by "exploring their significance and meaning in social and political relationships" (Goldenberg & Shapiro, 2013). The Jewish victims of the Holocaust are often treated as a mass, focusing only on their persecution, and ignoring their pre-war and possible post-war lives. Gender analysis can help discover a wealth of information, to respectfully memorialise the lives of women and men.

Holocaust Consciousness and Anti-Semitism in England

Despite England's complicated past in regard to anti-Semitism (Julius, 2010), compared to other parts of Europe, levels of anti-Semitism were lower in 19th century England, making it an attractive place to emigrate to, when possible. In the period following World War II, historians and other scholars suggest there was a post-war silence in public discourse and awareness of the Holocaust. Though debate surrounds this "myth of silence" (Cesarani, 2012, p. 2), it is generally agreed by historical and Holocaust scholars that a 'turn' towards Holocaust took place in the 1970s, which led to a development of our "holocaust consciousness" (Pearce, 2014, p.1). However, anti-Semitism continued. At the end of the

1950s, swastikas were painted in public places in England. In 1962, 2,000 protested in London to "Free Britain from Jewish control" (Pearce, p. 24). The capture and trial of Eichmann in 1961 also brought the mass atrocities more into public knowledge in England.

In comparison to many European countries, England had not been occupied, meaning it was perhaps easier to keep the Holocaust at an arm's length. The "domestication of violence" existed in England, which was described as a combination of avoidance, guilt and aims of a "collective memory" (Stone, 1999, p. 15). However, some Jewish people did move to England before the war, particularly Jewish children in the 'Kindertransport' (Hammel & Benz, 2005). British involvement in the rescue operations of camps also brought the Holocaust into public awareness. Britain's Jewish population is now the second largest in Europe (Jewish Virtual Library, 2014). Britain's involvement in Palestinian and Israeli politics also played a role in this consciousness.

The Current State of Holocaust Education in England

The Prime Minister's Holocaust Commission Report (2015) aimed to continue preservation of Holocaust memories. The four recommendations in the report led to four complementary suggestions, regarding a new memorial, focus on Holocaust education, an endowment fund to support projects and renewed urgency regarding recording survivor testimonies. The recommendation for improved Holocaust education came from the finding that there were often significant gaps found in teacher's knowledge. Teaching materials would often be sourced from films, rather than scholarly research (Pettigrew et al, 2009). They also discovered that there was little focus on Jewish people's lives before and after the war.

Research found gaps in student's knowledge of the Holocaust, including a perpetrator-based focus and underestimations of scale (Foster et al, 2015). There was also an absence of

knowledge on the wider societal causes of the genocide. The researchers expressed concern that these issues remain, even after twenty-five years of its mandatory presence in the National Curriculum for history. Further calls for increased training and support for teachers was suggested in a White Paper (Commons Select Committee, 2016). The Guardian (2016) published an article on the findings from UCL, continuing encouraging a public discourse of a need for further teacher training.

The Holocaust is thought to be able to teach 'lessons'. John K Roth wrote about the intention to use Holocaust education to learn about the "moral issues", such as "respect for human life", "sound ethical reflection" and to "mend the world" (2001, p31), as well as a tool to combat prejudice, racism and stereotyping (Pettigrew et al, 2009., van Driel, 2010). It has been suggested that education on the Holocaust can also increase knowledge of human rights issues (Carrington & Short, 1997). All of these apparent effects could help facilitate a learning environment in the increasingly multicultural classrooms of England. However, much debate surrounds these 'lessons' of the Holocaust. Foster et al (2015) suggested that basic factual knowledge on the Holocaust as a "historical phenomenon" is getting lost amongst the "civic-based approach" which the teachers are focusing upon. These debates were often mentioned in my research, so they will be discussed further.

Objectives and Structure of Research

Since the 2000 Stockholm Declaration, teaching of the Holocaust is compulsory by law for schools in England. It is usually taught during Key Stage 3, which spans from age 11 to 14, as part of the National Curriculum for history. In this research I will be focusing on the education of this age group of pupils, as it has an effect on the majority of students in England, whereas in later years the students may not continue studying history, and study of

the Holocaust is no longer compulsory. However, the future of history education in the National Curriculum is also uncertain, as more schools become academies, meaning the curriculum is no longer compulsory.

In this paper I begin by outlining some of the scholarly work on women and gender in history, after which I will focus on Holocaust education. I researched three main stakeholders in the production, the implementation and the effect of Holocaust education. I looked at the representation of men and women, as well as the possible gender analysis present in the current history curriculum as well as textbooks. I also looked at attitudes towards gender analysis and its perceived importance (or lack of) in relation to Holocaust education. This helped me gain insight into obstacles in the way of a development of gender analysis in Holocaust education and the wider history lessons.

Chapter 1 – Literature Review

In this chapter, I will first outline some of the arguments regarding the importance of women's history, as well as gender analysis, to benefit historiography. Secondly, I will explain how women's stories and gender analysis have been debated in relation to the study of the Holocaust. This will provide the framework and justification for my research, in order to better understand the representation of men, women and gender analysis in Holocaust education in England, and why this can benefit Holocaust education. Furthermore, I wish to understand the obstacles which are preventing these aims being developed further.

1.1 Women and Gender in History education

In this section, I will review some arguments for a feminist writing of history. Historical narrative has been dominated by male historians, and "gendered male by tradition, accident and circumstance" (Smith, 2000, p. 3). Therefore in the historical canon, men are generally at the centre as the 'subject', and women are 'the Other'. Nevertheless, there has been development in the documentation of women's stories and experiences. The state of women's representation, as well as gender analysis has been improving in historiography, with existing assumptions being challenged (Morgan, 2006). In this research, I want to gain understanding on whether these assumptions are challenged in KS3 history education in England.

Challenging established assumptions may occur more in some topics of history than others. As Joan Scott explained, if a historical topic is not obviously related to gender, then it may not be considered an appropriate category of analysis. In topics such as "women, children, families and gender ideologies", gender seemed an appropriate method of analysis to historians, but in other areas, such as "politics and power", then gender seems irrelevant

(1999, p. 59). The horrifying nature of the Holocaust was used as a legitimisation in the 1980s to not understand the Holocaust as a historical catastrophe. Later, historians argued against this, saying this argument means it cannot be analysed or explained or learnt from, nor can you use this information to prevent future genocide (Levy & Sznaider, 2002). Discussion has developed regarding the different factors which led to the Holocaust. Similarly, due to the particularly horrifying nature of the Holocaust, and the persecution based on racism, gender analysis may not seem obviously important or relevant to educators, producers of teaching materials, as well as the teachers. In this research, I am interested in if gender analysis is considered important in history education, particularly the Holocaust, by the main stakeholders involved, because it could give an indication about the current situation, as well as the future of gender analysis in these areas.

1.2 Women and History: "Add and Stir"

In this section, I will outline the "add and stir" approach of including women in history narratives (Morgan, 2006, p. 13). Scholars have successfully argued the importance of representing women in history in a more fair way than has been previously found, with strong arguments for doing so. However, there have been varying approaches towards implementing this aim. Morgan outlines how the "'add and stir' approach of women's history had perpetuated rather than challenged the essentialized, male/female binary structures of traditional history." (p. 13). Therefore, whilst more women being represented in history and Holocaust education is a development, it can continue the problematic trends of gender stereotypes. Gisela Bock explains how what was considered relevant to a historical narrative needed to be challenged and "overturned" (1989, p. 7). Importantly, she emphasises that this does not mean that women should be conceptualised as one homogenous group. Due to the

boundlessness of women's history, and the inequality that occurs between women, as well as between men and women: women cannot be seen as one.

In this research, I was interested to find out how people thought a gender analysis, as well as representation of women and men, could or should be incorporated into history and Holocaust education. In particular, the approach of the authors of the textbooks, as well as the discourse in the interviews, and the possible approach of 'adding in' women. I also wanted to see whether women, as outlined by Bock, be considered as a homogenous group, with the same group experiences in history and in the Holocaust. These points are relevant when deciding how women should be included in historical teaching materials. As Michelle Rosaldo wrote, "Women must be understood…in terms of relationship – with other women and with men – (not) of difference and apartness." (1980, p. 574). Scott continued this line of thinking, explaining the importance of "how the subjective and collective meanings of women and men as categories of identity have been constructed." (1988, p. 6). These are preferable alternatives to the 'adding women in' approach for a solution to gender inequality in the historical narrative. We must avoid this approach which is so often given as an inadequate temporary remedy to the subordination of women in narratives of history. A gender analysis can improve the framework by making the focus on many forms of inequality, rather than following the reasoning that increasing the number of women found in textbooks or the curriculum equals gender equality.

1.3 Gender Blindness vs. Gender Analysis

Here I will outline why gender analysis is necessary, as well as arguments against some of the approaches. Bock (1989) and Scott (1999) outlined how, in history, the male has held the role as the normative subject, and how important it is to change this, partially by including

the varying experiences of women. They also point out how 'gender' has often referred to women, or evokes responses which show that to many, gender means women. Bock explains how a history cannot operate by attempting to use gender blindness or apparent gender neutrality, as a deeper understanding may only be reached by looking at gender relations.

Scholarly work on feminist history has given me the structure and arguments for why gender analysis is important. Elizabeth Fox-Genovese describes gender analysis as a "critical feature of all social relations" (1982, p. 15) and Penelope J. Corfield how it benefits and "enriches the study of history" (1997, p. 117) Scott (1999) explained how vital gender analysis is to improve the state of women's history. Bock further described this use of gender analysis, describing how it "challenges the sex-blindness of traditional historiography." (1989, p. 11). Gender analysis can help address a number of inequalities, and provide understanding into societal structures, for example patriarchy. (Hall, 2002). One can look at the reference of masculinity to femininity and vice versa, and how such gender identities are changing (Donnelly & Norton, 2012). These arguments justify my focus gender analysis in historiography, as well as setting a framework for me to compare interview responses and the content in the history textbooks. The work of these scholars can also facilitate suggestions for alternative approaches to teaching the Holocaust, such as the use of video testimonies in pedagogy. In the past, use of survivor testimony was met with scepticism, as the memory of the survivors and bystanders was not trusted (Roseman, 1999). However, usage is now on the increase, and as was found in the report 'Britain's Promise to Remember', it is the most immediate of the four aims of the report, due to the temporality of survivor testimony.

1.4 Essentialising Women

A big change has been Judith Butler's disruption of distinguishing between sex and gender, so that male or female does not need to mean anything set in stone (Butler, 1990). The importance instead, was on how these gender-based difference was "produced discursively as a normative system of knowledge and meaning and how identities of gender were disseminated over time" (Morgan, 2006, p. 13). However, Scott (1999) explained how in much scholarly work, gender equalled women, as men held the normative position. This has meant that an attempt at gender analysis can lead to a focus on biology. Bock explains the dangers of this, as biology is used as a "sociocultural category" which has had a huge impact on categories of man and woman (1989, p. 11). Biology is linked to weaknesses, such as pregnancy and childbirth, and therefore "social and political inequality" (p. 12). Women are associated with gender, which is associated with biology and weakness, and inequality, which is then associated with women.

I want to find out whether this is raised in my interviewees, as well as in the textbooks, particularly looking at whether women are presented as 'the Other' and men the 'one'. This could give some indication about what the students are taught. I will also be interested to see whether physical or biological differences of men and women are mentioned. Scott explains that the impact of this focus on biology uses gender to signify "cultural constructions" and the perceived gender stereotypes (1999, p. 59). This would indicate how despite issues of feminism entering the public discourse more frequently, without training including gender analysis, the gender-based binaries will continue.

1.5 History Education in England and the Representation of Women

This section focuses on the current situation of history education in England and how women are currently represented in the curriculum. Pearson (2012) asked the question "where are the women?" in regards to the National Curriculum for history in England. Looking at the syllabi of three schools, and at which historical figures were mentioned, she found an unequal balance between the representation of men and women, with women's representation being displayed in a very narrow number of ways. In one school, the only women that were mentioned in the whole year of their history class were the victims of serial killer Jack the Ripper. Pearson raises questions about how these decisions are made, by whom and the message they give to students. She found that teachers chose the topic based on habit, appropriateness, relevance, their own interests and school approval. Furthermore, use of 'significance criteria' found women are considered less worthy of being awarded significance. She also refers to the absence of the effects of the feminist debates regarding in gender in educational history, saying it is as if they did not occur. This is a framework I will use when analysing the textbooks and the interviews within the schools and at the organisations.

Maria Grever (1991) explored the positive impact of women's history being part of the curriculum and therefore also the examination, in Dutch secondary schools, as well as details on the practical implications of changing this. She discusses how the historian's preferences of focus make a huge difference to "which players are chosen for the historical stage" (p. 67) and the influence of feminist historians in the Netherlands. This highlights the roles of the stakeholders in education and curriculum development. This could also help explain the

presence or absence of gender analysis, and the representation of men and women in Holocaust education.

However, inclusion of women is not the end goal of the gender analysis I am arguing for. Scott (1983) wrote about the various methods of writing a feminist history, and described gender analysis as an approach of looking at different social relations, for example

> "…examining women and men in relation to one another…the definitions or laws in relation to one another, what the comparative location and activities of men and women reveal about each, and what representations of sexual difference suggest about the structure of social, economic and political authority."
>
> Scott (1983, p. 153)

So not only am I looking to see how the history textbooks represent men and women, but also whether the authors of the textbooks explore the possible gendered nature of these differences. I suggest that there are different levels of representation of women, and gender analysis, which can overlap and occur simultaneously. In the next chapter I will outline the way this analysis will be guided.

1.6 Approaches to Women, Gender and the Holocaust

In the second half of this literature review, I focus on the debates surrounding the representation of women, as well as gender analysis, in the study of the Holocaust. In the analysis chapters, I will look at how the historiography evolved, and how this has been translated to educational material. Despite the acceleration of feminist scholars working on study of the Holocaust, using gender analysis has remained marginalised, and its impact limited (Goldenberg & Shapiro, 2013). In my research I am looking at the current state of

gender and representation of men and women in Holocaust education in England. I argue that the full experiences of men and women in the Holocaust cannot be understood without implementation of gender analysis, used to challenge "previously accepted assumptions, interpretations, and perspectives on the Holocaust." (p. 7). These aims echo those of gender analysis in historiography.

Gender is also imperative to understanding racism, which is central to the Holocaust. Doris Bergen described gender as "central to how people organize and give meaning to their world" (2013, p. 22), meaning it is also essential to understanding the Nazi regime of racism. Bock also explains the gender focus of racism, including racist discourse of "sexuality, blood and violence" (1989, p. 21). This highlights the importance of gender dimensions, particularly in the area of Holocaust studies, as much of Nazi policy was based on racism. I am interested to see whether in the interviews, sexism will be brought up in relation to racism, and whether this will be a feature in the textbooks, as understanding racism should help to reduce racism.

Joan Ringelheim (1998) questioned why there was no gender analysis occurring, particularly as in the camps the Nazis kept track of male and female deaths. Why was no scholarly research looking into the differences in the death rate? Gender was not ignored by the Nazi regime, so we should not (Dworkin, 1998). In 1983, Joan Ringelheim and Esther Katz organised the first conference on women and the Holocaust, which took place in the US, following which the research into this area snowballed, gaining momentum by way of second-wave feminists and historians of women's history (Petö, Hecht and Krasuska et al., 2015). It will be significant to see whether a gender analysis would be applied to the fluctuating death rates of men and women in different times and places during the Holocaust, in the textbooks which I will be analysing.

Whilst the scholarly attention to the Holocaust grew, gender analysis has remained on the margins of scholarly work in this area. Ringelheim described her experiences at a conference in 1979. During a conversation with her colleagues, they all confidently stated that sexual violence had not occurred in the Holocaust – claims which were not based in fact or research (Ringelheim, 1998). These claims possibly reflected a general narrative of the Holocaust which had developed, which has been called the "master narrative" (Horowitz, 2000, p. 159), to use a significantly gendered term. She also described the mistakes she made during an interview with a woman who spoke out about her experience of rape in one of the camps. Both of these experiences show how one's own biases can influence how we view the past, and also the importance of self-reflection and challenging of our beliefs. Ringelheim found that some women were questioning whether their experiences of sexual violence were worth mentioning next to the rest of the brutality of the Holocaust. In my interviews, the biases can give an indication of the teaching style in how men and women are represented in classes on the Holocaust.

Scholarly work has looked at the implications of a male-centred narrative of the Holocaust. Horowitz wrote that there are two main aims when applying gender analysis to the study of the Holocaust, "recovering the experiences of women and reshaping and nuancing the experiences of women." (2000, p. 176). This is particularly in response to the master narrative, meaning that the normative equals man. Horowitz wrote how this refers to "one that reflects the male voice, the male experience, the male memory as normative" (Horowitz, 2000, p. 159). Petö et al (2015) expanded on these two aims, stating "the first seeks to gather the lost and neglected stories of the Holocaust, the second focuses on the framework, or rather settings, in which these stories are situated". (p. 16). I wanted to discover whether these aims are evident in the textbooks, or described by the organisations or teachers. This will give further depth and understanding into the nature of the representation of men and

women and the level of gender analysis, suggesting improvements for the future of Holocaust education.

It is important to reiterate that gender is not synonymous with women. Furthermore, ensuring that women's experiences are included in memorialisation and education of the Holocaust is part of, but not the same as a gender analysis of the Holocaust. Whilst adding more women to a history curriculum or to the study of the Holocaust is a development, it is not the final goal, particularly as the worry can be that it will continue "gender stereotypes and women and re-marginalizes women as one unified group" (Petö et al, 2015, p. 15). As mentioned earlier, seeing women as a homogenous group with the same experiences, or with a focus on biological differences, is also not the aim here. This reinforces a binary and essentialises women. When looking at the textbooks and analysing the interviews, I wanted to use this framework as guidance on how to analyse representations of men and women, and whether gender stereotypes will be reinforced.

Our own stereotypes can affect how we look at the Holocaust. Petö et al (2015) suggest a revision of history, using a combination of the three main types of revisionism- significance-driven, evidence-driven and value-driven (Tucker, 2008). These authors argue that a gendered look at the Holocaust aims to, "interrogate its very assumptions: to ask what we think we know while acknowledging that our knowledge remains incomplete." (p. 16). Petö et al expand on their reasons why a gender analysis is so crucial, namely "the dynamics in historical processes and their role in the production of gender", use and challenge of feminist and gender theory, challenging our ideas of the categories of 'masculine' and 'feminine'. (2015). These suggestions can act as guidance for future Holocaust education. In my research, I will look at whether textbooks, organisations and teachers in England already keep gender in mind. How can these three arguments for gender analysis become a part of the existing aims of Holocaust education? One example where our own gender stereotypes can

affect our study of the Holocaust is in the roles that were mainly played by men and women; with particular views regarding the female perpetrators. Will the students be aware of the female perpetrators? If so, how will they view them? The role of rescuer is presented as "great men" (Bergen, 2013, p. 22). By looking in the textbooks, as well as asking the students and teachers, I investigated whether the focus is on more on individual men or women, and whether there is an equal balance.

One of the important roles of women's studies and gender analysis is how it has brought to our attention that rape and other gendered violence occurred during the Holocaust, including to women and girls in hiding. It has shown that despite the fame of Anne Frank's story, it is not representative of the majority of hiding experiences (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2012). The numerous cases of editing by her, her father and various publishing houses, means it should not be treated the same as an original historical text. Furthermore, treating Anne's story as the canon for hiding during the Holocaust means it ignores those who underwent sexual abuse during this time. Some have argued that study of sexual violence in the Holocaust is disrespectful to those who were victims. I will be interested to see whether any of the interviewees bring up sexual violence in the Holocaust during the interviews, when I mention gender. One question, which cannot be covered by the scope of this research, would look at what the students do and do not see. This could be influenced by their age, and in pedagogy it seems there are different age limits suggested for students to be taught about violence and about sexual violence. Furthermore, I will analyse the textbooks whilst keeping in mind the content that has been chosen to be shown to this age group.

Ringelheim (1998) brought up how in most historical events, often in war, women are considered a reward for men, whereas in the Holocaust, women, men and children were all targeted to be killed. Himmler explained the reasoning behind why each of the mentioned groups were murdered: men were a risk because they were men, children were future

dangers, and women could produce these future dangers. Horowitz (2000) summarised two main viewpoints when it comes to looking at gender analysis in the Holocaust. One is that men and women suffered equally, as Jewish people, which goes beyond sexist or gendered stereotypes. The second is a focus on the biological experiences of women, and coping mechanisms, which can "reinscribe male experience as normative for the development of a master narrative, and relegate women only to the category of the mother, or of the sexually abused" (2000, p. 177). Whilst the National Curriculum and the recent research from UCL (Pettigrew et al., 2009, Foster et al., 2015) ignore gender analysis, I thought the case would be the same in the discourse of the schools, as well as in the textbooks, and women would be reduced to essentialized roles, or gender would be ignored.

Whilst sexual and gender-based violence in the Holocaust should not be ignored, as well as the experiences related to motherhood, it should also not be the only way that women are heard about. Nor should the stories of women only focus on childbirth or pregnancy or other "uniquely female experiences" Petö et al (2015, p. 14). Horowitz explains why this can be damaging, and not a sign of advanced study through gender analysis, when women are associated with biological functions, particularly as they are associated with weakness and used as an excuse for inequality. When analysing the textbooks, I will investigate whether the discourse surrounding women focuses on biology, as well as the material presented in the textbooks.

There has also been debate in exactly how women should be represented in Holocaust education, and how gender analysis should be approached. Katz and Ringelheim's (1985) approach was to explain the different coping and survival strategies of men and women, explaining that women would grow close friendships, whereas men competed. Horowitz challenged these findings, suggesting that gender analysis can be used in order to gain a deeper meaning or level of knowledge, which would not lead to such a dichotomy between

men and women, or a "history of the Holocaust in our own image" (2000, p. 187). Applying features of the students and teachers own standpoint, including biases. This is a perfect example of how your own gender-based biases can influence how one views history, and highlights the importance of using gender analysis to challenge existing assumptions.

1.7 Arguments against Gender Analysis and Holocaust Education

Use of gender analysis in Holocaust studies has been met with various criticisms. In a letter to Joan Ringelheim in 1982, Cynthia Ozick described the study of gender and the Holocaust as "morally wrong" and comparable to Holocaust denial, explaining that the victims were chosen for being Jewish (Ringelheim, 1998). Lawrence Langer famously wrote that by focusing on the differences of suffering between men and women "banalizes" the Holocaust (Ofer & Weitzmann, 1998, p. 351) or that it could "eclipse the Holocaust" (Horowitz, 2000, p. 178). I will be interested to see whether these arguments against gender in Holocaust education will be echoed by the interviewees.

Ringelheim describes a conference in 1993 at the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, where panels looked at the plight of different groups who were targeted in the Holocaust; homosexuals, men of colour, and men who were less physically able. All were male, as the organisers said they forgot to include stories of women (Ringelheim, 1998). As mentioned previously, one of the arguments against gender analysis is that its irrelevance to how suffering was felt in the Holocaust, and is therefore thought to subtract from the horror of the Holocaust. However, these groups are clearly seen as more legitimate than focusing on women, despite the gendered nature of experiences in the camps. Dworkin described her experiences in the same museum, saying how Jewish women were not ignored by the Nazis,

or by anti-Semitics since the Holocaust, “So how can this museum, dedicated to memory, forget to say what happened to women?” (1994). In the 1995 conference “Women and the Holocaust”, Yehuda Bauer “conceded that while a study on women would be valid, it would be of “secondary” importance.” (Horowitz, 2000, p. 181). I was looking to see whether interviews would be similar to these criticisms, or more supportive of gender analysis in history and in education on the Holocaust.

Horowitz (2000) describes her experience of spending considerable effort to put together what she considered to be a balanced syllabus on the Holocaust, from a wide variety of sources. She was caught out when a student asked why there were no female authors, which was something she had not considered. She had, however, considered which texts would be easily accessible for her students, and many texts written by women were difficult to get hold of as they were no longer being printed. Similarly to my previously stated research interests, I will be looking to see whether this will be something the organisations and teachers consider, either in the form of sources, or historical figures, or who is being represented in the textbooks.

In 1998 Gabriel Schoenfeld criticised the Holocaust in academia and education, but also in regards to gender studies, suggesting it as having a “singular agenda” (Horowitz, 2000, p. 181). Furthermore, Horowitz illustrated how arguments against the inclusion of gender analysis in Holocaust studies can highlight general attitudes towards gender analysis, partially due to experiences with her colleagues, as well as in the media. It is also relevant to mention here the issues of intersectional memory in studies on the Holocaust, and which victim groups receive memorialisation. As outlined by Petö et al (2015), researching marginalised victims of the Holocaust can help towards reducing continuing forms of prejudice, such as anti-Semitism, racism and homophobia.

Whilst feminist analyses of the Holocaust have increased, focuses on gender are still in the sidelines, or as Bergen described, thought of as a "mere sideshow…removed from what count as the big questions in the field" (2013, p. 17). In this piece of work, I argue that gender analyse can help understand further, rather than an add-on to the existing study of the Holocaust. In this research, I am particularly interested in understanding further the current state of history and Holocaust education in England, particularly in relation to gender analysis, and the representation of men and women. I will be looking into some of the key stakeholders involved; the textbooks which are produced, the organisations, the teachers and the students. My aim is to understand the current situation regarding gender in Holocaust education, as well as the potential strategies used to avoid or support it.

1.8 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have explained the advantages of a feminist, or gender studies approach to history, and how it can give deeper understanding of the social relations between men and women, as well as an encompassing history of women. The difference between the two is important, but they also relate to one another. In this research I wanted to see in the schools and organisations, how much is a focus on women's history, and how much includes a gender analysis, and how much both occur simultaneously. The aim was to understand the obstacles in the way of gender analyses being used in history education. In the next chapter, I will outline the justifications and implementation of my methods for the textbook as well as interview analyses.

Chapter 2 – Methodology

2.1 Aims of Research

In the government report, 'Britain's Promise to Remember' (2015), as well as the National Curriculum for history, there was no mention of gender analysis, despite the scholarly research in the previous chapter. I will investigate this using four different sources; interviews with Holocaust organisations, teachers, and students, as well as analysis of the most current history textbooks for KS3 (age 11-14) in England.

I had three main aims for this research. Firstly, I wanted to see exactly what is being produced, by looking at the most current history textbooks for this age group by asking the questions; how are men and women represented in the textbooks? Is there evidence of a gender analysis? Secondly, I wanted to find out the views of those key stakeholders who are involved in the production of Holocaust education; therefore I interviewed three leading Holocaust organisations: the Holocaust Educational Trust, the Centre for Holocaust Education and the Holocaust Memorial Day Trust. Do the representatives have an awareness of gender analysis and the Holocaust. If so, would they think it is important? Thirdly, I wanted to find out what is taking place in schools, by interviewing teachers and students. What would teachers and students mention when I talked about gender analysis in the Holocaust? How important is this to them? To get an understanding of the current state of gender analysis and the Holocaust in education at this level in England, I will use triangulation; by conducting interviews with the various stakeholders (organisations, teachers and students) and by analysing the textbooks and the history curriculum.

2.2 Implementation of Methods

I conducted the interviews with the three organisations at their offices in London. Each interview lasted from one to two hours. I put together the questions for the interview guide using the guidelines set by Weiss (1994), organising the questions into subtopics and the subsequent related questions (see appendices). After gaining consent, I also recorded the interview. I interviewed teachers at two different schools, and students from the same two plus one extra. Two schools were in Chester, and one in Liverpool. In each school, I conducted two group interviews with the teachers, as well as group interviews with the students. I spent one or two days in each school, depending on the request of the school. Two of the schools were academies, and one was a community school (see appendices for full school profiles). I was put in contact with the schools through a family member who knew staff that worked there.

Initially I had planned to put aside an hour with each interviewee, as taken from guidelines by Weiss (1994). Unfortunately, I was only given a very limited amount of time with the teachers – in one school a group interview with three teachers lasted thirty minutes, and at a second I spoke to three teachers and a student for forty-five minutes. At the third school, I was initially given fifteen minutes with each teacher, but this was changed to ten minutes with all six members of staff, which I ended up not conducting. Instead, I emailed (and re-emailed) them the three main questions – to which I never received a reply. With each group of students I was given thirty minutes with each group. In order to cut down on time, I reduced my interview guides with the teachers and students down to three key questions **(**see appendices). I made notes whilst we were talking which I would use to record follow up questions if there was time.

2.3 Textbook Analysis

Shrader and Wotipka (2011) conducted an analysis of the representations of men and women, and their relations to one another, in a number of American-produced textbooks on World War II, published 1956 – 2007. They support the value of textbooks in a number of ways, for example how they can highlight what is missing, such as women, and how they can be used to see how this can change over time, as well as gaining, "in the *politics* of official knowledge" (Apple, 1996, p. 23). Textbooks can give insight into "enduring gender roles and power structures" (Shrader & Wotipka, 2011, p. 70), as well as women's political history (Scott, 1984). In this research, I am focusing on the representations of men and women, and the absence or presence of gender analysis in the World War II sections of the two most current history textbooks.

The two textbooks are "Technology, War and Independence: 1901 – Present Day" by Aaron Wilkes (2015) and "Making Sense of History: 1901 – Present Day" by John D Clare, Neil Bates, Alec Fisher and Richard Kennett (2015), both published for KS3 history in England. They are the most recently published textbooks for this age group and for this period of history. I chose these two books as I wanted to reflect on the representation of women, men and of gender analysis in the most up to date textbook resources in England, for the age group I am researching. Despite the fact that the schools I visited did not cite them as a specific resource that they use, I wanted to see what was currently the most up-to-date history textbook resource, to get an idea of what is currently considered the most relevant information by those producing textbooks, in case this is different to the organisations and the teachers. The textbooks are generally produced by exam boards, to follow the exam specification, though at this level of education, the students have SATs in English, Science

and Maths, and no official examinations in History (until GCSE and A-Level, which are not compulsory). Therefore these textbooks are not dictated by exam specifications.

When analysing the textbooks, I decided to follow the categories that Shrader and Wotipka (2011) followed, who were influenced by Tetreault (1986). The categories can be seen in Table 1. I will also use my own category of 'gender-blind' history.

Type of History	**Description**
Male History	Lack of women, which is not commented upon. "There is no consciousness that the male experience is a "particular knowledge" selected from a wider universe of possible knowledge and experience" (Tetreault, 1986). Privileged over other forms of knowledge.
Contributory and Compensatory History	The former, "women as contributing to male-defined society" and the latter "…rests on singular female exemplars" (Shrader & Wotipka, 2011, p. 73) – no challenge to existing structures and frameworks.
Gender-Blind History	Ignores gender entirely, referring to groups of people but ignoring the existence of gender. No challenge to existing structures and frameworks.
Bi-Focal History	Emphasis on binaries. "…women's roles as mothers are emphasized, and attention is given to their oppression…women are seen as passive agents" (Shrader & Wotipka, 2011, p. 73-74).
Feminist History	"…women's traditions, history, culture, values and perspectives…independent of men's history" (Shrader & Wotipka, 2011, p. 74).
Multi-Focal and Relational History	"A multi-focal, gender-balanced perspective…to fuse women's and men's experiences into a holistic view of human experience…scholars are conscious of particularity, while at the same time identifying common denominators of experience." (Tetreault, 1986, p. 217).

Table 1: Categories of analysis for men, women and gender in history textbooks

2.4 Research Issues

I ensured as much as possible that I did not lead the interviewees to answer the questions in a particular way. For example, with the students, I tried to get them to come to their own conclusions. I made sure to not show my own viewpoints as much as possible, though they may have guessed I was advocating gender analysis as they knew I was writing a thesis for an MA in gender studies.

As highlighted by Sprague and Zimmerman (1989), it is important to be transparent about how one reaches certain conclusions, and I am to continue to self-reflect in order to do this carefully. It is important to note that I am not Jewish. I think it is important to consistently reassess your own subject position when you are referring to a cultural group that you are not familiar with or part of. This was particularly relevant when I spoke to the representatives of the Holocaust organisations, as well as the teachers, that I did not come across as dictating how their work on educating about the Holocaust should be conducted, what is taught, and how it should be carried out. I acknowledged my subject position, as well as focusing on the wider history curriculum, so that the study of the Holocaust is part of a gender analysis of the wider history lessons.

Regarding ethical issues, I was working with young people, therefore I discussed with the schools beforehand about whether I needed to get a Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check, but this turned out not to be a possibility, unless I was volunteering for or employed by the school. They said this was fine as long as a member of staff would be nearby at all times. When I carried out the interviews with the students, there was a member of staff nearby, which was part of the school rules. I was initially quite apprehensive about this, as I thought it could influence their answers. However, in both cases the staff were sitting further

away and were working with other students. The students did not appear distracted by their presence.

2.5 Conclusions

The main challenges of the research involved the restrictions on time and access to the schools. Somewhat understandably, the schools could only offer time during lessons, as students were not expected to volunteer any of their free time. Furthermore, it would have been beneficial to speak to more teachers, but unfortunately this has not been possible as I did not receive replies and some cancelled. This indicates attitudes towards my research topic of gender in history and Holocaust education. However, interviews with the organisations were much longer, and I believe the interviewees held more interest for the topic, even if it was not a priority for them.

I think that whilst teachers may have become more aware of various gender issues, particularly due to gender mainstreaming policies, for example The Gender Equality Duty and Schools Report (2007), they may have not previously thought about gender analysis in relation to Holocaust education. In findings from Pettigrew et al (2009), they found that teachers complain of a lack of resources, particularly when teaching the Holocaust, therefore I was expecting teachers to be less keen about this approach.

As I have outlined in this chapter, this research comprised of analyses of two textbooks, which will be explored in the following chapter, using the categories set out by Tetreault and Shrader and Wotipka. The final two chapters were based on the interview section of the research; firstly with the organisations and secondly at the schools, with the teachers and the students.

Chapter 3 – Textbooks

In this chapter I will look at the most current two history textbooks that cover the Holocaust, which have been printed in England, "Making Sense of History: 1901 – Present Day" (Clare, Bates, Fisher & Kennett, 2015) and "Technology, War and Independence: 1901 – Present Day" (Wilkes, 2015). As explained in the previous section I will be using five categories of analysis; male history, contributory and compensatory history, bi-focal history, feminist history and multi-focal and relational history, as well as my own additional category of gender-blind history (Tetreault. 1986., Shrader & Wotipka, 1987).

Alongside the textbooks, I looked at the KS3 National Curriculum for history, and found there is no mention of any female historical figures, despite there being mention of individual male figures. The only mention of something specifically 'women's history' is "women's suffrage", and it is not a compulsory topic in the curriculum. This begins to give an indication of the value placed upon women's history in the history curriculum in England.

3.1 Male History

This section will look at the area of history where there is an absence of women, which is neither noted nor analysed. In both textbooks, throughout the chapters on World War II, including the Holocaust, a range of male historical figures were mentioned or cited, but very few female. The males included Adolf Hitler, Richard Wagner, Winston Churchill, Neville Chamberlain, Alan Turing, J.B. Priestly, Paul von Hindenburg, Harry. S. Truman, Sir Arthur Harris and various male historians. In comparison, only four female figures were (very

briefly) mentioned. In "Making Sense of History" (textbook A) Anne Frank, and Vladka Meed were referred to, and in "Technology, War and Independence" (textbook B), only Klara Hitler and Hitler's sister were mentioned. This is similar to the findings of Pearson (2012) who outlined the very limited representation of women in schools in England and the implications of this, for example that women are not considered to be significant, even when they meet the same significance criteria as their male counterparts.

Even when women are mentioned, they are often as support roles for men – for example as Hitler's mother and sister. In the one extract taken from a testimony of courier Vladka Meed, half of it described the courage of a male Jewish courier, rather than her own experiences or stories.

	Photos		**Illustrations**	
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Textbook A	16	9	12	6
	Men	Women	Men	Women
Textbook B	19	3	13	5

Table 2: Photos and illustrations of men and women in Textbook A and Textbook B.

As you can see from the table above, in both textbooks, and for illustrations as well as photos, there were significantly more containing men than containing women. Whilst the presence of women is not the only goal of a feminist or gender studies analysis, it is telling to find such a lack of a mention or representation of women. Similarly to Horowitz' (2000) description of putting together a syllabus on the Holocaust, in textbook A, all sources are from men and male historians. This raises questions of why female historians are being ignored, and the message it sends to students as well as teachers.

One of the arguments that was given by the organisations was the apparent lack of time that teachers face when teaching about the Holocaust, particularly at this level of education. Teachers also explained that it would not be until GCSE (age 14 – 16) or A-Level (the following two years), during the non-compulsory history exams, that a gender analysis could be included. Later I will critique the explanation of lack of resources and time. Despite this defence against gender analysis as time-consuming, there seemed to be quite a waste of space on some pages. For example, Textbook A uses a photo of a man holding a mug depicting the message "Keep Calm: We Won the War", which takes up a quarter of an A4 page. Who the man is, is not explained nor contextualised. Is this the most beneficial way to use space, and introduce this this topic? Gender analysis should not mean increased consumption of time, rather it is an approach, not something, that needs to be 'added in'.

In this section of the book, there are only three photos showing women on their own, compared to eleven of individual or groups of men. This links into theory that the normative is male, and women are 'the Other' or the exception, meaning their absence is considered unimportant (Horowitz, 2000). In Textbook A, the authors mentioned how Jewish prisoners could be chosen for the role of Sonderkommandos and have the potential to "staying alive a little longer" (p. 60) – were men and women chosen for this role, or just men? The photo seems to be depicting men, but there is no explanation of the gendered nature of this role, which could have been included. This is an example of how these categories of historical analysis can seem to appear at the same time; here as either an absence of women, or as a gender-blindness, which will be looked at in the next section.

3.2 Gender-Blind or Gender-Neutral History

In this section, I look at the second category of analysis, which focuses on the lack of mention of gender in textbooks. Throughout the chapters on the Second World War, and the description of the key players involved, there is no mention of who was fighting. How the roles in war can be gendered was generally ignored as were the various roles and social relations of men and women. As supported by the comments by students in my interviews, it is presumed that the military is male, and the women stay at home. Even if this complete split was the case – the women are still entirely ignored. In Textbook B, there is a description of the beginning of the war, mainly mentioning Hitler, Chamberlain and Churchill. Here, one of the only two photos which feature women or a woman from the whole section of this textbook. It is a group of young women looking excited and happy. The only explanation reads: "Source A: A photograph of the German invasion of Austria, March 1938." (p. 82). There is no contextualisation of who these women are, and why they are celebrating the invasion, and who is the smiling man holding the crowd back? It made me ask exactly was this photo included, and if there are so few photos of women included, or if, indeed, as historians argue, that women did not play significant roles in the war, then should they not receive more explanation when they 'can' be included? It seems that they are being shown in this photo as frivolously excited women due to the Nazi occupation.

Similarly, throughout both textbooks, when the Jewish people are referred to, they are always referred to as "the Jews". Though there were often varying gendered experiences during World War II and the Holocaust, the textbooks do not, on the whole, seek to investigate them. This suggests to me that the authors wanted to portray some kind of gender neutrality. This is similar to the argument that was put forward in scholarly research, and in these interviews, that suffering was not affected by gender, so there is no need for a gender analysis in respect

to the Holocaust. It presents Jewish people in the Holocaust as a uniform group, who all suffered in the same way, regardless of other intersecting factors. Whilst statistics are often given for how many Jewish people were murdered during the Holocaust, gender based statistics are generally ignored, as previously argued by Dworkin (1994), the Nazis did not ignore gender, so how can we?

Survival rates for men and women fluctuated throughout the Holocaust, in the ghettos and camps. A gender analysis can give deeper insight into why this could have been. Neither of the textbooks address why the vast majority of women would be sent to the gas chambers upon arrival. If this was to be included, one would need to be careful to not reinforce stereotypes about women, which occurs when women are automatically grouped with those that are considered 'weaker'. Textbook A gives an explanation for what happened to prisoners upon arrival, "Most were gassed upon arrival, while the physically fit were temporarily kept alive and forced to work." (p. 60). This explanation entirely ignores the gendered nature of who was murdered upon arrival. Is this because it is considered unimportant- as they describe, shortly they will probably be dead, so perhaps the authors considered it irrelevant. Textbook B gives a deeper level of understanding:

> "When they arrived at a death camp, the prisoners were immediately sorted into two groups: those who looked over 15 years old and were strong and healthy were sent to the left; the old, the sick, pregnant women, and women with young children were sent to the right. Those on the left (usually about 10 per cent) were put to work helping to murder the ones on the right."
>
> Textbook B (2015, p. 114.)

This suggests that if a woman was over 15 years old and healthy, that she would go to the left of the group, though this was not the case, and the vast majority of women would be

murdered upon arrival. Therefore, this information is another example of the author utilising gender blindness to ignore that many healthy women were put to death, for being women, as this "10 per cent", if it included all healthy men and women who looked over 15 years old, would have been higher. One could argue that this is an improvement on the past methods of teaching about the sorting of prisoners at the camp. Ringelheim (1998) and Dworkin (1994) complained that in the US Holocaust Memorial Museum, that there was no explanation that the vast majority of women were gassed upon arrival, whilst in this textbook, there is an explanation that being a mother or future mother could be dangerous for your life. However, there may have been a higher proportion of women who were sent to the gas chambers, for reasons that are not explained here – which suggests the sexist beliefs of the Nazis playing a role, as well as the threat of women's ability to reproduce. It seems that these beliefs are not being challenged by these modern teaching materials.

In both textbooks, the authors broach the subject of the different groups targeted by the Nazi regime. Scholarly work by Ringelheim and Dworkin suggests that if particular groups should be memorialised because they were targeted because of their group membership, then so should women. Despite this, there is no mention in either of the textbooks of the particular reasons that men and women were targeted, though this could have been an opportunity to do so.

In Textbook B, there are some particularly graphic descriptions of what happened inside the camps, based on eyewitness accounts. For example:

"The children were taken to an enormous ditch; they were shot and thrown into the fire… If mothers managed to keep their babies with them, a guard took the baby by its legs and smashed it against a wall until only a bloody mess remained in his hands. The mother

then had to take this "mess" with her to the "bath" [gas chamber]. Source C: Another eyewitness account."

Textbook B (2015, p. 114)

As well as these horrifying descriptions, there is an image taking up two thirds of a page, showing "Piles of dead bodies" (p. 115). Despite the sources which show that women were routinely experiencing sexual violence from guards as well as other prisoners, this is consistently avoided in education. Whilst the debates on what should be shown to 11-14 year olds continues, I want to know the justifications behind what images and testimonies are considered inappropriate and appropriate for this age group. It seems that sexual violence is considered an inappropriate type of violence include in a young person's education. Whilst I understand the sensitive nature of the topic, a report published in 2015 found that 5,500 sexual offences were recorded in UK schools in three years (Commons Select Committee, 2016). It seems the tradition of treating sexual violence as a taboo is not working in schools. Whilst I am definitely not suggesting that the topic of the Holocaust is used to teach sexual violence, avoiding it, whilst happily teaching about other areas of violence in the Holocaust, may be perpetuating the stigma and secrecy around such issues.

Whilst I would agree with scholars who argue the need for women to not only be portrayed as victims of sexual violence and as mothers, I think these textbooks are mainly focusing on women's role as mothers, and ignoring the gender-based violence which occurred in camps, as well as in hiding. To add insult to injury, on these particularly shocking pages, above the photo of the naked, dead bodies, there is a small box in the corner, perhaps to provide some 'light relief', which gives information about three pigeons which received medals due to their work in the war. This makes me question the aims of the author – by using the shocking image, and testimony, as well as the pigeons. It is understandable that he may be trying to

shield students from the atrocities of the camp. However, he has still chosen this photo. One cannot simply counteract a shocking image with a piece of pleasant text, to create a balanced and effective pedagogical tool. It seems that more effective and ethical means need to be utilised, as well as possibly taking a look at the aims of history and Holocaust authors.

3.3 Contributory and Compensatory History

Textbook A seems to be the biggest proponent of these historical styles of representing women and men, as well as gender. In descriptions of Britain during the war, there is mention of "mothers-with-babies" and "housewives" (p. 39), but otherwise it seems everyone mentioned is presumed to be male, which fits into the narrative of men as the normative. Similarly, in the Blitz, women are described as filling support roles for men, and as part of male-dominated structures. In one small box, women's experiences during this time are summarised as:

> "Britain's Women: from 1941, single women aged 20-30 could be conscripted into the armed forces or into industry. Some women – such as the 'Aycliffe Angels' of County Durham – did hugely dangerous work filling shells in the Royal Ordnance Factories. About 80,000 girls joined the Women's Land Army to help farmers."
>
> Textbook A (2015, p. 41).

Not only is this small box used as a token summary of the role of women during this period of World War II, but it is patronising and sexist, by referring to the members of the Land Army as "girls". None of their male counterparts are referred to as boys, so the gender bias is clear. These women are further demeaned by their roles as to simply "help farmers". The

work is also suggested to be exceptional, as it is described as dangerous, however none of the men's roles in the war are ever described as dangerous, suggesting it is part of a gendered stereotype that it is natural for a man to take part in war, but an outlier for women to do so. The fact that this small box summarises "Britain's Women" suggests to the reader that every other part of the Blitz involved male actors. Therefore the comments of the students, which will be analysed later, came as little surprise to me.

Throughout the Textbook A, women are consistently grouped with those considered to be weaker than them, which is similar to the findings mentioned earlier, of a focus of the perceived biological differences of men and women explaining social differences. This also occurred in discussion on the resistance movements: "Most partisans were single, able-bodied men. However, some Jewish fighters also welcomed women, children and the elderly who had escaped from the ghettos." (p. 59). It seems that gender is viewed as a weakness, and women are consistently grouped with those viewed as weaker. Whilst this may have been the viewpoint of the partisans, it is important to clearly separate past viewpoints from now, and challenge them. Despite this viewpoint being reiterated on the same page, "The Bielski brothers ran a family camp in the Naliboki forest in Poland. The group accepted all Jews, regardless of age, sex or ability to fight" (p. 59). This also occurs in Textbook B, "Pregnant women, blind and disabled people, and women with children under five were sent by road and train to safer countryside areas." (p. 103). This is one of the very few times that 'women' are mentioned in this textbook, and it is to group them with those considered weak, in an essentialist manner.

In Textbook A, Anne Frank is the one example of a compensatory (Tretceault, 1986, Shrader & Wotipka, 2011) female figure of history, given as an example of resistance. It is encouraging that a nuanced definition of resistance is being explored – in camps, outside of camps, in hiding. However, it seems that students are not taught about the experiences of

many others who hid, who were not middle class, and did not stay with their families. Anne Frank cannot represent the hiding experience of every Jewish person in the Holocaust, which should be acknowledged. Whilst I am not suggesting she should be ignored, this could be used as an opportunity to mention how her class meant she potentially had a higher level of comfort than a large amount of those in hiding, and how some women would experience sexual violence when in this situation.

This section of the textbook was also factually incorrect, or at least misleading: "They (Anne, her sister, and mother) were survived by their father, who had managed to keep Anne's diary safe." (p. 60). Whilst this is in some ways true – Otto Frank did end up with the diary, which he spent time to get published – this ignores the role of Miep Gies, who risked her life in providing food to the family, and went back to the Annexe after the family had been captured to retrieve the diary and keep it safe, knowing how important it was to Anne. This was also a dangerous act of resistance which is ignored by the textbook. Only did it make it to Otto's hands when the war was over.

Textbook A continues to discuss the varying forms of resistance which could take place – another example where women are explicitly mentioned, is in relation to religion in the camps: "…some Jewish women blessed lightbulbs or made Sabbath candles from hollowed-out potato peelings filled with margarine." (p. 61). Without background knowledge of Judaism, this extract could be difficult for a student to place in the history narrative, as the reader has no idea why only a woman would do this. As there are very few mentions that are particularly in regard to women, this shows as very scarce in details.

3.4 Bi-Focal History

Bi-focal history focuses on dualist categories, or binaries (Shrader & Wotipka, 2011). This was very commonly found throughout both of the textbooks, when men and women were mentioned alongside each other. In typical textbook style, there were questions and tasks concerning the information that had been given. Whilst it could have been the case that these particular groups were put together, the textbooks do not examine deeper structures explaining why this happened. This could have been a useful opportunity to study and potentially challenge these gender-based stereotypes. Depending on the teacher, these statements could go unchallenged and interpreted in a way that does not look at background structures. In Textbook B, one of the questions is a project which, amongst other themes, includes the "changing roles of women" (p. 103) as more women were working in Britain. As men would "prepare for attack" (p. 102) and "single women were forced to work." (p. 103): This could be an opportunity to examine the structures which mean that women are often portrayed as support roles for men.

In Textbook B, the author outlines the structure of the Nazi youth organisations, which were compulsory for children in Germany, and the differing school curriculums in school for girls and boys. There is an explanation for the need for 'masculine' boys and 'mothering' girls. These pages in the textbook ask questions about the differences "for the different sexes" (p. 76), such as "Why do you think boys and girls were taught different things?" (p. 77). This could open students and classes to discussions about gender analysis and challenging gendered stereotypes. How the teachers dealt with these questions would be very crucial, to avoid the continuation of such biases.

Textbook B also explains how boys would join the Hitler Youth, and girls the League of German Maidens, then continuing to give a sample of the Hitler Youth organisation, and some of the tests and lessons that they could be challenged with, including hiking and physical tests. The author finishes with the caption, "It describes what ten- to fourteen- year-

old boys had to do to get an 'Achievement Award'. Would you be tough enough?" (p. 77). It seems an extremely strange choice to valorise the masculinised standards of the Nazis, particularly just after defining eugenics and explaining how these youth groups were a part of "the scientific study of how to improve races" (p. 76). Whilst it is possible that the author would argue he was trying to show that the children were 'normal' or comparable to the pupil's lives and interests, it does seem an extremely problematic 'challenge' to suggest.

Women are often placed alongside groups that are considered weaker and in need of protection, which fits into a bi-focal framework, where the emphasis is on women as mothers, grouped as "womenandchildren" (Enloe, 1991) and also their lack of agency. For example in Textbook B, an RAF pilot describes the bombing of Dresden: "It struck me at the time, the thought of women and children down there…You can't justify it." (p. 107). Women are consistently and without question placed as the primary caregivers of their children, for example in describing evacuation from cities to the countryside. Whilst it could have been the case that all fathers were fighting, it seems too simplistic to presume so. There is also never any analysis of why the military is generally comprised of men, and information about women who were in the military. For example in Textbook A: "3.5 million men and 487,000 women were conscripted or volunteered to serve in the armed forces during the war" (p. 41). The gendered roles are rarely challenged or interrogated within these textbooks, which could continue to reinforce such biases.

A photo is used in both textbooks, of a man and woman, who are being publicly shamed, as one of them is a German Jew and the other is not Jewish, which was banned. Both of them are holding signs, written in German. The translation differs between the textbooks. Textbook A claims it reads: "'I am the greatest pig and only let Jews in' and 'As a young Jew, I only take German girls into my room.'" Whereas the translation from Textbook B reads, "The woman's sign reads: 'I live with a pig and only go with Jews.' Her husband's sign reads:

‘Instead of Jews, I only take young German girls to my room.’” (p. 75). This is an area where gender roles and biases could have quite easily been interrogated, but instead this topic had little attention paid to it. The photo and the caption give no more detail. This could be an example to look at sexism in Nazi Germany, and how it could affect men and women, and how the Nazis had chosen what to write on the signs. However after the image is shown and the (incorrect) translation is given, it is not explored further. It is even impossible for the reader to look up the translation themselves due to the quality and size of the photo.

Textbook B also gives information about the laws which increasingly restricted the life of Jewish people. One of them refers particularly to how men and women had to add different names on to their existing names, to show they were Jewish. One of the questions in the “Work” (p. 75) section could have referred to the gendered implications of these laws. In Textbook A, the authors refer to the Nuremberg Laws of 1935: “Jews were forbidden to display the national flag or employ female citizens under 45 years old.” (p. 51). Presumably, women over 45 were considered less important, as they were considered past prime reproductive age. Therefore, it did not matter if they were employed by Jews, as they were not needed by the Nazi government. With no reference to this in the book or classroom, this bias can continue. On the opposite page, students are asked to code various events into the following themes, ““propaganda, segregation, emigration, violence, mass extermination”. To me, the tasks given in the textbooks seem like a place for critical thinking, using a gender analysis. However, this does not take place.

In one sub-chapter in Textbook A, the authors ask the question, “What would you include in a memorial to Jewish resistance?” (p. 54-55). In these pages, the proportion of women is much higher than in the rest of the World War II pages, which is initially encouraging, particularly as the topic is resistance. In one of the photos, there is a fairly low quality photo with the caption “Jewish women and children being led naked to the gas chambers at

Treblinka, c. 1942." (p. 54). Here, women are again being portrayed as mothers, in a passive role, with little contextualisation for why they were naked. A second photo of women on these pages shows women looking out of a train, on its way to Auschwitz, with the caption, "Jewish women on the train to Auschwitz" (p. 54) Whilst on the same page we see female and male partisans in the same photo, smiling, there is no discussion of their gender, with the caption, "Jewish partisans (resistance fighters in German-held territory) in Vilna, 1944" (p. 54). Both photos of women are labelled as women, but the Jewish partisan photo, and a photo of a male and female partisan being hung, presumably for resisting, on the opposite page, also ignores gender. We could have heard about the young man and women who are being hung, and who is taking a photo. We could have heard about the lives of the partisans and the social relations between men and women in this environment. Whilst it is important to not only include women in a way that shows them as 'exceptional examples' of women, it is also potentially harmful to include the photos with no explanation. As resistance was often mentioned by teachers and students, and it featured a large proportion of the pages in these textbooks, it seems that it is a priority of Holocaust education. I would like to see this being approached using a gender analysis.

3.5 Feminist History

Shrader and Wotipka (2011) defined feminist history to "…illuminate women's experiences as significant and meaningful, independent of men's history." (p. 74). The closest that the textbooks come to doing this was in Textbook B, "What was life like in Hitler's Germany?" (p. 78), where the author asks whether it was a sexist society. He described how women (and couples) were encouraged to have children by the government. A quarter of the page is taken

up by a woman breastfeeding, with a description of the rules prescribed by the Nazi regime to women's bodies, based around being a wife and mother.

Firstly, by asking whether Hitler's Germany was sexist, this implies that Germany's current society, or perhaps the society he is writing from (England) is not sexist. The approach of this attempt at an interrogation into sexism takes a top-down approach: we do not learn about the experiences of women who were living in Nazi Germany and encouraged to have children, rather we see the government incentives and the government propaganda. What about the stories from the perspectives of the women, their opinions and stories? Could testimony be used from their viewpoint? Instead, on this page, we are presented with a long paragraph on Nazi party incentives for "hardworking members" (p. 78), told by a male historian. On the opposite page, one of the questions asked is "Explain how this law tried to encourage Germans to have more children". The law is one that never came into effect. Whilst it is interesting, it would be easy for the pupils to simply regurgitate the information, rather than look at the structures behind it.

3.6 Multi-Focal and Relational History

These two textbooks have not reached the stage of multi-focal or relational history, described by Tetreault as:

> "A multi-focal, gender-balanced perspective…to fuse women's and men's experiences into a holistic view of human experience…scholars are conscious of particularity, while at the same time identifying common denominators of experience."
>
> Tetreault (1986, p. 217).

The final category of analysis focuses on inequality, rather than 'adding in' women, or treating men and women as a "similar but different" dichotomy (Shrader & Wotipka, 2011). At first glance, it could have seemed that some areas of the textbooks had developed, and were utilising a gender analysis. However, this often was not the case, and the examples fitted better into the other categories, such as bi-focal, or the majority into gender blind. I would suggest that this multi-focal and relational style of history education would be a positive aim of the textbooks and the future National Curriculum for history.

3.7 Conclusions

Similarly to the National Curriculum, in the textbooks, I found that there were a significant lack of women compared to men; in photos and illustrations, used as sources, and as named historical figures. Where women were found within the pages, they were often presented as support roles for men, little information was given about them, mistakes were made, or sometimes the fact they were women was ignored. Jewish people are represented as a mass, with little individualism and gender was usually ignored. Presenting women alongside other groups considered physically weak highlighted the essentialist focus on biology. There was also much focus on the perpetrators of the Holocaust, rather than from the perspective of Jewish men or women.

Chapter 4 – Organisations

During the interview stages of my research, I spoke to three organisations involved in Holocaust education, working with students, production of teaching materials, teacher training and research; The Holocaust Educational Trust, UCL's Centre for Holocaust Education, and the Holocaust Remembrance Day Trust. The first section of this chapter looks at the aims of Holocaust education, and the debate on whether it should be used to teach other lessons, such as prejudice or racism. The second section focuses on one of the main problems that the organisations claim teachers face when teaching the Holocaust, which is lack of time. The third section is based on attitudes towards gender and the Holocaust, and how it is generally considered a secondary issue. The final section looks at attitudes towards gender and the representation of men and women, and what this made the representatives bring up in conversation.

4.1 Using the Holocaust as a Lesson

Through the interviews, I became aware of a debate emerging which I had not previously considered relevant for this particular area of research. This regarded the lessons that are taught alongside the facts of the Holocaust. The Holocaust has long been considered as a means for teaching wider lessons, as Landau said it, "can civilise and humanise our students and…has the power to sensitise them to the dangers of indifference, intolerance, racism and the dehumanisation of others." (1989, p. 20). At the Holocaust Educational Trust, there was a heavy emphasis on this, most easily shown by their programme, "Lessons from Auschwitz" (LFA), which sends students from England, Wales and Scotland to Poland, for example with the aim of learning about "loss and absence" (Personal interview, 2016). Similarly, at the

Holocaust Memorial Day Trust (HMDT), the respondent discussed the yearly themes of the organisation, such as "How Can Life Go On?" and "Don't Stand By" (Personal interview, 2016), and explained how he put the teaching materials together for the particular annual theme:

> With 'How Can Life Go On?' its trauma, its displacement of refugees, rebuilding communities…Like forgiveness for example, is there a story that is particularly interesting around forgiveness that can be used to highlight this part of the theme vision?
>
> Personal interview, HMDT (2016)

The interviewee also described the aims of HMDT as "growing understanding and creating a safer and better future". They summarised the debates surrounding whether the Holocaust should be used for this purpose:

> There is a debate that will always go on between those of us who believe that lessons being learnt are just as important as the history being learnt itself and those that will argue that the focus on lessons being learnt in part detracts from the history being taught accurately, and confuses what we're trying to say…for example, 'hey look at the language looking being used to describe Jewish people in 1930s Germany, look at this use of rat, look at this use of cockroach during the early 90s in Rwanda, look at these newspaper articles now about immigrants, and drawing this parallel and saying so can you say that the similarities here? I think many would argue that this detracts from the understanding that people come away with of the Holocaust itself.
>
> Personal interview at HMDT (2016)

Whilst they are aware of the arguments against using the Holocaust to teach outside lessons, he still uses this method. This suggested to me that despite it being the case that he can see both sides of the debate, he trusts that lessons are important. On the other hand, it could be that his role at HMDT is so involved in lessons, with the focus on annual themes, that he would need to promote this viewpoint.

The interviewee at UCL discussed the 'worrying' aims in schools of teaching about the Holocaust, were based on these lessons – she gave the examples of reducing bullying and being kind to your neighbour – rather than getting the facts of the Holocaust correct. She explains that the teachers lack of resources means that they are focusing on these "moral values" rather than working on "challenging their misconceptions."

All three of the organisations brought up this issue. Despite the HET project being called "Lessons from Auschwitz", the interviewee showed his discomfort with the use of this language, when describing LFA:

> Then we have a follow-up seminar, and they come to the follow-up seminar- first of all they discuss their responses to the visit, what they've taken from it, and how they feel about it, that kind of thing. Then we start looking what – I hate to use the term 'lessons' because I don't like it.
>
> Personal group interview at HET (2016)

The lessons were discussed by each interviewee, in detail and without prompting by me, and despite the fact that I had said I wanted to discuss gender and representation of women and men. Only the interviewee at HMDT suggested that gender analysis could be used to improve education:

> I would wonder if you particularly focused on the treatment of women during Holocaust or other genocide or episodes, and you were teaching that to boys for example, a young man in the UK now would understand that women being gang raped in Rwanda, as sex as a weapon…and her testimony of what she went through, and really understood that aspect. One would thing that because they would recognise that as being awful, that it could help them understand that this kind of treatment of women in war and more general is a negative thing and could help create a safer, better future… That could be something that works.
>
> Personal interview, HMDT (2016)

The interviewee is looking more closely at gender and how exactly, on a practical level, it could improve education and the surrounding lessons, so by learning about the motivations behind sexual violence, this could lower the likeliness of sexual violence occurring in the country that this is taking place. However, his reaction is to focus on sexual crime, and from the perspective of the perpetrator, in quite a simplistic way. He suggests that a young man in the UK would be less likely to commit such a crime because they would really understand the impact it would have on the woman, with this vague idea of creating a "safer and better future".

4.2 "Lack of Time"

Throughout my interviews with the representatives from the three organisations, they mentioned the lack of time which teachers have to deal with. At HMDT, they brought up this problem, suggesting resulting inaccuracies during teaching, calling it the biggest problem in Holocaust Education. At HET, they detailed how KS3 is meant to take three years to teach, but many schools are fitting it into two years, to leave a year to prepare for GCSEs. They say

that history, and particularly the Holocaust, needs the full three years, especially as they think the Holocaust should not be taught in the first year of KS3 (age 11/12). The respondent at the Centre for Holocaust Education mentioned the research which she was a part of (Pettigrew et al, 2009 & Foster et al, 2015), and how on average, three hours was spent on the Holocaust in classrooms. This meant the width and depth of knowledge was lacking:

> There seems to be an Auschwitz focus and very little about Jewish life before the war, very little about Jewish agency, very little about Jews response to the rise of Nazism. It's all about what the Nazis did the Jews, rather than what was the Jewish response to this?
>
> Personal interview, UCL (2016).

Another important aspect of the amount of time spent on the Holocaust, is so that students and teachers can deal with the emotional side of the topic – and rushing through would not adequately allow to do this. However, I would argue that including a gender analysis in Holocaust education would not need the teacher to spend more time, as the idea is that it is a different approach rather than something being added in. Harstmar (2001) stated that this is a common excuse given by teachers when asked about diversity in the classroom.

The current National History curriculum is the fifth version, each of which has included the Holocaust as a compulsory topic. This was in part due to the efforts of the Holocaust Educational Trust, who highlighted to me the importance of the exam boards, as teachers are working towards the exam specification in their classes and in the teaching materials that they chose. However during KS3, the students do not have nationwide exams to take part in for history, and therefore the teachers do not need to follow an exam specification. During these interviews, the representatives often mentioned how GCSE and A Level history would go

into much more detail, meaning it would be more likely that there would be space and time for a gender analysis:

> I think gradually we will start to see things like that seeping through to the classroom, because I think it is an issue that teachers are often not aware of. I mean maybe part of the problem is because most often the Holocaust is taught in year 9, that doesn't allow for bringing quite as much detail as later stages do, but when you get to those later stages, there is much less focus on the experiences of ordinary people during the Holocaust, because it is typically on papers about the Nazis. So I think, the research that has been done, both on women or rather gendered experiences of victims, but also perpetrators as well, as that begins to gain, as more of it is done, we become more aware of it, then I think it will seep through.
>
> Personal group interview, HET (2016)

The respondent also explained how few students are continuing with history to GCSE level, and even less for A-Level, where there is this potential for deeper and richer detail and analysis. However, even for those students that do continue, the likeliness of a gender-based analysis would still depend on a variety of details; whether the exam board included a question related to gender, whether the teacher chose that topic, as well as the project that the student decides to undertake. Therefore it is easy for any focus on gender to get lost, as it can be very difficult to find in the first place.

'Lack of time' is frequently mentioned by the representatives of the organisations, offered as a sympathetic explanation for any of the problems in the schools, as well as why a gender analysis is currently not taking place. This argument valorises men, as the subject and the 'centre' while keeping women as 'the Other' (Smith, 2000) and ignores the importance of women throughout history, leading to a historical narrative dominated by men, and people

convinced that it could not be any other way. This may particularly be occurring, as Scott (1999) argued, as the study of war, as well as the study of the Holocaust, is not an obvious choice to look at gender analysis, compared to the family, or women, and children.

4.3 Gender as a Secondary Issue

Representatives of the organisations had knowledge of gender analysis in the Holocaust, and did make some suggestions for what this could mean, but still did not express that they think it is particularly important or a pressing matter, or rather a matter which they plan to focus on. Therefore, from these interviews, I got the distinct impression that gender is not deemed an obvious priority for the organisations, in terms of future research, teacher training and production of teaching materials. The organisations stated they had not focused on gender when the teaching materials had been put together. Furthermore, the representatives suggested that if more resources, namely time, became available, then looking into a gender analysis would not be their first port of call. This reflected the previously mentioned comments from Yehuda Bauer, describing a study of women in the Holocaust as "secondary" (Horowitz, 2000, p. 181). Lack of gender analysis is not seen as a loss, and there is a lack of gender expertise, which is not seen as a serious shortcoming. Gender analysis in academia is still considered a pursuit on the margins.

One of the arguments towards incorporating a gender analysis was regarding the lack of resources, particularly teacher's time. Therefore the idea of introducing another component which teachers must seem less than appealing. At UCL, the interviewee also mentioned the many other areas with could do with attention:

> It is important to hear a wide range of experiences to understand a range of experiences, and gender is one of those. But we need to hear about children

> experiences too, and Orthodox Jews, all these areas are side-lined a little bit. We need to hear more of the stories of different groups that we haven't heard from, give their testimony. If it's a matter of, that we don't ask them, then we need to ask them. Hear, or be aware, that we have to have much more stories from a range of people, a range of backgrounds…There are so many problems.
>
> Personal interview, UCL (2016)

Whilst of course there are many issues related to Holocaust education, and also said herself that the history narrative is "male dominated", it seems that she does not think that these problems could help solve each other. For example if a more intersectional approach was taken, using a gender analysis, then this could result in this "decentring of the male subject" as well as "widespread re-examinations of the most fundamental of historical presumptions" (Morgan, 2006, p. 1), meaning more space for the other issues she raises in Holocaust education, including a variety of rarely-heard experiences.

During this project, I generally found that interviewees would talk about gender as something that is 'added in' to studying a particular topic, and that in reality, one can 'take or leave' gender analysis, rather than the viewpoint that everything is gendered. For example, when respondent II at HET relayed their experiences of teaching history, they described gender as something that you "bring in" and how it is coming up "more in some topics than others" (Personal interview, 2016). I choose to interpret this in two potential ways. On the one hand, they could be suggesting that the teaching materials that they were expected to work with may or may not have come from a gender-analysis approach. Alternatively, he could be suggesting that in some areas, there was nothing to say about gender. A similar suggestion was made at HMDT:

> Purely teaching with a gender lens probably wouldn't be the right way to do it, because I have to say that not all of it has a gender lens to it, but I'd be very open even to someone showing me I was wrong in that opinion.
>
> Personal interview at HMDT (2016).

For me, this raises the questions: how to suggest an appropriate gender analysis in history. How to show it is something that is an ingrained into a new approach, rather than adding to an existing approach, but how can this be done? Furthermore, this raises questions regarding those involved in creating the curriculum, as well as the exam specifications, and how their role must make a big impact, in this top-down approach. The respondents open-mindedness is encouraging, though suggests to me that a definition or clearer understanding of what a gender analysis would entail, could be beneficial when attempting to convince those involved in education of the advantages of further analysis and an alternative approach. Of course, I also cannot know how much he could be saying it as a reaction to speaking to someone with an interest in gender studies.

During the interviews with the organisations, they made it clear that gender is not top on their list of priorities to improve Holocaust education in England. The representatives from all three of the organisations suggested that one of the key ways to improve Holocaust education would be for widespread teacher training to take place, and for more resources to go towards the humanities. HET and the Centre for Holocaust Education both mentioned the use of role-play as a pedagogical tool which should be avoided, which could be one element of the training. At HMDT they gave some information about an e-learning platform which they will be working on, which would give teachers a great deal of support: "something that can be used by someone with very little knowledge and understanding." HMDT and HET also suggested the usefulness of incorporating the Holocaust into other classes, such as Religious

Education and English. In fact, HMDT put forward that this could increase the likeliness of a gender analysis – in English lessons. Some classes may seem more suitable for women to have space, whereas the male centred historical narrative (Smith, 2000) may just seem too deep rooted to imagine approaching it in an alternative way.

4.4 Reactions to 'gender'

During the interviews, I was very interested in the varying responses that would occur when I would mention the word 'gender' or refer to 'representation of men and women': As mentioned earlier, the respondent from HMDT suggested that gender analysis could be used to understand sexual violence and how it can link to masculinity. When I spoke to the interviewee at the Centre for Holocaust Education, she suggested that there is a gender-based inequality in the discourse and teaching of history:

> Gender - I think there is a problem with it, I think women generally are not represented in history…We have a male orientated historical narrative, so that affects the Holocaust as well.
>
> Personal interview, UCL (2016)

This is similar to the idea of Sara Horowitz' description of a gendered master narrative, reflecting, "male voice, the male experience, the male memory as normative." (2000, p. 159), as well as the male-dominated textbooks.

The respondent from HDMT mentions that one possible issue in Holocaust education in relation to gender would be that particular experiences relating to women are not included:

> In the life stories that we publish here, or testimony that's given, it is rarely focused on anything to do with women-only issues, like having your period, like being pregnant. I suppose these things are fairly rarely talked about in general. Perhaps partly because of the British sort of inability to talk about these things anyway. We don't tend to talk about how life was probably different in camps based on sex, because of some fundamental aspects about being different genders, if you see what I mean. Whether it would be helpful to, I don't know, certainly it doesn't tend to be spoken about, talked about or put in educational materials, or in most of the books in here."
>
> Personal interview at HMDT (2016).

It seems by not talking about these 'issues', is further perpetuating the taboo of talking about them. If such topics were discussed and studied in school then it would not be such a problem. Whilst the interviewee does make a valid point, that these experiences, as well as gender-based violence, seem to not be included in teaching materials, his method seems to be focused on either a bi-focal history or perhaps a feminist history. He later suggested that gender analyses could utilised to understand sexual violence:

> If we understand that some of the ways that particularly men are recruited to these things is kind of, ideas around machismo, sort of 'being a man'…the Hitler Youth played along that… and then also the experiences of women, which have been that of sexual violence, that of being used as a weapon. Understanding this, and teaching about this stuff and having these focuses helps us do the prevention bit of it.
>
> Personal interview at HMDT (2016).

As mentioned earlier, a focus on biology is criticised and does not lead to a deeper understanding of gender relations. The interviewee has only mentioned menstruation and pregnancy as 'women's issues, as well as reducing women to their reproductive functions. As outlined earlier, this is an approach which I am suggesting should be avoided to develop Holocaust education and pedagogy in general.

At HET, whilst a gender analysis is not the highest priority for them, they do highlight and criticise how current gender stereotypes can affect how we look at history, and how they incorporated that into their own teaching materials for Lessons from Auschwitz (LFA). During the interview, the interviewees mentioned female perpetrators:

> One of the things we use, is a photograph of the Helferinnen, the female SS auxiliaries at Auschwitz…Quite a number of these photos just show these normal young women, having fun…often kids don't even realise that there were women working in Auschwitz, or if they did think about it, they would think about it in terms of these awful stereotypes of women like Irma Grese, which emerged after the war, where if women entered the narrative at all, it was simply as these kind of Myra Hindley style figures.
>
> Personal interview, HET. (2016)

This supports the previous research on how female perpetrators can highlight existing stereotypes about women. (Mushaben, 2004). It also perpetuates the dichotomous categories of putting women into either victim or perpetrator, good or evil. At UCL, the interviewee also brought up this discussion of female perpetrators, "We often try to bring out a little bit about women perpetrators as well…why should that shock people more than male perpetrators?" (Personal interview, 2016) Including female perpetrators seems to be part of the 'add and stir' women or contributory or compensatory approach which was found in the textbooks. Women

are being added to existing frameworks without them being questioned. I would like to see how this could this be improved for future teaching materials, without over complicating the topic, which could potentially put teachers off due to the explanation of lack of time. The likeliness of little in-depth knowledge on the topic could be playing the biggest influence.

At HET, they also mentioned gender-based statistical analysis. As mentioned previously, this is evidence of development. Ringelheim (1998) asked why lists of those who had died in concentration camps were split onto male and female deaths, but not analysed:

> There is this immense significance when initially the Einsatzgruppen and other killing units were essentially killing men, and you can actually look through the reports … and you can literally see the moment where large groups of women are being killed, and then children as well. And by the end of the year most women and children are dead. And the people most likely to be left alive are working men physically able to work, who at the beginning were the group that were most likely to be targeted, because they had decided they were pretty much going to try and kill everybody, it was the ones who could work who were the ones that would be left.
>
> Personal group interview at HET (2016).

Whilst it is encouraging that this type of analysis has taken place, it is all too familiar to see women and children grouped together (Enloe, 1991). In the future, a critical analysis of this could take place as part of the textbook tasks.

When I asked the interviewees from HET about their opinions on gender analysis and representations of men and women in the history curriculum, they suggested that only a small amount of historical research makes its way into the actual syllabi within schools. He gave the example of Elizabeth I, in relation to an A Level exam paper:

> because there has been a lot of historical debate about Elizabeth herself and how she used and presented her gender, and more broadly what that said about gender in the 16th century. Then most years there would be some kind of essay question which dealt with that, so there was a lot of material out there, whereas I suspect with many historical issues, it's not necessarily something that the writers of textbooks really consider.
>
> Personal interview, HET, (2016).

This highlights what someone thinks about when asked about representation of men and women in the history curriculum, as well as showing how KS3 is thought to be too early on to think about gender, and some of the potential obstacles which exist in helping to prevent a gender analysis in history and Holocaust education. Furthermore, he suggested that this could explain why scholarly work on gender in the Holocaust has been going on for a long time but has not become a part of education: whilst the debate on gender in the Holocaust is not new, it has not become a key focus in Holocaust education.

4.5 Conclusions

These views are quite understandable: even with an interest in Gender Studies, before this postgraduate course, I would not have necessarily known exactly how a gender-based analysis could add to and develop Holocaust education, or why it was so important. I have also learnt that the 'add women and stir' approach is not ideal and requires further development. It also seems to be the case that people think of gender as meaning women, as if men are the normative and do not possess a gender, due to the examples that the representatives brought up when discussing gender analysis in the Holocaust. It became clear to me that what is put in the exam specification understandably makes the biggest impact on

what teachers will teach. If the exam boards could be convinced of a changed approach to Holocaust and wider history exam questions, I think the ongoing debates of gender in the Holocaust could be helpful.

Chapter 5 – Teachers and Students

In this final analytical chapter, I look at the practise of history and Holocaust education within the schools, based around the analysis of interviews with teachers and students in three secondary schools in England. The first section of this chapter looks at the discourse surrounding using the Holocaust to teach wider lessons, which was very prevalent. The second is focus on the attitude from teachers and students that the reason women's stories are not heard as much as men's is because history was dominated by men, and women's behaviour and actions were rarely significant. The third looks at the lack of time which the organisations talked about in their interviews. In the fourth section, I look into how important the teachers thought a gender analysis was in relation to the study of the Holocaust. In the final section, I focus on the gender-based stereotypes of students, and how this affected their discussion of history and Holocaust learning.

5.1 Teachers and Students: Using the Holocaust to Teach Lessons

In the previous chapter I outlined some of the arguments for and against using the topic of the Holocaust to teach wider lessons. This discourse regarding the Holocaust being implemented to teach wider lessons was consistently reflected within the schools. Compared to the organisations, who all offered some wary criticism of using the Holocaust in this way, the teachers and students did not hold back. Alsop High School dedicated a whole month to the Holocaust in January called Respect 2015, and a year later put together Hope 2016, where talks from a Holocaust survivor, as well as an exhibition from the Anne Frank Trust, were

part of "sharing of ideas, hopes and dreams" (Alsop High School website, 2016). I asked the members of staff their motivations which had led to so much activity:

> Respondent A: We are a monocle area here, 97 per cent of people here are white
>
> Respondent B: We're aware in this school…there isn't a diverse range of ethnicities, and that's purely a geographical thing…an obligation to ensure our pupils do have access to understanding about different cultures…obviously it helps when they have that access and empathy and compassion.
>
> Personal Interview at Alsop High School (2016).

This is a concrete example of one of their "hopes and dreams", which will hopefully lead to students who have an awareness of people in the wider community. They also repeated the aim towards "the common good" and "promoting tolerance", "the dangers of prejudice" and "the difference between right and wrong", which echo the benefits suggested by Roth (2001) and Pettigrew et al (2009). The members of staff at Alsop also suggested this was only possible through the Holocaust. In the interview with teachers at Bishop's Bluecoat, the teachers said that the pupils' behaviour had changed after teaching the Holocaust, making them more "engaged". They also described how they treat the topic of the Holocaust differently to other areas of the history syllabus, as the skills which are usually promoted, such as "assessing the validity of sources" seem "inappropriate". This highlights how the Holocaust is treated so differently from other areas of history.

This lesson-based focus was echoed by the students when I asked them what they thought the aims were of learning about the Holocaust, with students at Wade Deacon saying the aims were to "learn about stereotypes" as well as preventing future genocide. Another student's rationale was that you would learn about the Holocaust to avoid offending someone. At

Bishops, the groups of students also said that the point was to learn about respect, and prevention, and the importance of empathy. The students consistently used examples of these outside 'lessons' as an aim of learning about the Holocaust, with prevention the most commonly repeated. I think the teachers would be pleased with this, as it also seems to be their teaching aim.

Whilst these are noble aims, it is important to know whether this really is a cause and effect of learning about the Holocaust. As mentioned in the introduction, research has suggested that in some small samples, Holocaust education has had the effect of decreasing prejudice, racism, stereotyping (van Driel, 2010), increasing students "active citizienship" and awareness of human rights (Carrington & Short, 1997, p. 271), and encouraging ethical awareness (Roth, 1991). Further research into the lessons taught from Holocaust education would be beneficial, particularly as all of the organisations mentioned some disadvantages with this approach, which the teachers did not.

5.2 Teachers and Students: "it's how society was."

I asked the interviewees how they thought the representation of men and women was, in the history curriculum or syllabus. From these conversations, it generally did not feel like women had a particularly comprehensive share of space nor attention. When I asked the teachers at Bishops High School about whether the representation of men and women in textbooks is equal, they stated that it is:

> Respondent E: I would say it's probably as fair as it can be.
>
> Respondent G: As it can be - it's not going to be equal is it?

> Respondent E: You study a monarch because they are important, Queen Elizabeth I you don't study her because she's a female, you study her because she's an important monarch.
>
> Personal group interview, Bishop's High School (2016)

There are two points made here which I would like to discuss. Firstly, the suggestion that there is not a way in which representation of men and women could be completely equal, because of the heteronormative patriarchal system. Whilst I am quite aware that societal structures through history have meant that men have been exposed to more privilege which meant more opportunity, I do not think this means that the textbooks and focus of educators should be more on men – the other fifty per cent of the world's population was still busy living.

An alternative approach would be to move away from the 'add and stir' method and focus would be on why this inequality occurred and has continued. Showing the value of this to those who put together the curriculum, would go a very long way. The second particular point of interest is the above statement that "you don't study her because she's female, you study her because she's an important monarch." Firstly, this statement highlights the male-centred nature of history education, as they are suggesting that only men made a significant impact. Secondly, perhaps they thought that I would put forward that they should 'bring in more women', regardless of the significance of the individual, as a token gesture. This links to the earlier-mentioned research of Pearson (2012), who outlined how the historian and the teacher's opinions and standpoint can impact what is taught, and what they consider significant, which can often not be women, even if the woman has ticked the same boxes of significance criteria as male historical figures.

The students maintained an interesting discourse, which generally leant towards the idea that equality of men and women has now been achieved, and that the sexism that is discussed is a problem of the past. The following extract is a prefect from Alsop High School during a group interview with some of his teachers.

> You could say that's to do with the changing role of women in society, now we've got equality… But that's just the past that was how it was, women weren't prominent… That's more of a societal thing I think. Some of the more modern topics which are on specification, Thatcher's Britain and stuff, which is more women-centred. There's more women in, as historical figures.
>
> Personal group interview, Alsop High School. (2016)

This narrative reflected a post-feminist discourse, suggesting that after the 'third wave' of feminism, equality has been achieved. He could potentially be implying that there is no longer a need for feminism, potentially due to increased awareness of popular culture containing feminist discourse (McRobbie, 2004). This fits in with bi-focal history, where there is a "different but equal" approach (Shrader & Wotipka, 2011). Many of the students at the three schools made similar comments. Group 1 at Wade Deacon said that the main difference between men and women in the history curriculum is that the women are usually queens, whereas men have more significance or are in charge because "that's how society was". Their general attitude was that men have been more impactful, which was not women's fault.

Significance cropped up a lot in the interviews with the students. They also suggested that for a women to make history, she must "really prove herself" compared to the standard for a man, which seemed to show some awareness of the structural position of women, rather than just explaining subordination with essentialism. Furthermore, later on in the interview with

group 1 at Wade Deacon, they debated amongst themselves about whether women were not in the curriculum because they were not as significant in historical terms, whilst two girls suggested that instead the impact of women has been ignored. At Bishop's, group 1 suggested that women are increasingly incorporated into the textbook as they "do more things". Group 2 at Bishop's said that men had more dominant roles in history because men were thought of as superior to women and were therefore more influential, which is why women are not taught. They described a class where they looked at the one hundred most influential people in history, and there were less than ten women. When I asked group 2 at Wade Deacon the main topics they had learnt about in history classes, they said that they mainly focused on World War I and II, meaning they did not really learn about any women. During one interview at Wade Deacon, a boy kept interrupting himself as he worried he was saying something sexist, when he was trying to explain that women did not have as much opportunity to reach significance in history. It was interesting to me, particularly as I cannot imagine any boy saying that when I was the same age, fifteen years ago.

5.3 Teachers: "Lack of Time"

At Bishop's Bluecoat High School, one history teacher explained that women's suffrage is currently being taught at GCSE level, but next year it will not be part of the curriculum. It seems that one of the biggest impacts on the specifics of the curriculum are based on the exam boards, which are dictated by the government. Whilst GCSE and A-level may have more potential for the inclusion of gender analysis, the age group I am focusing on is KS3; year 7, 8 and 9 of secondary school, covering the ages 11-14. Therefore this stage of education is not dictated by exam boards, and teachers have less, or rather different pressures.

During the limited interview time I had with the two groups of teachers, they did not state that they had problems when teaching the Holocaust, nor did they find that there was not enough time to teach it properly. However, the widespread research of Pettigrew et al (2009) suggested otherwise. I do not know how much of this is due to the wish for the teachers to appear positively, or that at that school they somehow had more time dedicated to history lessons or the Holocaust, though this seems unlikely. As mentioned previously, I would suggest that the 'lack of time' reasoning for absence of gender analysis by the organisations is more of an excuse than a reality. This thinking may stem from the approach of women's history, or gender analysis as a time-consuming 'add-on', where in fact it is an alternative approach.

5.4 Teachers: How Important is Gender in Holocaust Education?

When I spoke to teachers, I was trying to get an idea of whether they thought a gender analysis had a place in Holocaust education, as well as their views on it in the wider history curriculum and syllabus. Some of the teachers hinted that they thought I was completely missing the point of Holocaust education. A history teacher at Bishop's High School put forward that Jewish people did not suffer depending on their gender, but because they were Jewish:

> For the Holocaust, I don't think it's particularly relevant. Because the suffering for the minorities would, wasn't because you were a man or a woman, it was because it was ethnically and religiously based, and the persecutors, I don't think it particularly matters.
>
> Personal group interview at Bishop's High School (2016)

This shows the gender blindness, or apparent neutrality suggested by this teacher. Similarly to the textbooks, there is no focus on the gendered experiences in the Holocaust, suggesting that those involved in the production and implementation of Holocaust teaching materials do not think it is a priority. Both teachers said that if there was more time to teach the Holocaust, gender analysis would not be their priority, and there are other 'topics' in the Holocaust they would choose before gender, for example "why normal men became persecutors" (Personal interview, 2016). They seemed to suggest that it was quite unnecessary and trivial for me to be think that there should be more of a focus on gender (though I was careful not to state my views outright). This reflects the sentiments of Yehuda Bauer who described women of "secondary importance" in the study of the Holocaust (Horowitz, 2000, p. 181). I believe that gender would be lucky to be of third or fourth importance in these organisations and most of the schools. However, some interest was shown at Alsop High School in regards to women in the curriculum: a member of staff in the history department explained how they had deliberately chosen a particular A-Level topic on the changing role of women. Whilst this is a positive development, not all students will continue to A-Level history, and perhaps many schools will not have chosen this particular topic. As mentioned in the interview with HET, few students are continuing with history to GCSE level, and even less for A-Level, where there is potential for deeper and richer detail and analysis. However, this would still depend on a variety of details; whether the exam board included a question related to gender, whether the teacher chose that topic, as well as the project that the student decides to undertake.

I held one group interview at Alsop High School, during which the school prefect, who had given an assembly in January for Holocaust Memorial Day, and an all-round model pupil, suggested that equality has now been reached. Respondent D stepped in to disagree:

> I still think work needs to be done…I think there is that under-representation… I think it's like, people look at there being a Black president, but there isn't a Black presence in the White House. There's certainly no black presence is there. I don't know what - to answer your question - I think you're starting to see more, you're conscious of.. more needs to be done. Something we all need to be conscious of it isn't it.
>
> Personal group interview at Alsop High School (2016)

I cannot know whether he said this because it is what I wanted to hear, but he definitely picked up on the student for suggesting equality had been reached, using classes on Margaret Thatcher as an example of this, which is quite a compensatory or contributory approach or solution to women in the curriculum. His mention of the US, and a mention of race rather than gender, is interesting due to the particular focus of the questions I was asking, and seems he could not have thought of a more relevant example.

When I asked the teachers about whether they come across any issues when teaching the Holocaust, they said they sometimes were unsure of which images were suitable. In the following extract, the teachers discuss this difficulty:

> Respondent G: My issue is with what to show, and what not to show. There is the temptation to go full on with all the images, all the pictures, but you do have to remember, you're teaching 13-14-
>
> Respondent E: But you don't wanna sort of negatively impact teaching because some things are brutal, there is a reason for that being shown.

> Respondent F: It’s a fine line isn’t it? You're skirting it all the time, particularly the Holocaust.
>
> Respondent G: Yeah, definitely. When I went to work with the Holocaust Trust, and went for a couple of training days with them, one of the things that they said was after we'd met some survivors and so on and heard their stories, they were talking about trying to get teachers from going away from the shocking, the shock factor
>
> Personal group interview at Bishop’s High School (2016,)

In the textbooks, I found that they did not hold back on showing very shocking and horrifying testimony and images. The teacher mentions the training she had done at a previous school with the Holocaust Educational Trust. The first member of staff who spoke is the Head of History, and I got the impression that they had not previously discussed these issues, which could have benefited their teaching, as she had received further training from HET.

Anne Frank was mentioned by many of the different people I spoke to, showing the continuation of her diaries fame. One student described her as the “main protagonist of the Holocaust”, and how she is potentially the only person that many young people (and people in general) know in regards to hiding. Looking at her (heavily edited) experiences could influence how people think it was to be in hiding, which is limited in comparison to all of the different hiding that occurred during the Holocaust, including the prevalence of sexual violence, as well as sexual violence in the camps. This is a topic which was definitely not covered in any of the schools which I visited, and was not mentioned by any of the students or teachers or organisations.

From my own schooling experiences, I know that we were never taught about it, and in fact despite my own extensive reading on the topic of the Holocaust away from school, I was still

surprised to learn that there were brothels in the camps, which I found out during this MA degree, along with sexual violence in the camps, ghettos and women and girls in hiding. It seems that these issues are considered too explicit, or taboo, to be taught about in secondary school. I have a problem with this contradictory argument, particularly due to the possible negative effects of keeping sex as a taboo in the heteronormative framework of school (Epstein, O'Flynn & Telford, 2000). If sexual violence was to be included in Holocaust education, as well as the wider history curriculum, great care and consideration would undoubtedly need to be taken in how to do this in a pedagogically sound way. However, this does not seem to be the case in the other violent teaching materials which are used in this same age group.

5.5 Students: Gender-Based Stereotypes

In this section, I will look at what students explained as their awareness of men and women in the curriculum. I asked the students about three main topics; 1) their experiences of learning about the Holocaust, 2) the aims of learning about the Holocaust and 3) discussion on representation of men and women in history lessons in general, as well as in the Holocaust (please see appendices). These questions are the same questions that I asked their teachers as I thought this could give me two perspectives on the same areas.

At Wade Deacon, in group 1, when focusing on section three, I began by asking them to list the men and women they had learnt about in their history classes during secondary school. In this group, they first only listed men, and I needed to prompt them to think of some women which they had studied. In the room where I was talking to them, there was a large photographic display from newspaper headlines and stories through history. They expressed surprise that they could not think of more women. It turned out they were using the display to

help them think of historical figures, and they pointed out, with more surprise, that there were so few women in this display. At Wade Deacon and at Bishop's High School, both described men and women's roles in World War II as men in the army and women in factories or on farms, or as nurses. They said that women were not allowed to fight, and therefore had to stay at home. At Bishop's they also mentioned the use of propaganda against women. This description of what they have learnt about history seems to be at the bi-focal stage (Shrader & Wotipka, 2011), with an emphasis on binaries.

I spoke to six small groups of students, namely about the aims of Holocaust education, their experiences of being taught about the Holocaust, and some discussion of men and women in the history curriculum, and in the Holocaust. I found that the students would apply their gender biases to analysis of the Holocaust, for example by suggesting that only men were guards because they needed to be very strong. These essentialist views could have originated from what they have been taught, including their own perceptions of gender-based stereotypes being applied to learning about the Holocaust. A similar example of this was when we discussed male and female perpetrators, and a student told me that there were only male guards, because women would not have been able to cope with the gas chambers. These students' understanding of masculinity and femininity and its associated traits meant they could not even contemplate the guards not being male. The flipside of this finding in a different interview, was that one girl told me about a female guard who had tortured someone until their eyes had "popped out". She concluded by saying that you do not hear about the male guards doing anything "like that" which indicated the possible demonising of women. This echoes the discussion at HET, where Tom discussed how female perpetrators were even more shocking, as a kind of abnormal women. Whilst this is interesting, again it is not the main aim of feminist history and Holocaust education, though critical analysis of this could be a part of multi-focal and relational history (Tetreault, 1986).

As mentioned earlier, Heinrich Himmler explained the rationale behind this systematic mass murder and the reasons for targeting children, men and women (Ringelheim, 1998). The fear of reproduction of further generations shows how the Holocaust differs from other examples of genocide and systematic sexual violence in war – when women were raped in the camps by guards, which was illegal, the guards would often kill the women afterwards, for fear that the women could be pregnant. When I asked the students how men and women may have experienced the camps differently, they consistently told me that men would be kept alive so they could work, and women, and other "weak" people, such as children and old people were sent to the gas chambers. This is a change from previous education on the Holocaust which used to ignore the fact the majority of women were selected at this stage, for example in the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, as previously the description was that the very young and the old were selected, and the women were ignored. Despite this development, I feel that this is an area where education is quite glaringly missing gender analysis, or even hearing the stories of women without essentialising them.

I found that the student's held an unquestioning/unchallenged essentialist belief that men are stronger than women. One student told me that women would not have been chosen to be killed in the gas chambers if they were stronger, or for example if they had larger biceps. Though the other students did laugh at this, they also agreed that women simply could not have worked because women are born weaker. This may have been part of the reasoning of the Nazi regime regarding who was selected to work (as well as the fact women were more likely to get pregnant) it was clear that the students were not saying that the Nazis thought that women were weaker (which is part of why it is important to also look at sexism in Nazism) but that they also definitely thought this *is* the case.

During these interviews, the focus on differences between men and women were clearly strong. After Katz and Ringelheim's (1985) binary-reinforcing findings regarding coping

mechanisms were challenged by Horowitz, who provided some sage advice. She explained that gender analysis can be used "…so as not to reinvent a history of the Holocaust in our own image" (2000, p. 187). This is a warning which is not heeded by those involved in Holocaust education. They were similar to the views of the students, that men and women have inherent differences which they are born with, rather than through socialisation. Even some students who argued against 'sexist' comments during the interviews, would agree to similar statements. This must link to trends in the wider history curriculum and education in England in general.

5.7 Conclusion

In this chapter, I highlighted the most important findings from when I spent time in the schools, where the implementation of the national history curriculum is taking place, alongside Holocaust education. It highlighted the discord between academic views towards using the Holocaust to teach other lessons, and the strength of this discourse in schools. Whilst I agree that the aims of teachers, which have been passed onto students, sound very noble and beneficial, I think further research is needed to study the particular effects of the current Holocaust education, in the 'multicultural classroom' of England.

In the following concluding section, I will tie in the main findings of these three chapters and look at the implications of them. Gender does not simply mean women, and that the improved Holocaust education which this thesis is aiming to contribute to, would definitely not mean a lack of focus on men's experiences, rather one that is more equal, whilst not reinforcing age-old gender-based stereotypes, as well as aiming towards a multifocal and relational history as suggested by Tetreault (1986).

Conclusions

At the beginning of this work I outlined the particular situation of England in relation to World War II and Holocaust education, and the main contributing actors. I focused on Key Stage 3 history education in England, covering age 11-14, as this is when Holocaust education is currently a compulsory part of the National Curriculum for history. The Prime Minister's Holocaust Commission Report (2015) outlined some of the particular problems with Holocaust memorialisation and education in England. When looking into this report as well as the history curriculum, I noticed a distinct absence of gender analysis. In this thesis I have argued why a gender analysis can develop historiography, as well as Holocaust education. I analysed the relevant parts of the two most current KS3 history textbooks, as well as conducting interviews with some of the main stakeholders involved in Holocaust education; the organisations, teachers and students.

One debate which emerged in this research concerned whether to use the topic of the Holocaust to teach lessons. These lessons have the potential to be extremely beneficial in England; to decrease anti-Semitism, racism, and as a reminder to those taking an anti-refugee stance. However, whilst the schools and teachers had embraced this idea wholeheartedly, the organisations and textbooks had not. This has led me to make two suggestions; firstly, that the effects of Holocaust education in England, alongside ethical lessons, should further be researched. This would include ensuring that facts about the Holocaust are being taught alongside the lessons, which research has suggested has been detracting from the historical facts, leading to inadequate student knowledge in England. Secondly, that these approaches should also include a gender analysis, due to the benefits of it in anti-racism education, as well as in fully understanding human experiences and inequality. The findings from this research can work as a stepping stone, where similar interviews could be conducted on a

bigger scale, in order to put together teacher training which could react to the some of the strategies used by organisations, teachers, and echoed by students, in order to avoid a gender analysis. As we have seen, despite the huge amount of research in women's stories in the Holocaust, as well as gender analysis in the Holocaust, it has not become part of the historical canon.

The importance of how the teacher uses the textbooks will make an enormous difference. For example, the teachers and the students could critically look at how the textbook authors have represented men and women, such as in the various tasks which are found throughout the pages. At this point, the training of the teacher would be crucial as it would make an impact on how they would interpret the problematic sections of the textbook. Furthermore, I found that the textbooks took some extremely worrying approaches, such as the inaccuracy about Anne Frank and Miep Gies, the valorisation of the Hitler Youth lessons and tests, the shocking images and the accompanying pigeon story, as well as a section on being able to "recognize Jews at a glance" (Wilkes, 2015, p. 76). In this final example, it shows how by simple repeating Nazi ideology, without explaining it, it can be continued. A student could read this book and think that all Jewish people look different but also the same as each other, continuing the racist 'Othering' of the Nazi regime. If the teachers do not use these materials in a challenging way, these beliefs can continue. Gender stereotypes, as well as essentialising women are also continued through these textbooks, which are a key focus of the education system in England.

Looking at the textbooks and the analyses of the interviews, there seems to be two main hurdles in the way of including gender in Holocaust education in England. Firstly, it seems that the thought of using gender analysis when teaching about the Holocaust, would be time-consuming. This is the case with organisations and teachers. Secondly, this gender analysis is not seen as high priority. To improve Holocaust education in England, I have a few

suggestions. Firstly, the National Curriculum for history would be restructured in order to utilise a gender analysis approach. However, due to the vast majority of schools having academy status and not being required to follow the KS3 National Curriculum, a more bottom-up approach could be beneficial. If the curriculum changes, the schools may not continue to follow it. Secondly, teacher training in history would also prioritise gender analyses, which would affect teaching style and methods of analytical thinking – for example even problematic textbooks could be used productively to challenge stereotypes. The approach to a gender analysis in teacher training, as well as in textbooks and other teaching materials, would be extremely important, rather than simply bringing in more women, essentialising women as a homogenous group, or any of the other approaches argued against in this work. Rather, the focus should be on moving away from a gender blind, bi-focal history and developing a multi-focal, relational history (Tetreault, 1986). Furthermore, those in charge of the curriculum and teacher training, as well as the organisations, would need to be convinced of the benefits of this approach, otherwise the male-dominated, binary-reinforcing historical narrative would not be over turned. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) could be a significant part of the future of gender analysis in Holocaust education, as they are not ruled by exam specifications and curriculums. Perhaps the academies could work in the favour of gender analysis, as the schools may feel more freedom for approaches considered 'alternative'. This hierarchical nature of the education system will not change quickly, which is why suggestions for bottom-up approaches are valuable. One benefit of this could be the focus of intersectional memory, to avoid victim groups being left out of memorialisation and education, and giving opportunities to create and connect spaces of memory.

References

Alsop High School. (2016, January). Community based initiative HOPE 2016 launched at Alsop High School | Alsop High School. Retrieved from http://www.alsophighschool.co.uk/community-based-initiative-hope-2016-launched-at-alsop-high-school/

Apple, M. W. (1996). *Cultural politics and education* (Vol. 5). Teachers College Press.

Bergen, D. (2013). What do studies of women, gender, and sexuality contribute to understanding the Holocaust. *Different horrors, same hell. Gender and the Holocaust*, 16-37.

Bock, G. (1989). Women's history and gender history: aspects of an international debate. *Gender & History*, *1*(1), 7-30.

Carrington, B., & Short, G. (1997). Holocaust education, anti-racism and citizenship. *Educational Review*, *49*(3), 271-282.

Cesarani, D. (2012). Challenging the 'Myth of Silence': Postwar Responses to the Destruction of European Jewry. *After the Holocaust: Challenging the Myth of Silence*, 15-38.

Clare, J.D., Bates, N., Fisher, A., & Kennett, R. (2015). *Making Sense of History: 1901 – Present Day.* Hodder Education.

Commons Select Committee. (2016, April). Sexual harassment and sexual violence in schools inquiry launched - News from Parliament - UK Parliament. Retrieved from http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/women-and-equalities-committee/news-parliament-2015/sexual-harassment-and-sexual-violence-in-schools-launch-15-16/

Commons Select Committee. (2016, January). Holocaust education: more teachers should be trained report finds - News from Parliament - UK Parliament. Retrieved from http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/education-committee/news-parliament-2015/holocaust-education-report-published-15-16

Corfield, P. J. (1997). History and the challenge of gender history∗.*Rethinking History*, *1*(3), 241-258.

Department for Education. (2013, September). History programmes of study: key stage 3. National curriculum in England. Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/239075/SECONDARY_national_curriculum_-_History.pdf

Pearce, A. (2014). *Holocaust consciousness in contemporary Britain*. Routledge.

Donnelly, M., & Norton, C. (2012). *Doing history*. Routledge.

Dworkin, A. (1994). The unremembered: Searching for women at the Holocaust Memorial Museum. *MS, Nov/Dec*, 52-58.

Enloe, C. (1991). "Womenandchildren": Propaganda Tools of Patriarchy.*Changing the US Role in the Middle East. Common Courage Press: Monroe ME*.

Epstein, D., O'Flynn, S., & Telford, D. (2000). " Othering" Education: Sexualities, Silences, and Schooling. *Review of research in education*, *25*, 127-179.

Equal Opportunities Commission. (2007, March). Retrieved from http://www.epm.co.uk/schools/gender_equality_duty_and_schools_guidance.pdf

Foster, S., Pettigrew, A., Pearce, A., Hale, R., Burgess, A., Salmons, P., & Lenga, R. A. (2015). What do students know and understand about the Holocaust? Evidence from English secondary schools. UCL Centre for Holocaust Education

Fox-Genovese, E. (1982). Placing women's history in history. *New Left Review*, (133), 5.

Goldenberg, M., & Shapiro, A. H. (Eds.). (2013). *Different Horrors/Same Hell: Gender and the Holocaust*. University of Washington Press.

Goldenberg, M., Ofer, D., & Weitzman, L. J. (1998). Women in the Holocaust. *Women in the Holocaust*.

Grever, M. (1991). 'Pivoting the Center': Women's History As a Compulsory Examination Subject in All Dutch Secondary Schools in 1990 and 19911.*Gender & History*, *3*(1), 65-80.

Hall, C. (1992). Feminism and feminist history.

Hall, C. (2002). *Civilising Subjects: Metropole and Colony in the English Imagination 1830-1867*. University of Chicago Press.

Hammel, A., & Benz, W. (2005). Emigration as rescue and trauma: The historical context of the Kindertransport. *Shofar: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Jewish Studies*, *23*(1), 2-7.

Hartsmar, N. (2001). *Historiemedvetande. Elevers tidsförståelse i en skolkontext*. Lund University.

Holocaust Commission Report. (2015, January). Britain's promise to remember. Retrieved from

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/398645/Holocaust_Commission_Report_Britains_promise_to_remember.pdf

Horowitz, S. R. (2000). Gender, Genocide, and Jewish Memory. *Prooftexts*,*20*(1), 158-190.

Julius, A. (2010). *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-semitism in England*. Oxford University Press

Kahn, A. F., Katz, E., & Ringelheim, J. M. (1985). Women Surviving the Holocaust.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B., & Shandler, J. (2012). *Anne Frank unbound: media, imagination, memory*. Indiana University Press.

Landau, R. (1989). No Nazi War in British History. Jewish Chronicle. 25 August.

Levy, D., & Sznaider, N. (2002). Memory Unbound The Holocaust and the Formation of Cosmopolitan Memory. *European Journal of Social Theory*,*5*(1), 87-106.

Linehan, T. (2012). Comparing Antisemitism, Islamophobia, and Asylophobia: The British Case. *Studies In Ethnicity & Nationalism*, *12*(2), 366-386.

McRobbie, A. (2004). Post-feminism and popular culture. *Feminist media studies*, *4*(3), 255-264.

Morgan, S. (2006). *The feminist history reader*. Routledge.

Mushaben, J. M. (2004). Memory and the Holocaust: processing the past through a gendered lens. History of the Human Sciences, 17(2-3), 147-185.

Pearson, J. (2012). Where are we? The place of women in history curricula.*Teaching History*, (147), 47.

Petö, A., Hecht, L., & Karolina Krasuska, eds. (2015). *Women and the Holocaust: New Perspectives and Challenges*. Warsaw: Instytut Badań Literackich.

Appendices

Appendix A

Representative from Organisations

- **Background**
  - How long have you worked here?
  - What brought you to this organisation and position? Experience of holocaust education before working here?

- **Teaching the Holocaust**
  - What do you think are the issues surrounding teaching the Holocaust? (what problems do teachers face?)
  - Resources / lack of time / student responses / Muslim students / sensitive and upsetting topics /

- **Your organisations role in Holocaust education**
  - Please tell me about ……'s role in Holocaust education in England/the UK
  - How are the teaching materials put together?
  -

- **Aims of teaching the Holocaust**
  - What do you think are the benefits/aims of teaching the Holocaust?
  - Do you think these aims are being met?
  - How do you think Holocaust education could improve?
  - How does Holocaust education now differ to your own experiences? / what do you think are the main changes in Holocaust education?

- **Gender and women in the curriculum/ History**
  - How do you feel women are represented in the history curriculum?...
  - Do you think women get a fair share of space? (ask them to elaborate)
  - How are women generally talked about? Examples of women in the curriculum. (Would need to compare to men in the curriculum?)

- **Views on representation of women in the Holocaust**

- How do you think men and women are represented in Holocaust education materials? No difference/ in different ways?
- A body of literature suggests proposes that women are represented in a very limited number of ways (give examples). What do you think about this issue?
- Would you be open to suggestions of change? (I don't mean from me – I am just trying to work out what they think about it)

Appendix B

Alsop High School, North Liverpool

Alsop High School is a community secondary school (controlled by the local council and not influenced by business or religious groups) to the north of Liverpool. There are approximately 1700 students attending the co-educational school. Its main speciality is technology. It does not state a particular religious leaning.

Bishop's Bluecoat Church of England High School, Chester

Bishop's Bluecoat is a co-educational academy school (run by a governing body, independent from the local council – they can follow a different curriculum) in Chester, with approximately 1100 students attending. The religion at the school is Church of England.

Wade Deacon High School, Widnes

Wade Deacon High school is also an academy school. There are approximately 1500 students attending the co-educational institute. It does not state a specific religion.

Appendix C

Teacher Questions

- **Please tell me your experiences of teaching the Holocaust**

- **What do you think are the aims of learning about the Holocaust?**

- **What do you think are the roles of men and women in history, and in the Holocaust?**

Appendix D

Student Questions

- **Can you tell me your experiences of learning about the Holocaust?**
  - First learnt about it (in and out of school)
  - Books/ movies/ museums
  - What did you learn?

- **What do you think are the aims of learning about the Holocaust?**

- **What do you think are the roles of men and women in history, and in the Holocaust?**
  - History lessons and in the Holocaust?

Appendix E

Interview Guide: Peter Bull, Alsop School, Coordinator of Hope 2016

- **Teaching history: background**
    - What is your role at Alsop? What do you teach? (religious education) How long have you been teaching?
    - Do you teach the Holocaust? How long have you been teaching the Holocaust?

- **HOPE 2016**
    - Who were the main groups involved? (Anne Frank Trust, Anthony Walker Foundation, Hillsborough, Holocaust survivor Zigi Shipper, assembly..)
    - What were your aims when organising HOPE 2016? Do you feel these aims were met?
    - Do you have plans for next year/ what are they?
    - Similarly – what do you think are the aims of teaching the Holocaust / wider goals / outcomes?
    - Do you think Holocaust education could be improved? How?

- **Views on representation of women and men in the Holocaust teaching materials and in HOPE 2016**
    - With regards to representation, how do you come up with the different groups of people involved HOPE 2016? Different backgrounds/ genders/ - how did you put this together?

- **Experiences of teaching the Holocaust/ teachers experiences at this school**
    - How do you find teaching the Holocaust?/ how do the history teachers find it?(in general)
    - Any problems? Any particularly positive/rewarding experiences?
    - How do you think men and women are represented in Holocaust education materials? No difference/ in different ways?
    - How do you think men and women should be presented in teaching materials?
    - A body of literature suggests proposes that women are represented in a very limited number of ways (give examples). What do you think about this issue?
    - Do you think teachers would like more of a focus on gender issues? Why?

- **Gender and women in the curriculum/ History**
    - Do you think men and women are represented equally in the history curriculum and teaching materials?/ or talk about religious education materials?
    - Which men/women are talked about?

- Is there any chance I could see the text books which are used for history in this school/ the name?