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Foreword

This volume is a product of the joint Initiative on Holocaust Education and Genocide Prevention by the Salzburg Global Seminar and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. I am honoured to have been associated with this project since its inception in 2009. Working together, the Seminar and the Museum have brought together scholars, educators and policymakers from different academic disciplines, and from many different parts of the world, to consider how far, and in what ways, education about the Holocaust and other genocides can actually contribute to the prevention of further such tragedies in the future.

One essential prerequisite for effective work in this field is to know what is already being taught about the Holocaust around the world, and where, and how. By providing a systematic review of practice outside the 31 countries of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance—that is, in Africa, Asia, Australasia, most of Latin America, and even large parts of eastern and southeastern Europe—the present volume, with its accompanying directory of regional and country-specific programmes, makes a vital contribution to our collective endeavours to understand past genocides and prevent future ones.

I am glad that the Seminar and the Museum together intend to continue their work, by helping to forge a worldwide community of Holocaust scholars and educators, and by conducting a series of case studies on international responses to recent genocides. This will help to shape more effective responses to such crises in future. I applaud their efforts, and hope that others will give them the support they need to carry out these tasks.

Kofi A. Annan

Secretary-General of the United Nations, 1997–2006
Honorary President, Salzburg Initiative on Holocaust Education and Genocide Prevention
**Prologue**

How do you teach about the Holocaust in countries that were not directly affected by it? Do the lessons of this largely Europe-based event help us to understand contemporary instances of genocide or mass violence, such as those in Rwanda, Cambodia, and Darfur? And vice versa, how does our evolving understanding of contemporary genocide contribute to an evolving understanding of the Holocaust?

There are no easy answers to these and other questions raised by the topic of Holocaust education, but they serve as parameters to compare and evaluate the expertise developed around the globe. While the Holocaust was largely a Europe-based event, it has become a global reference for many discussions in the 21st century.

The Salzburg Initiative on Holocaust Education and Genocide Prevention explores these global connections, and divisions, between the fields of Holocaust education, genocide prevention, and human rights. The Initiative has been developed jointly by the Salzburg Global Seminar and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Since 2010, we have convened a series of meetings and conferences that have brought together experts and practitioners of Holocaust, genocide, and human rights education from close to 30 countries. The purpose of this multiyear initiative is to create a space in which experts from various fields can interact across disciplinary boundaries to develop educational models and approaches that help to deepen Holocaust education and contribute to the prevention of genocide and its precursors.

Our meetings in Salzburg are not conferences in the traditional sense. They are based on the strong belief in the value of in-depth conversations and nurture a space in which aspirations, challenges, and failures can be reflected upon in a global dialogue.

As chair of this initiative, I am grateful for this opportunity to describe how we started, developed, and today define our specific contribution to the field of Holocaust and genocide education.

How did we start?

At the 2010 founding conference, which brought together 50 international experts, we allowed ourselves the luxury of addressing large topics: the roots of genocide; the connections between justice and genocide prevention; the relationship between trauma and reconciliation. Our discussions frequently returned to the complex relationship between teaching about the Holocaust and learning from the Holocaust. We investigated the compatibility of Holocaust and human rights education, as well as rising Holocaust denial and distortion.
The conference developed key recommendations on education and prevention and led to a clearer understanding of the need for a long-term initiative. Additionally, some of the themes discussed, such as the fate of women during the Holocaust and later genocides, the need for comparative genocide studies, or the relevance of regional networks have been further developed by participants since then in a variety of forums.

Following the 2010 founding conference, we addressed—in consecutive planning meetings in March and June 2011—the hard question: How can we effect change?

We looked closely at other initiatives, especially at the 31 member-state International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA). We were inspired by the 2010 IHRA paper on the *Holocaust and Other Genocides* and related debates under the 2011 Dutch IHRA presidency. After the luxury of scanning the broad field of what had been done, we were looking for what might be lacking, and how we could make a specific contribution to a more connected network of Holocaust, genocide, and human rights experts.

In 2012, we decided to query experts from outside the established IHRA framework in order to better understand how the Holocaust and other genocides are being taught outside its geographic parameters. We see the lack of knowledge about this expertise, and of a network linking those concerned, as one important obstacle to the development of a truly global conversation about Holocaust education and the potential of training as a form of genocide prevention.

Points of departure

The Holocaust is not the first genocide in history. But as Yehuda Bauer stated, while the Holocaust is a genocide, no other genocide has been a Holocaust: the attempt based on ideology—not pragmatic, economic, or power interests—to eliminate a group entirely, throughout the world. Genocides happen within mostly national or regional borders; the Holocaust intended a total destruction of one group everywhere. The Wannsee protocol did not just list the Jewish communities of Germany or German-occupied territories, but was envisioning the “Final Solution” of the “Jewish question.” The Holocaust changed our perception of humanity. Hannah Arendt described it as “a crime against humanity perpetrated upon the body of the Jewish people.” Countless members of other groups—Roma and Sinti, the disabled, homosexuals, and Soviet prisoners of war, among many others—were murdered as well.

The suffering of individuals, in whatever genocidal context, are horrific and cannot be measured against each other. We do not differentiate genocides to develop a hierarchy of victims, but to understand the tools and mechanisms used by perpetrators. Clearly we are not the only ones who can learn from such an analysis. Throughout the 20th century and now into the 21st, we have witnessed another learning process: that of perpetrators learning from each other, copying and extending their methods of dehumanization.

Much of the debate in recent years has investigated whether, and how, we can move from a culture of reaction to a culture of prevention. Both the Universal Declaration of Human Rights
and the Genocide Convention were adopted in 1948 linking the Holocaust, history, and human rights. Despite our vow of “never again” we have failed to match these two instruments with decisive action. Since 1948, millions more have lost their lives as a result of mass killings.

Some of the colleagues attending our meetings live and work in countries that have experienced ethnic conflict or genocide: we learned much from them about the challenges of reconciliation. The effects of genocide do not end when violence stops. Survivors live with trauma and loss; a community that has lost its civil core takes generations to rebuild.

While the International Criminal Court and the United Nations have taken relevant steps forward, we are still struggling with bringing perpetrators of genocidal acts to justice—a critical step in establishing the rule of law. Governments have embraced the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) norm, progress in the area of comparative risk assessment. The issue now seems less the lack of a generalized normative consensus, but effective implementation. Some countries are in the process of establishing protocols and government agencies to assess early genocide warnings and engage before military intervention becomes the only remaining option.

As participants in our 2010 and 2012 conferences pointed out, teaching about the Holocaust and learning from the Holocaust define two, often quite different, pedagogical approaches that may be easier to align in our aspirations than in a school environment. Teacher training, student-centered learning methods, accessibility of resources and funds, national curricula: Holocaust education is as much defined by the changing parameters of a national education system as by national perspectives on its relevance.

Our work is guided by the large questions: if, how, and what we learn from history. In our discussions we often felt it was vital to ask the right questions, in order to address the complexity at stake, and to understand different perspectives and answers. One of the major issues discussed during both conferences and the interim meetings was the question of whether by connecting past genocides and contemporary human rights violations we improve our understanding of both topics, or whether we thereby endanger the recognition of their vast differences.

Seemingly, the Holocaust echoes more strongly than ever in the world: as the lowest point of humanity; as a central memory in Western culture, politics, and legislation; and increasingly as a global frame of reference for contemporary genocide, ethnic conflict, and human rights violations.

A recurrent theme in Holocaust and genocide education is the hope that it can contribute to strengthening tolerance. But can we substantiate the assumption that it is effective against racism, antisemitism, xenophobia, or homophobia? The connections between education, social and civic engagement, and social norms need further exploration and study.

What does it mean, then, that Holocaust denial seems to grow worldwide? Holocaust denial and antisemitism have been embedded in Western societies ever since 1945, and traditional European antisemitism remains a powerful source of prejudice and hate. Increasingly, Western Holocaust
denial is adopted and utilized by Muslim fundamentalist voices. For the first time since Nazi Germany, a state, Iran, aggressively sponsors Holocaust denial as a government objective. Social media has become a major tool for education, and for denial. If such a fully documented genocide as the Holocaust can be denied, what does that mean for the remembrance of other genocides, or massive human rights violations?

Education as prevention?

Within the IHRA, guidelines have been developed on how to strengthen Holocaust education. However, its 31 member states by no means form a unified body. Rather they remain separate nation states reflecting upon the Holocaust within their national histories. Holocaust education in Germany is different from what it is in Israel, or the United States, or Argentina. Increasingly, we explore if and how Holocaust education can be used as a tool for addressing other, more recent genocides and human rights abuses.

What we are missing is up-to-date knowledge of how the Holocaust is referenced and/or used in education outside IHRA member countries. The UN’s global mandate as stated in General Assembly Resolution 60/7 (2005) “Holocaust Remembrance,” urges member states to develop educational programs that “will inculcate future generations with the lessons of the Holocaust in order to prevent future acts of genocide.”

Local circumstances and conditions shape the ways in which the Holocaust, other genocides, and human rights issues can be, and are, taught. We do not seek any “one size fits all” model. Rather, we are interested in creating a global forum in which educators, policymakers, and activists can explore what they share, develop a common vocabulary, and discuss best practices.

As a result of our conversations, we changed the course of the Salzburg Initiative and decided to focus the 2012 session on expertise that exists outside the established frame of the IHRA. Inviting colleagues from outside the alliance, we gained new perspectives, gathered information on best practices, and were challenged by the expertise that has been building in countries from the Global South, as well as in Eastern Europe and former Soviet states.

Encouraged by the results, we decided to undertake an unprecedented global survey of Holocaust education. By bringing together so much extensive data, which will be available online and added to in the future, we hope to make a concrete and lasting contribution to the field and improve global documentation and awareness of Holocaust and genocide initiatives.

Through the 2010 and 2012 conferences and successive conversations, we learned that our colleagues involved in Holocaust and genocide remembrance outside the IHRA geographical framework face daunting obstacles. Emerging networks in non-Western countries, where Holocaust and genocide experts are often working with limited resources and little or no government or civil society support, e.g. Chile, China, Mexico, Morocco, Rwanda, or South Korea, are in need of cross-border and global networking, access to resources, and technical assistance. There is a strong desire for cooperation in Africa, Latin America, and Asia among
organizations addressing Holocaust and genocide awareness. Colleagues want to learn from others working on similar initiatives.

In societies struggling with their own legacies of genocide and human rights abuses, for example in Rwanda, Cambodia, or South Africa, educators themselves struggle to understand how such traumatic events were allowed to happen. They point out that Holocaust studies and remembrance can provide orientation and possibly a framework for understanding genocides, and for dealing with other histories of human rights abuses. While Holocaust education, research, and remembrance was indicated as a potentially helpful model, colleagues from post-genocidal countries also emphasized that within this dialogue it is important to consider the particular historical, social, cultural, and political dynamics in each genocidal event.

Innovative work and different educational practices are developed outside the IHRA network and are vital contributions to a growing global conversation on the Holocaust and other genocides. Within the IHRA, however, little is known about work taking place in countries such as South Africa, Ecuador, Armenia, Mexico, Morocco, Ukraine, Cambodia, or Rwanda. We hope that the Salzburg Initiative can contribute to a collegial dialogue on Holocaust and genocide remembrance activities around the world, and an exchange on resources and best practices.

In today’s world, Holocaust and genocide denial, distortion, and/or minimization have become global phenomena. Colleagues from countries as diverse as Morocco, China, Turkey, or South Africa stressed the need to develop effective strategies to combat the growing assault on historical truth.

Building on the expertise of our colleagues within the Salzburg Initiative network, we have developed two resources, which we hope will be helpful in addressing some of the shortcomings listed above. This publication, “Global Perspectives in Holocaust Education” is composed of two sections: (1) a comprehensive survey of practices around the globe; (2) an encyclopedia/directory of regional and country-specific resources. We acknowledge the work of many colleagues who contributed to these publications.

Hannah Arendt’s description of the Holocaust as a “crime against humanity” helped to frame our understanding of genocide today as an assault on the very essence of mankind: human diversity. Based on this understanding, we hope the Salzburg Initiative helps to nurture a truly global conversation on the Holocaust and other genocides in the 21st century, and that—geographically and otherwise—it will include a more and more diverse multitude of voices and visions in the years to come.

Dr. Klaus Mueller
Chair, Salzburg Initiative on Holocaust Education and Genocide Prevention
Representative for Europe, United States Holocaust Memorial Museum
INTRODUCTION

In late June 2012, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the Salzburg Global Seminar co-sponsored the symposium *Learning from the Past: Global Perspectives on Holocaust Education*.¹ The symposium, with support from the Austrian Future Fund, the Austrian National Fund for the Victims of National Socialism, and the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance,² convened experts and practitioners on Holocaust and genocide education from five continents. These experts discussed the value of the Holocaust as a topic of study to states outside of the general scope of Western Europe, North America, and Israel. The symposium was a first step in an effort to assist individuals and organizations who seek to understand the potential relevance of the Holocaust and its lessons to their particular culture.

Building on the symposium’s insights, we now examine how national, regional, and international historical narratives impact the global understanding of the Holocaust. We survey the world’s major regions, explore where the Holocaust is known and where it is not, and assess the major institutions responsible for the dissemination of knowledge about the Holocaust. In

¹ The full report on the symposium can be found here: [www.salzburgglobal.org/mediafiles/MEDIA68454.pdf](http://www.salzburgglobal.org/mediafiles/MEDIA68454.pdf).
² Formerly the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance and Research.
general, these institutions include the national and local education systems. As an embodiment of the state, the educational system is especially influential in shaping the local historical narrative of the Holocaust.

Learning from the Past: The Salzburg Global Seminar

In the late 1990s, then-Swedish Prime Minister Göran Persson learned that Holocaust denial proliferated among Swedish youth and convened the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust. In 1998, the forum officially established the Task Force for International Cooperation on Holocaust Education, Remembrance, and Research (ITF). The ITF, recently renamed the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance (IHRA), currently has 31 members—most of which are located in Western Europe—and is the only intergovernmental organization solely devoted to Holocaust remembrance and education. While educational initiatives around Holocaust memory in these 31 countries have been chronicled, far less is known about states outside the IHRA. This project seeks to fill that gap.

In 2012, representatives from states as diverse as Ecuador, Rwanda, and South Korea convened in Salzburg, Austria. Following four days of discussion, participants summarized the lessons the Holocaust offers their home countries, i.e., as a means

---

3 From November 30 through December 3, 1998, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the United States Department of State convened the Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets. Attendees devoted a day to the topics of Holocaust education, remembrance, and research, including the importance of Holocaust education and the goals of the newly established ITF. For more information, see Proceedings of the Washington Conference on Holocaust-Era Assets (Washington, DC, 1999).

• to understand national identity and the impact of the Holocaust and Holocaust-related immigration;

• to illuminate traumatic discrimination in the country’s past; and

• to serve as a prism for examining current issues in contemporary society.\(^5\)

Understanding National Identity and the Impact of the Holocaust and Holocaust-related Immigration

Though many of the states in which the Holocaust took place are members of the IHRA, a significant number of states have not joined the organization. Citizens in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus, for instance, suffered anti-Jewish and anti-Slavic violence at the hands of the Nazis. Though the Soviet era’s official interpretation of Nazi aggression as predominately anti-Communist complicates Holocaust memory in those states, the Holocaust is clearly relevant there.

Even in those places where the Holocaust did not directly take place, substantial pre-war Jewish populations and the immigration of both Holocaust survivors and perpetrators to some states led to a greater national memory of the Holocaust. Following the war, many Jewish Holocaust victims remained in Europe or settled in the United States and Palestine/Israel. However, significant numbers of Holocaust survivors also immigrated to South America, South Africa, and Australia. Areas with a history of receiving significant numbers of Jewish refugees tended to develop an interest in educating their citizens about the Holocaust. On the South American continent, Argentina received the most European immigrants after the war, including

---

\(^5\) SGS, Concluding Table Discussions, Permission Pending.
many Jewish refugees as well as Nazi war criminals attempting to flee prosecution. Argentina’s interest in Holocaust education is evidenced by the fact that it is currently the only state outside of Europe, North America, and Israel that holds full membership in the IHRA. Australia offers another example of the impact of European Jewish immigration. By the 1970s, two-thirds of Australia’s sizable post-World War II Jewish population was comprised of Holocaust survivors. Australia now has two Holocaust museums, which work closely with local schools to train teachers in Holocaust education.⁶

Illuminating Traumatic Discrimination in the Country’s Past

Some states with limited historical connection to the events of the Holocaust have nonetheless employed the history as an effort to understand and reconcile their own traumatic pasts. In these instances, the Holocaust serves as an example of the consequences of intolerance and racism and therefore, in the words of the Education Working Group (EWG) of IHRA, as the world’s “paradigmatic genocide.”⁷ In South Africa and Rwanda, attempts to reconcile divergent ethnic groups after the apartheid era and the genocide, respectively, have led to educational engagement with the Holocaust. These initiatives are intended to develop more compassionate societies in which diversity is respected. In South and Central America, the transition to democracy after a series of brutal military dictatorships and the end of state violence against mostly indigenous citizens spawned a renewed interest in human rights education. Several Latin


Americans states have looked to the Holocaust as a way to think about their own pasts. In China, scholars have compared and contrasted the Holocaust with the atrocities committed by the Japanese military against civilians in Nanjing during World War II.

The Holocaust as a Prism for Understanding Current Issues in Society

On the one hand, the increased interest in human rights in the past quarter century has led citizens, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and governments to incorporate the study of the Holocaust into the curriculum as a means to teach students to respect diversity. In Ecuador, for example, the Ministry of Education has promoted a curriculum that reflects on consequences of the Holocaust as a way to fight discrimination against indigenous peoples. In Mexico, recent pedagogical experiments highlight the Holocaust as a means to foster civic responsibility and combat violence.

On the other hand, the study of the Holocaust has been fraught with political tension. In some states in North Africa and the Middle East, conflict over the legitimacy of the state of Israel, which resulted from the UN partition of Palestine in the years immediately following World War II, has influenced some citizens and governments to diminish or to deny outright the accepted scholarly consensus on the events of the Holocaust. This interpretation is not without its exceptions, but its prevalence demonstrates that the memory of the Holocaust cannot be understood without accounting for local political considerations.

The Global Influence of Holocaust Education
In the past decade, an international infrastructure has developed to extend awareness of the Holocaust to populations outside of IHRA states. The United Nations has played a major role in furthering Holocaust education. In 2005, the UN General Assembly adopted Resolution 60/7 entitled “Holocaust Remembrance,” making January 27, the anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, International Holocaust Remembrance Day (IHRD). The Resolution also recommended that UN members mark the day with suitable events. In addition, the United Nations established an outreach program to “mobilize civil society for Holocaust remembrance and education, in order to help to prevent future acts of genocide.” Since then, the Holocaust and the United Nations Outreach Programme has been involved in commemorative ceremonies around the globe, from Burma to Kenya.

Additionally, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) works closely with its member states’ specialized organizations and the Holocaust and the UN Outreach Programme to promote Holocaust awareness. General Resolution 34c/61 (2007) asked the Director-General of UNESCO to consult with the Secretary-General of the UN regarding the Outreach Programme with the view to contributing to the promotion of Holocaust education and the confrontation of Holocaust denial. UNESCO’s many contributions include the 2009 experts meeting “Combating Intolerance, Exclusion, and Violence through Holocaust Education,” which looked particularly at the potential of Holocaust education in Africa; a 2010 double issue of the organization’s journal, Prospects, devoted to international perspectives on Holocaust education; a 2011 symposium titled “Teaching Difficult Issues in Primary Schools: the Example of the Holocaust;” a January 2012 international conference titled “International

---

Dimensions of Holocaust Education;” and the April 2012 experts meeting “Holocaust Education in a Global Context.” The latter initiative is part of an ongoing UNESCO effort to map and assess formal Holocaust education worldwide.9

NGOs have similarly contributed to expanding the global influence of Holocaust education, in particular, using the Holocaust as a case study to understand and prevent genocide. The more prominent efforts in this field are represented by a number of significant international organizations,10 including:

- Aegis Trust
- Anne Frank House
- Auschwitz-Birkenau State Memorial and Museum
- Facing History and Ourselves
- Mémorial de la Shoah
- Salzburg Global Seminar’s Holocaust Education and Genocide Prevention Initiative
- The Aladdin Project
- United States Holocaust Memorial Museum
- USC Shoah Foundation
- Yad Vashem

Another global influence in furthering awareness of the Holocaust is popular culture. The influence of popular culture is difficult to document, but cultural productions about the Holocaust, originating mostly from Europe and the United States, have reached millions of people around the world. In short, popular culture since World War II and especially in the past

---


10 Left from the list above of international organizations and the list below of nongovernmental organizations is the European Union Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA). Operating primarily within Europe, the FRA’s substantial contribution to Holocaust education, remembrance, and research overlaps with that of the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance. Notably, Action 4 of the Europe for Citizens Programme offers grants for remembrance of the European past, including the preservation of sites linked to Nazism, and the FRA has developed educational materials and publishes an annual report on antisemitism in Europe.
quarter century has brought the Holocaust into a variety of national contexts. *The Diary of Anne Frank*, first published in Dutch in 1947 and first translated into English in 1952, has since become available worldwide and has stimulated Holocaust education. The diary has been translated into more than 60 languages, including Japanese, Korean, Spanish, Armenian, and Afrikaans. It is currently used pedagogically in South African schools, for instance, and in the early 2000s, the Documentation Center of Cambodia translated the book into Khmer and distributed it to schools in Phnom Penh to facilitate discussion about the 1970s genocide in Cambodia. ¹¹

Popular films about the Holocaust have also contributed to historical consciousness of the period. The film adaptation of William Styron’s novel *Sophie’s Choice* (1982) and Claude Lanzmann’s nine-hour documentary *Shoah* (1985) were some of the first internationally acclaimed films about the Holocaust. In 1993, Steven Spielberg’s Academy Award-winning *Schindler’s List* reached countries around the world and is still screened in many countries, as is Roberto Benigni’s *La Vita È Bella* (1997) and Roman Polanski’s *The Pianist* (2002).

Regional Framework

In the pages that follow, we have built on the insights from the Salzburg symposium in order to consider the current state of Holocaust education outside the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and Israel. We have approached this study through the lens of the following eight geographical regions:

¹¹ Table Discussions, “What Have We Learned,” SGS, permission pending from South African, Armenian, Korean, Cambodian, Venezuelan delegations.
1. South America
2. Central America, the Caribbean, and Mexico
3. the Middle East and North Africa
4. Sub-Saharan Africa
5. Asia
6. Russia and Eastern Europe
7. the Balkans and the Caucasus
8. Australia and New Zealand
SOUTH AMERICA

For the purposes of this paper, South America includes all of those states in South America proper. The major historical development accounting for awareness of the Holocaust in this region appears to be significant Jewish immigration to the region, which has historically been concentrated in Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Ecuador, Venezuela, and Colombia, for example, could have just as easily been grouped with Central America and Mexico. Those states, however, have usually seen their interests more closely tied to the larger states to the south than to those across the Isthmus of Panama. Still, it is useful to think of South America as two sub-regions. One comprises the southern cone, where Jewish immigration dating from the end of the 19th century and continuing after World War II has allowed for a more direct relationship between citizens of these states and the Holocaust. The other sub-region includes the Northern Andes region, where those states that have engaged with the Holocaust have done so mostly as a result of human rights concerns.

The current state of Holocaust awareness in South America largely corresponds to the long history of Jewish immigration to the region. Beginning in the late 19th century, governments of the southern cone states (Argentina, Brazil, Chile, and Uruguay) either tolerated or encouraged European immigration. Brazil and Argentina were at the forefront of these efforts, with Argentina most interested in attracting Jewish immigrants. Brazil’s late 19th-century attempt to “whiten” its population, i.e., decrease the “African” blood in its society to more closely reflect the perceived racial make-up of European countries, mostly focused on immigrants from Italy and Spain. Immigrants from Russia and Eastern Europe, some of them Jews, did emigrate to Brazil. Anti-Jewish pogroms in Slavic Europe in the 1880s and 90s

---

created significant “push” factors for Jewish emigration as well. In spite of various waves of antisemitism, significant Jewish populations established themselves in the southern cone—mostly in the cities of Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Montevideo, and Santiago. Further, the presence of both Jewish refugees and Nazi war criminals in the years after World War II kept the Holocaust in the public consciousness. Outside of these four countries, Jewish populations in South America are quite small. As a result, with the highly notable exception of Ecuador (see below), the Holocaust is less well known in the rest of South America. Where it is well known, mostly in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, and Uruguay, it has been refracted through the local lenses of antisemitism prevention, indigenous revolt, and the history of human rights atrocities committed by the military regimes of the 1970s and 1980s.

**Argentina**’s current Jewish population, at almost 200,000, is the largest in South America and the seventh largest in the world. In addition to the Jewish population’s Holocaust memorialization, Nazi war criminals who hid in Argentina and elsewhere in South America also kept the Holocaust and antisemitism in the public consciousness. Two attacks in Buenos Aires motivated by antisemitism—a car bomb at the Israeli embassy in 1992 and another that destroyed the Jewish Community Center in 1994—that together killed more than 100 people pushed the Argentine government to seriously confront anti-Jewish sentiment. Pointing to these two attacks, President Fernando de la Rúa advocated for the inclusion of the Holocaust in

---

13 For instance, a pogrom against Jews in Buenos Aires immediately after World War I; and rising infatuation with fascism during the Getúlio Vargas regime in Brazil in the 1930s and the Juan Perón regime in Argentina in the 1940s.

Argentina’s public school curriculum in remarks he delivered to the Stockholm International Forum on the Holocaust in 2000.¹⁵

Thus, Argentina has taken the lead in advancing Holocaust education in South America, including with its membership in the IHRA. Argentina is currently the only state outside of Europe, Israel, Canada, and the United States to belong to the organization. The framework for IHRA activities in Argentina is built around a Permanent Consultative National Board, of which the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Justice, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs share administrative duties. These responsibilities include remembrance activities for the population at large, open access to archival materials, and educational programs for both the public and the school-age population. Most of its educational activities are dispersed through the Ministry of Education. Its national curriculum emphasizes human rights education and, in 2009, the Ministry of Education resolved to assist local provinces in developing and disseminating educational materials related to the Holocaust.

Argentina features the premier Holocaust museum in South America, the Museo del Holocausto. Not only does Holocaust education in Argentina emphasize the event as a historical phenomenon, but it also follows the IHRA suggestion to teach the Holocaust by “encourag[ing] … students to study local, regional, national and global history and memory.”¹⁶ Particularly indicative of this trend is the publication series sponsored by the Ministry of Education titled Education and Remembrance, which connects Argentina’s own recent past with the Holocaust. This series has featured publications about the Holocaust in addition to works commemorating

the disappearances under the military junta (1976–1983) and during the Falkland/Malvinas War (1982). The Ministry of Education also partners with Argentina’s Casa de Ana Frank to train teachers in Holocaust education. In another example of Argentina’s support for Holocaust education, the Jewish Agency and Yad Vashem cooperatively organize Bamah in Buenos Aires. Bamah is an annual teacher-training event for educators from Jewish frameworks in Argentina and throughout Latin America. Alumni have developed Holocaust education curricula or lobbied for institutionalized Holocaust education within their region and country.

Uruguay’s Jewish population, concentrated almost exclusively in Montevideo, is about 17,000, but as a percentage of the country’s population of three million constitutes a larger proportion than in Argentina. Uruguay’s delegation to the Stockholm Forum has also pointed out that the country has had a long history of support for Israel, advocating for the partition of Palestine in 1948 and repudiating the 1975 UN General Assembly Resolution equating Zionism to racism. The delegation also emphasized that Uruguay was the first country in Latin America to devote a site to Holocaust remembrance and issue a commemorative stamp. Though the nation does not mandate Holocaust education, on International Holocaust Remembrance Day in 2010, the Uruguayan legislature recommended that the country join the IHRA, and two years later, a senator “suggested the desirability” of mandating Holocaust education in Uruguay.  

---


Brazil’s Jewish population of almost 100,000 represents a large absolute number but, relative to the state’s total population of almost 200 million, is a tiny fraction of the citizenry. Brazil’s population is aware of the Holocaust, in part because of its history of Jewish immigration as well as the presence of Nazi war criminals there—Treblinka commander Franz Paul Stangl was found working at a Volkswagen factory in Brazil in 1968; Josef Mengele also spent time in Brazil. Further, in her examination of Holocaust education in Brazil, Rochelle Saidel has pointed to the recent interfaith cooperation between Catholics and Jews. In 1981, the National Conference of Brazilian Bishops sponsored an official commission for Catholic-Jewish religious dialogue. Though Brazil has experienced antisemitism, its international image as a multiracial democracy has sensitized politicians to the complexities of racism. For instance, the statement of the country’s delegation to the 2000 Stockholm Forum reflected its long-standing commitment to projecting an image of racial tolerance: “The Brazilian government and society follow with keen interest the work of this Forum, according to our tradition of abhorrence of intolerance and the promotion of political, cultural, and religious pluralism.”

Still, in spite of lofty ambitions, Holocaust education is fairly limited in Brazil, and to date the government has not shown interest in joining the IHRA. The country does have a Center for Jewish Studies at the University of São Paulo and a Jewish museum in Rio de Janeiro that includes “testimonials and objects of victims who immigrated to Brazil.” The Anne Frank House and Yad Vashem also run educator training programs there, but grassroots initiatives have been less forthcoming. In spite of the stated intentions of the Catholic Church, for example, the

---

actual implementation of an awareness of the Holocaust as the terrible fruition of antisemitism has yet to make its way even into Brazilian Catholic seminaries, much less into local Catholic schools.\(^{21}\) In October 2010, however, the city of Porto Alegre mandated Holocaust education in its public schools. Passed in response to neo-Nazi attacks on Jewish cemeteries and synagogues, the law meant that 60,000 students at 96 schools would receive access to education on the Holocaust. The law was “the first of its kind in Brazil.”\(^{22}\)

**Ecuador** represents an intriguing exception to those countries in South America whose awareness of the Holocaust stems primarily from the existence of significant Jewish populations. In Ecuador, the Jewish population is small. Yet, in 2009, the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education mandated the teaching of Holocaust history in its schools. In 2006, the election of Rafael Correa Delgado as president, following a 20-year period of political instability, corruption, and indigenous protests against neo-liberalism, brought a sweeping new constitution that emphasized human rights and actively sought to promote respect for all cultures.\(^{23}\) Seeking a way to teach human rights and critical thinking skills within this framework, the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education worked with the Albert Einstein Experimental School in Quito to develop a curriculum entitled “Human Rights, the Holocaust, and Recent Genocides.” The curriculum emphasizes the relationship between the world wars and “the rejection of racism” in the 20th century.\(^{24}\) It features a lesson on the long history of human rights from the Magna Carta through the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights and into the present. It then extends the

\(^{21}\) Saidel, “Holocaust Studies,” 58.


discussion through historical case studies of the Holocaust, ethnic cleansing in Bosnia, and the genocides in Rwanda.\textsuperscript{25} In particular, the curriculum emphasizes the IHRA guidelines to “use witness testimony to make this history more ‘real’” and to “create a positive learning environment, with an active pedagogy and a student-centred approach.”\textsuperscript{26} As explained at the 2010 Salzburg Global Seminar conference \textit{The Global Prevention of Genocide: Learning from the Holocaust}, the lessons explore Holocaust narratives by inculcating in students a “praxis of interpretation.” Students learn about the event “existential[ly]” as much as historically, learning to “penetrate the subjectivity of the events” and to “respect alterity and otherness.”\textsuperscript{27} Beyond simply offering support in the classroom, the Ministry of Education also sponsors a yearly essay competition in which students must connect the Holocaust to both the concept of human rights and examples of recent genocides.\textsuperscript{28}

Since 2008, the Ministry of Education has trained approximately 3,000 teachers to teach the new curriculum. Though there have been challenges in providing materials to all students, particularly in remote areas in the Andes, the Ecuadorian program has been successful enough that the Ministry of Education has also trained teachers in Panama and Costa Rica.\textsuperscript{29}

The Ecuadorian program stands out in that portion of South America outside of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay. Many South American curricula do feature World War II in their social studies guidelines, but no other countries mandate the study of the Holocaust. \textbf{Chile’s}
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curriculum provides an instructive example: Its secondary-level history objectives recommend that students understand how the “consciousness of humanity was impacted by the trauma of world wars, genocide, and totalitarianism.” While this objective does not specifically mention the Holocaust, the scaffolding exists for further focus on the Holocaust. The Chilean organization Fundación Memoria Viva (Living Memorial Foundation) has begun some of this work, recently producing oral histories with over 100 Holocaust survivors, copies of which have been entrusted to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. Further, Fundación Memoria Viva has plans to open a museum in Santiago.30

The only South American country in which hostility to Holocaust education may exist is Venezuela. Former Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez increasingly allied himself with Iranian President and Holocaust denier Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. Chávez also took stands against Israel, expelling the Israeli ambassador to Venezuela following the Israeli army’s military actions in Gaza in 2009. “The Holocaust, that is what is happening right now in Gaza,” Chávez said at the time. “The president of Israel at this moment should be taken to the International Criminal Court together with the president of the United States.”31 In spite of such charged rhetoric, no direct hostility toward Holocaust education in Venezuela has been evident. Since Chávez’s death in March 2013, it remains to be seen what perspective the government of successor Nicolás Maduro will take on Holocaust education. The Anne Frank House has partnered with a local organization to bring programs “focus[ing] on tolerance and dialogue” to 40,000 students, and in January
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2012, the Caracas-based Universidad Metropolitana organized a three-day seminar on the Holocaust.32

Conclusion

South America features one comparatively well-developed Holocaust education program in IHRA member state Argentina. Recent trends show growth of Holocaust awareness in Brazil, Uruguay, and especially in Ecuador. In much of the rest of the continent, it is more limited. Most of the countries have fairly well-developed school infrastructures as well as recent histories closely intertwined with European events as a result of European colonization in the 16th and 17th centuries and European immigration in the 20th century. South America, therefore, potentially represents an area where Holocaust education programs may grow.

MEXICO, CENTRAL AMERICA, AND THE CARIBBEAN

Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean include all of those states from the Isthmus of Panama north through Mexico, as well as the island states of the Caribbean Sea. Obviously this categorization groups together a wide diversity of countries, but most had very little direct connection to World War II or significant Jewish immigration. Their engagement with Holocaust education has thus been shaped in a roughly similar way.

Mexico, Central America, and the Caribbean had little direct engagement with World War II. With the exception of Mexico, which has a Jewish population of about 40,000, and the Dominican Republic, which in 1938 opened its borders to Jewish refugees, these states have rarely served as destinations for Jewish immigrants. While they had limited direct connections to the Holocaust, several states have experienced repressive state violence in their recent history. In Guatemala and El Salvador, military dictatorships have waged brutal wars against mostly indigenous populations. No governments in this region have mandated Holocaust education, but foreign and local education initiatives link regional traumatic memory to the Holocaust.

No country in particular stands out in terms of its engagement with the Holocaust, but some significant recent connections have occurred. Within this region, Mexico has the only museum devoted specifically to the Holocaust, Memoria y Tolerancia (Memory and Tolerance). Opened in 2010, the museum not only focuses on the Holocaust but also houses exhibits on historical genocides elsewhere in the world, in Darfur, Srebrenica, Rwanda, Guatemala, and Cambodia. Remarking on the opening of the museum, a member of the board of directors stated
that “there is very little Holocaust education and most Mexicans’ knowledge of the Holocaust comes from Hollywood movies.” Thus, the museum is an important educational resource for those Mexicans who might otherwise not learn about the Holocaust. In the first year, almost 200,000 visitors from 230 schools visited the center. In addition to the exhibits, the museum offers educational programs. Currently, the museum provides speakers and discussion forums on issues of local and regional interest like migration and refugees.33

The Mexican NGO Nenemi-Paxia has also worked to further Holocaust awareness in Mexico. For instance, Nenemi-Paxia developed a program called “Moments and Decisions” in which high school students create a traveling exhibition about the Holocaust.34 Nenemi-Paxia has also partnered with the American organization Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO)35 to begin a “pioneer educational project” with the Mexican Jesuit school Prepa Ibero to “create a model that will incorporate Holocaust education in the Mexican schools.” The program attempts to connect the recent history of escalating violence in Mexico to the Holocaust in order to help students learn about “those forms of civic action that can strengthen our weak Mexican democracy.”36

Also in 2011, the US-based Nunca Olvidar (Never Forget) Foundation organized an initial training on Holocaust education for teachers in Chorrera, Panama. The seminars were held in a central part of Panama, and 47 teachers from across the country attended. By using the
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Holocaust as a case study, the training aimed to “promote a tolerant attitude to differences [to] be transmitted to teachers in order that they are able to address these issues among their students.” Nunca Olvidar held another similar training session the next year, and a representative of the Ministry of Education “gave his support” for future seminars. Further, the Ecuadorian Ministry of Education has also trained teachers from Panama on using the Holocaust for human rights education.

Guatemala has recently expressed interest in a mandatory Holocaust education program, pointing specifically to the Ecuadorian model (see above). Like Ecuador, Guatemala did not experience much historical engagement either with World War II or with Holocaust survivors. Like several other Latin American states, however, Guatemala recently underwent a period of violent government oppression. From 1960 to 1996, the state committed atrocities against mostly indigenous citizens. The United Nations-supported Commission for Historical Clarification concluded that the state perpetrated genocide against the Mayan people. As a result Guatemalan schools have developed a human rights curriculum.
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The Anne Frank House has worked in Guatemala since 2005, developing an educational program focusing on “how a society can come to terms with the fact that large scale human rights violations took place in its midst.” The project, “Anne Frank, a History for Today in Guatemala,” has used “non-formal learning methods” to help young people learn about the country’s history of violence and to reconcile with the past through collective memory. Like Anne Frank House projects elsewhere, the Guatemala project trains local students as peer guides.41

The most recent developments in raising Holocaust awareness in the region, then, have occurred in Mexico, Panama, and Guatemala; Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Haiti represent areas where Holocaust education is more limited. Costa Rica’s Jewish Museum in San José addresses the Holocaust, and the Anne Frank House has worked in the country since 2009.42 Furthermore, Costa Rica, as the historically most stable country in Central America, has a fairly well developed educational system with a history curriculum that includes World War II, the Nazis, and antisemitism.43 The Ecuadorian Ministry of Education has also sent representatives to Costa Rica to train teachers to teach about the Holocaust.44

The Anne Frank House, in late 2010, began a museum program in El Salvador that tells Anne Frank’s story in conjunction with that of a Salvadoran boy named Chiyo who suffered during the government violence perpetrated against Salvadorans in the 1980–92 civil war.45
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Additionally, El Salvador also has a firm historical connection to the Holocaust as a result of the Mantello rescue mission. In this intriguing story, a Hungarian Jewish businessman befriended an El Salvadoran official who appointed him to be a diplomat at the Consulate General of El Salvador in Geneva, Switzerland. The businessman, George Mandel (also referred to by the “hispanicized” name Mantello), issued thousands of certificates of citizenship in an attempt to rescue European Jews from deportation.46 Finally, just as in Guatemala, El Salvador has responded to the atrocities committed during its civil war with a human rights education program.47

**Haiti** has a limited historical engagement with the Holocaust. The Haitian educational system, for a number of reasons, including the devastating earthquake in 2010, is in shambles. The tragic nature of the state’s infrastructure has made rebuilding the educational system a priority for the United Nations. Haiti’s historical experience with slavery and its legacy as the first slave society to throw off the yoke of colonial oppression make a study of Nazi racism relevant.48

Conclusion

Though the Holocaust was not of direct historical relevance for most of the countries in this region, there are states in Central America where the Holocaust might serve as an
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appropriate example of the consequences of systematic violence and racial conflict. The Anne Frank House has shown that in those countries with a recent history of state violence the Holocaust offers lessons about the tragic consequences of a political program of racial othering. The challenge here, as it is for those Caribbean states that are underdeveloped as well, is that a stronger education infrastructure is necessary in order for connections between national history and the Holocaust to be made effectively.
MIDDLE EAST AND NORTH AFRICA

The Middle East and North Africa refer to those states immediately west of India, including the states on the Arabian Peninsula, and the northernmost states in Africa. These states are grouped together because of their predominantly Muslim populations. The intention of this grouping is not to reify Muslim “difference” or to “orientalize” the region. Though there are clearly ethnic differences among the peoples of such a far-flung set of countries—the disparate ethnicities here include, for instance, Berbers, Arabs, Persians, and Afghans—relations between Muslims and Jews in the region have been exacerbated by the Arab-Israeli conflict. The conflict is the overriding prism through which most political leaders and at least a large portion of the citizenry view the Holocaust, if they have knowledge of it.

To understand views of the Holocaust in the Middle East and North Africa, we must return to the establishment of Israel in 1948 and the resulting increase of antisemitic sentiment in Muslim lands and territories. The UN vote in favor of the partition of Palestine into Jewish and Arab states and the establishment of the State of Israel turned the Holocaust into a serious point of contention within most Arab states in the Middle East and North Africa. Some critics of the state of Israel initially viewed its establishment in the context of Western, especially British, imperialism. Others viewed Israel itself with skepticism, particularly in the years following the rise of anti-Western nationalist movements, galvanized most famously by the 1955 Bandung Conference. Egyptian representatives, in particular, conflated Israel with Western domination, making inflammatory statements about the historical veracity of accounts of the Holocaust. As Gilbert Achcar has recently argued, Israel’s establishment generated much interest about the Holocaust and continues to do so, though that interest is often negative:
… [T]he Arab World and most of the Third World regard the state that claims to represent the victims of the Shoah from the standpoint of the victims of both the Nakba [the dispersal of Palestinian refugees] and Israel’s subsequent acts. This fact weighs very heavily on the reception of the Holocaust in the Arab East, which got ever more complicated from the time of the Shoah itself to the time of the Nakba and up to our own day. 49

Additionally, the final communiqué of the Bandung Conference supported the “rights of the Arab people of Palestine,” and Egyptian president Gamal Abdel Nasser convinced the participants to deny Israel membership in the non-aligned movement. 50 Major Middle East wars (the 1956 Suez War, the 1967 Six-Day War, and the 1973 Yom Kippur War) changed the face of the Arab-Israeli conflict, especially once Egypt signed a peace treaty with Israel in 1977. In spite of the peace between the two countries, anti-Israeli and anti-Jewish sentiment grew rapidly in Egypt.

Due to conflict over Israel and subsequent persecution of Jews by Arab governments in the years after World War II, the Jewish population in the Arab world plummeted from 856,000 in 1948 to just over 25,000 in 1976. Political controversies that occurred well after the Holocaust have affected Arabs’ views of the history. This politicization has reached a fever pitch in recent years, as some regimes in the region have questioned the scale of the Holocaust or questioned its veracity outright in order to provoke both Israel and other Western states. Gilbert Achcar points to French philosopher and revisionist Roger Garaudy’s warm reception in the Middle East and North Africa after the publication of Garaudy’s 1995 book, The Founding Myths of Modern Israel (Les mythes fondateurs de la politique israélienne), in which he argued that Jews were not subjected to genocide in World War II and that the Holocaust was a myth promoted by Jews to gain political legitimacy for Israel:
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Garaudy went on a triumphant tour of several Arab countries. He was the guest of nationalists in Lebanon and Jordan, of the Syrian minister of information, and of the ministers of culture in Qatar and Egypt. In Egypt, he was received by the grand imam of the Al-Ashar Mosque and the rector of the university associated with it, Sunni Islam’s main theological institute; he was also warmly welcomed by the Iranian authorities. The wife of the president of the United Arab Emirates gave him double the amount he had to pay in fines in France.\(^{51}\)

Achcar also argues that Garaudy’s reception in the Arab world pointed to structural limitations—such as the lack of a public sphere open to dissenting viewpoints—that appear to limit future Holocaust education in the region.

In spite of such limitations however, the region is not devoid of Holocaust education initiatives. First, a Western-influenced minority of Arab thinkers that emerged after the Oslo Accords (negotiated in the early 1990s and signed in 1993) offered new possibilities for peaceful co-existence in the Middle East.\(^{52}\) These thinkers defended the historical veracity of the Holocaust, and while they certainly represent a small group, they nonetheless offer the possibility of further influencing civil society. Palestinian academic Mohammed Dajani Daoudi from Al-Quds University in Jerusalem, exemplifies this line of thought; he advocates teaching the Holocaust to Palestinians.\(^{53}\) Second, Morocco offers a prominent exception to the region’s antagonism toward the memory of the Holocaust. Though public understanding of the Holocaust is complicated, Morocco has nonetheless demonstrated official interest in developing Holocaust

education. Finally, the Arab Spring has created uncertainty about the region, making it possible that in the long term Holocaust education may become more viable.

Among the states at the forefront of Holocaust denial in the region are Egypt, Jordan, Saudi Arabia, and Iran. As Israel’s main regional rival in the 1950s and 1960s, Egypt’s then-President Nasser several times denied the Holocaust. Most prominently in 1964, in an interview in a German magazine, he asserted that “no person, not even the simplest one, takes seriously the lie of the six million Jews that were murdered.” The phenomenon certainly outlived Nasser, as the Egyptian government banned internationally renowned Holocaust films like Sophie’s Choice (1982), Schindler’s List (1993), and La vita è Bella (1997). The Egyptian Gazette argued that Schindler’s List “defended the Jewish claim so as to justify the occupation of Arab lands.” Though the liberalization brought on by the 2011 Egyptian Revolution might lead to a more open attitude toward cultural products that tell the story of the Holocaust, recent indicators do not seem promising.

Jordan has been noted as the “Arab country in which Holocaust deniers are most active.” In April 1997, Jordanian journalist Muwaffaq Muhadin, for example, argued that “not a single country in history was founded by turning fiction into fact, save for the country of the Jewish enemy.” In 2001, the Jordanian Writers’ Association held a conference in which 200 attendees heard speeches “denying or diminishing the systemic murder of six million Jews by the Nazis.” More recently, the Palestinian-Jordanian Ibrahim Alloush,
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while not outright denying the Holocaust, compared Nazism to ‘what the Zionist movement is doing … and what the U.S. government is doing …. The new Nazism of today wears the robes of new liberalism. The new Nazism is imperialistic and Zionist policy, witnessed on a universal and globalized level today.’ 59

In 2006, Saudi cleric Sa’d Al-Breik defended Roger Garaudy and argued in an interview on Saudi television that in the West, “freedom does not extend to anyone who mentions one good thing about Hitler.” 60

In 2011, following a visit to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, Saudi-born liberal journalist Mansour Al-Hadj reflected on the state sanctioning of Holocaust denial in the public schools.

As a child in the Saudi Arab kingdom, I often heard about the Holocaust that befell the Jews at the hands of the Nazi regime in Germany during World War II. However, most of what I heard was that the Jews exaggerated the number of victims, that they used the Holocaust to arouse the world’s pity, and that they indisputably deserved their fate. I never learned that the Holocaust was among the most atrocious crimes in human history, and I did not read that persecuting [the Jews] based on their religion is considered racial discrimination. I did not feel any empathy toward the victims of the Holocaust, despite the atrocious things that happened to them, only because they were Jews. The word [‘Jew’] was associated in my mind with negative qualities like deceit, enmity, miserliness, and going back on one’s word.

Al-Hadj noted in the same piece that the Saudi government also exports to other Arab states educational curricula that either denies or minimizes the Holocaust. 61

Iran, however, has emerged as the state most vocal in its denial of the Holocaust. President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has, during his tenure, made several provocative statements denying the Holocaust. In late 2005, for instance, Ahmadinejad provoked international outrage
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when he called the Holocaust a “myth.””

The next year, Iran further shocked international observers when the country hosted a pseudo-academic conference in Tehran entitled “Review of the Holocaust: Global Vision,” which attracted European Holocaust deniers and American white supremacists. It is thus evident that the possibility for official support for Holocaust education in Iran and in many of its political allies remains a challenge under the current regime.

Morocco represents an important exception to the region’s outlook on Holocaust education. North Africa had, before World War II, a substantial Jewish population. Jewish communities existed in Tunisia, Algeria, Libya, and Morocco. Further, as Robert Satloff’s research on the “long reach of the Holocaust” demonstrates, Vichy France extended statuts de juifs (antisemitic legislation) into its North African colonies, and the Nazis forced Jews to work in labor camps in occupied Tunisia in 1942–43. For many North African Arabs, however, this period of history has largely been effaced from public memory. In his search for evidence of Arabs who saved Jews during the war, Satloff was shocked to encounter “utter consternation among Arabs who had never before heard of the persecution of Jews in their countries during World War II.”

Morocco has traditionally had a significant Jewish population, numbering about 350,000 by World War II and about 5,000 today. Satloff has shown how Morocco’s wartime sultan, Mohammed V, worked to provide “vital moral support to the Jews of Morocco” behind the scenes. For this reason, “Moroccan Jewish lore celebrates Sultan Mohammed V as a savior, one
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of the finest, fairest, and most tolerant rulers Jews had ever known.” Further, in the words of one journalist, Moroccans “proudly embrace their unique culture of diversity—built on a long tradition of Arab, Berber, Muslim, and Jewish co-existence.” Referencing this history, King Mohammed VI affirmed the importance of Holocaust remembrance in March 2009. He referred to the Holocaust as “one of the blots, one of the most tragic chapters in modern history. Amnesia has no bearing on my perception of the Holocaust, or on that of my people.”

Even before this proclamation, Moroccan institutions had partnered with foreign organizations to develop Holocaust education infrastructure. For instance, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum and the National Library of Morocco formally agreed to “an exchange of archives related to Morocco’s reaction to the Holocaust” in 2008. In November 2009, Yad Vashem brought Moroccan educators to Israel for a “tailor-made seminar on Holocaust education.” In 2009 and 2010, the Mémorial de la Shoah trained Moroccan history teachers to teach about the Holocaust. In 2010, the Anne Frank House brought an Arabic translation of the traveling Anne Frank exhibition to Rabat, marking the exhibition’s premier showing in the Muslim world. The same year, Projet Aladin and the National Library of
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Conclusion

Awareness of the Holocaust in the Middle East and North Africa is limited, but public officials in many of these states—largely in response to political concerns \textit{vis-à-vis} Israel—have made seriously distorted and patently false claims about documented evidence of the systematic murder perpetrated by the Nazis during World War II. As a result, public access to reputable sources about the Holocaust is limited. Morocco, however, represents an exception to this trend; the government has expressed support for Holocaust education, and both foreign and domestic organizations have furthered local public awareness of the Holocaust.
SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Sub-Saharan Africa includes those states on the continent that are roughly south of the Saharan desert. These states are grouped together because of their common history of colonial domination, a history that influences the view of European history in general. Also, in these states, Muslims are not the majority population, or if they are, they are a slight majority, as in Nigeria, and thus there is a different level of engagement with the Holocaust than in North Africa.

In contrast to those states in the Middle East and North Africa, the 20th-century Arab-Israeli conflict is not the overriding concern with regard to the Holocaust in sub-Saharan Africa. For the most part, countries in this region have been preoccupied with the more immediate needs of developing national polities and basic governmental infrastructures in the post-colonial era. As outlined at a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) experts meeting in 2009, the following challenges traditionally limit Holocaust education in sub-Saharan Africa:

- little historical connection to the Holocaust since it happened on European soil and few survivors immigrated to the region;
- history of European colonialism that may preclude an interest in learning about a “European” topic;
- larger immediate challenges for the education system and government, more generally, such as poverty eradication, infrastructure development, and political corruption;
- limited commitment to human rights;
• some sub-Saharan African governments “observe an almost automatic sense of solidarity with the Palestinian people.”

There are, however, two states which offer major exceptions to this account of the challenges facing Holocaust education in sub-Saharan Africa: South Africa and Rwanda. In the former, a relatively significant Jewish population including several hundred Holocaust survivors promoted interest in the Holocaust. The country’s attempt at reconciliation following the apartheid era has led to the development of a robust Holocaust education infrastructure and a national mandate for Holocaust education. In Rwanda, the 1994 genocide led to a national interest in the prevention of future genocides as well as the commemoration of the Holocaust. Several international organizations have supported this effort, using the Holocaust as a case study for genocide education. In the rest of the region, awareness of the Holocaust is more limited, coming mostly through the United Nations Information Centres (UNIC) and through UNESCO. The latter has recently “begun consulting with African states on how to address the history of the Holocaust and other genocides as a means to deal with traumatic pasts, address human rights issues and contribute to the prevention of genocide.”

**South Africa** is clearly at the forefront of Holocaust education in the region. Significant numbers of Jewish immigrants left Europe for South Africa beginning in the late 19th century, as did about 300 Holocaust survivors after World War II. The Jewish population peaked at 119,000 in the early 1970s and currently stands at about 80,000. Memoirs by South African Holocaust
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survivors were available as early as the 1960s. With the official end of apartheid in 1994 and the establishment of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission the next year, the South African government officially sought to dismantle both structural racism and its psychological vestiges. Holocaust education initiatives have contributed to this effort.

Inspired by a 1993–94 tour in South Africa and Namibia of the Anne Frank House’s traveling exhibition, a group of South Africans created Africa’s first Holocaust museum, the Cape Town Holocaust Centre. From its inception in 1999, the Cape Town Centre has worked with educators to develop lessons on the Holocaust, but it intensified its efforts in 2007 when the National Department of Education instituted a new history curriculum. The curriculum, designed to “emphasize the theme of human rights,” included instruction on the Holocaust for grades nine and 11. The ninth-grade unit—with a total suggested instructional time of 15 hours—focuses on the topics “Why the Weimar Republic failed as a democracy, the rise of Nazi Germany, the outbreak of World War II in Europe and in the Pacific and people’s experiences.” The Holocaust is specifically mentioned under the unit’s “Content and Concepts.” In the 11th-grade unit, “Nazi Germany and the Holocaust” is included as a case study under the topic of “Ideas of Race in the late 19th and 20th centuries.”

Given the Centre’s success, it expanded operations to Durban and Johannesburg and then formed the South African Holocaust and Genocide Foundation (SAHGF) to coordinate these

three Holocaust museums. The Foundation has been working to guide educators in teaching the Holocaust. Its resource pack for educators, “The Holocaust: Lessons for Humanity” includes an educator’s manual, a DVD, and a poster set and has been the central component in this effort. The education resource pack, while clearly concerned with historical accuracy is also “about more than Holocaust history. It is about the reading, writing, and arithmetic of genocide. It is about such Rs as rethinking, reflecting, and reasoning. It is about the responses to prejudice, racism, discrimination and scapegoating. It is about human rights and human dignity.”

Lessons connect both antisemitism and racism to the larger umbrella of Euro-centric “scientific” racism emerging from the 19th century. They draw parallels between the rise of Nazi Germany and the construction of the racial state in South Africa as well as between the Nuremberg trials and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The curriculum also features individual stories from Holocaust victims, much in line with the IHRA guidelines to “individualise the history by translating statistics into personal stories” and to “use witness testimony to make this history more ‘real.’”

The SAHGF, through its three Holocaust centers, has done much both within and outside the public education system to further Holocaust awareness in the state in recent years. Regional departments of education have invited the SAHGF to conduct teacher training programs across the country. It also runs workshops that explore the themes of “stereotyping, the fragility of democracy, the impact of propaganda, and how to become an activist rather than a bystander.” Additionally, in 2012 the Cape Town Holocaust Centre produced a children’s opera and worked with “over 1,000 learners” to engage with artwork from children imprisoned in the Czech ghetto-

81 Ibid.
camp of Terezin. Further, the Foundation produces and screens films based on survivor testimony, and it has organized Holocaust commemorations each January in South Africa for the United Nations. With funding from the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany and other organizations, it has expanded distribution of classroom materials stemming from *The Holocaust: Lessons from Humanity* resource pack.

Two international organizations also work in South Africa: the Anne Frank House and Shikaya. The Anne Frank House’s traveling exhibition “Anne Frank—A History for Today” has been touring South Africa since 2009. In partnership with the SAHGF, Anne Frank House representatives have trained local youth “peer guides.” The Anne Frank exhibit can be especially valuable in Africa: “Given its very flexible approach, a long history of partnerships with NGOs around the globe and its previous work in South Africa, the Anne Frank House has much to offer the African continent when negotiating how best to conduct Holocaust education that is relevant to the local context.”

Shikaya, which emerged from a partnership between the Cape Town Holocaust Centre and Facing History and Ourselves, also works in South Africa. The name comes from the Shangaan word “Xikaya,” which means “to go back to your roots.” In 2007, Shikaya developed a program titled *Facing the Past*, which “uses Facing History’s pedagogy and methods to help educators address apartheid in their classrooms.” Shikaya focuses on Weimar Germany and the development of Nazism as a case study to provide a safe entry point into a discussion of
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contemporary problems. The organization has conducted outreach in the Western Cape, KwaZulu-Natal, and Gauteng.\textsuperscript{86}

Beside South Africa’s well-developed Holocaust education initiatives, Rwanda offers another example of Africa’s budding interest in this history. Rwanda’s recent history has been influenced by the country’s attempts to memorialize the 1994 genocide of about 800,000 Tutsi by the Hutu-dominated military and Interahamwe militia. International organizations, especially Facing History and Ourselves (FHAO), have championed these efforts to memorialize and to teach the genocide in Rwanda. FHAO specifically adapts its core curriculum, \textit{The Holocaust and Human Behavior}, to countries with a recent history of violence. The standard curriculum is an “in-depth case study” that looks at “universal themes of human behavior, choice, and decision making.” With regard to “countries emerging from conflict and mass violence” FHAO offers “educators … a focus on bystander behavior and the possibilities for positive participation or upstander behavior.” The major benefit of using the Holocaust case study in Rwanda “is that the distance participants have from this history allows them to make powerful connections to what they have experienced themselves. In the case of Rwanda, this meant that connections could be made safely, that comments which would not otherwise be made out of fear, were allowed.”\textsuperscript{87}

FHAO has worked with the Human Rights Center at the University of California, Berkeley, and the Rwandan Ministry of Education to develop the curriculum, titled “The Teaching of Rwanda: A Participatory Approach.” Broken into four historical modules designed to teach the long history of Rwanda and where the genocide fits, the study presents
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historical sources and materials on the Rwandan history rather than simply writing the “History” of Rwanda and we used the “facing history and ourselves foundation” methodology, which is critical, and at the same time encourages the participation of the researcher or student in the personalized development of interpretation judged as the most appropriate in relationship to the reality and the truth of facts in order to find their causes and consequences.\(^{88}\)

The Rwandan Ministry of Education has undertaken significant work to rebuild the school infrastructure, introducing an “advanced secondary” history curriculum that includes the Rwandan genocide, a “political education curriculum” that incorporates human rights education, and an “ordinary level” curriculum that touches on the rise of the Nazis and the Rwandan genocide.\(^{89}\) It is unclear how far this instruction has been disseminated in Rwanda. As Rwandan Holocaust and genocide scholar Assumpta Mugiraneza has pointed out, Rwanda suffers both from a shortage of teachers in general as well as enough teachers trained to become “*parties prenantes*,” or “stakeholders,” in the reconciliation process.\(^{90}\) Further, students still do not have access to the resource books about the genocide and “there appear to be tensions between a commitment to introduce more democratic, student-centred teaching methods in schools (which would permit debate of multiple versions of the past) and the Government’s attempt to impose a singular ‘official’ narrative of Rwanda’s history … . Many analysts caution that these attempts to


foreclose historical debate are unlikely to succeed and are detrimental to the reconciliation process, which remains fragile.”91

The other major NGO involved with Rwandan reconciliation is the British-based Aegis Trust. Stemming from the work of the Holocaust Memorial and Educational Centre in the United Kingdom, Aegis funded and developed the major site devoted to remembrance in Rwanda, the Kigali Genocide Memorial Centre. The Centre opened on the tenth anniversary of the murders. In 2008, Aegis began funding its own genocide education program, titled “Building Peace, Reconciliation and Unity on the Lessons of Memory.” The program consists of outreach through the museum, bringing students from across the country to Kigali as well as providing housing for “young destitute genocide survivors to support them back to independence.”92 In addition to Aegis Trust, the following foreign NGOs have supported genocide education in Rwanda. Yad Vashem organized a seminar in partnership with the Belgian-based Rwanda NGO Nyamirambo. The seminar introduced Holocaust survivors and survivors of the Rwandan genocide. Similarly, the University of Southern California’s Shoah Foundation began its own genocide education program, hosting a workshop for educators in summer 2012. Using video testimony of survivors and witnesses, participants discussed the connections between Holocaust history, the Rwandan genocide, and South African apartheid.93

Promising local efforts to further awareness of the genocide and of its connections to the Holocaust exist as well. Since 2004, the Interdisciplinary Genocide Studies Center (IGSC) in
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Kigali has hosted foreign scholars of Rwanda for academic programs. The Center screens films and invites survivors to share their stories. It has also established a library on genocide literature. Currently, the IGSC features a three-week summer exchange that enables “teachers and students … to develop narratives that engage questions of social justice, conflict resolution, and peace building. The program has involved theater artists, filmmakers, academics, researchers and students from various disciplines and countries, whose practice engages questions of peace building.” Executive Director Aloys Mahwa has pointed to the relevance of the Holocaust for Rwanda, asserting that many Rwandans think about the relationship “not necessarily as a comparison between the Holocaust and the Tutsi genocide … but more as a dialogue.” Finally, since 2009, the Center for Conflict Management at the National University of Rwanda has offered a graduate degree in comparative genocide studies and prevention as well as short-term trainings for civil society and other political leaders.

In the rest of sub-Saharan Africa, Holocaust and genocide education efforts have been more limited and mostly sponsored by the United Nations or NGOs such as the Paris-based Mémorial de la Shoah. In recent years, the Mémorial de la Shoah has worked with the United Nations Information Centres outreach programme and UNESCO to establish programming for International Holocaust Remembrance Day. The museum broadcasts video conferences to students, teachers, and lawyers in Madagascar, Togo, Burundi, Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Senegal. As Ghanaian genocide scholar Edward Kissi has argued, these programs may have preventive value: “Genocide prevention and civilian protection
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strategies in Africa should also include Holocaust and genocide education. The United Nations can provide African countries with video footages of the Holocaust and other genocides with local language translations to be shown in all rural and urban areas.\textsuperscript{98}

A few sub-Saharan states stand out as places where there is or may be in some future time local interest in Holocaust education. Kenya’s high school curriculum features a human rights education program, which addresses the Holocaust in the context of World War II.\textsuperscript{99} Namibia’s indigenous population experienced atrocities at the hands of the German colonizers in the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. German colonizing forces perpetrated what some scholars have called the first modern genocide, eradicating some 30,000 Herero in 1904.\textsuperscript{100} Until 1990, Namibia was a part of South Africa, and black Namibians suffered the oppression of apartheid. In 2010, the South African Holocaust and Genocide Foundation ran International Holocaust Remembrance Day activities in Namibia, a connection that led the Museum Association of Namibia to acquire a traveling version of the SAHGf exhibit “The Holocaust: Lessons for Humanity.” This exhibit has subsequently toured extensively in Namibia.\textsuperscript{101} While Ethiopia does not currently mandate Holocaust education, the country’s long-standing Jewish population makes the Holocaust relevant there. Following the atrocities perpetrated on civilians by Sudanese militias during the lengthy civil war that led to its independence, South Sudan would seem to have an interest in a reconciliation process facilitated by Holocaust education similar to that in Rwanda. In late 2011, South Sudanese President Salva Kiir toured Yad Vashem during a state visit to Israel. This visit
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symbolized the possible link between the South Sudanese and Holocaust history. Further, ethnic violence continues to be an issue of major importance in South Sudan.

Conclusion

The study of the Holocaust in sub-Saharan Africa is limited. South Africa is clearly at the forefront of Holocaust education in the region. The SAHGF stands out in its ability to link the Holocaust to apartheid without flattening the historical experience of either. There is also the beginning of a Holocaust education infrastructure in Rwanda. While the ideological resistance to the Holocaust that holds sway in the Middle East and North Africa does not challenge Holocaust education in sub-Saharan Africa, structural limitations present the biggest impediment to Holocaust education in the region. The lack of an educational infrastructure and in some places even basic literacy limit efforts to teach about the Holocaust. Because there has been less engagement with the Holocaust, one important opportunity for Holocaust education in the region might lay in the fact that, as Edward Kissi points out, there are virtually no documented cases of outright Holocaust denial in this region.103
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ASIA

The Asia group includes India, China, Mongolia, Japan, the Korean peninsula, Southeast Asia and the Pacific islands. Australia and New Zealand, though geographically close, are treated separately because their history as European settler societies has led to unique implications with regard to understandings of the Holocaust.

Though no states in Asia have mandated Holocaust education, there has been significant public engagement with the Holocaust in China and Japan, with more limited engagement in a few other countries, mostly via United Nations initiatives. Not directly involved in the European theater of war in which the Holocaust took place, East Asia engaged in World War II with major combat and civilian casualties in Japan, China, Vietnam, and the Philippines. For much of this region, an understanding of the Holocaust is generally seen through the prism of wartime Japanese atrocities against civilians, particularly in China. In addition, several countries, most prominently China, sheltered Jews from Nazi persecution during the war, providing a narrative of pride that has made it more common for the public to encounter Holocaust history.

The two states in this region with the most awareness of the Holocaust are Japan and China. Widespread Japanese awareness of the Holocaust dates to at least 1952, when Anne Frank’s The Diary of a Young Girl was translated into Japanese. The book was an immediate bestseller. A million copies were sold in 12 years, with three million sold by 1990. According to Tetsu Kohno, writing in 1996, “no public library in Japan lacks a copy or two of Anne Frank’s
and the book continues to sell briskly.” Further, “the dramatized version has been included in the repertoire of not a few high school and college theatrical clubs.”

The Anne Frank House has been partnering with Japanese organizations since the 1950s to bring traveling exhibitions across Japan, and the country features three Holocaust remembrance sites: the Holocaust Education Center in Hiroshima (opened in 1995), the Tokyo Holocaust Education Resource Center (established in 1998), and the Auschwitz Peace Museum in Shioya (opened in 2000).

The Tokyo Holocaust Education Resource Center is of particular interest because of a landmark project undertaken by museum Director Fumiko Ishioka. The story, chronicled by Karen Levine’s young adult book *Hana’s Suitcase*, began when Ishioka borrowed several artifacts that belonged to an unknown Czech girl who died in Auschwitz. Ishioka’s students at the museum were curious about the name on the suitcase, Hana Brady, and their curiosity inspired Ishioka to track down the former owner of the luggage. Levine’s moving book reconstructs the parallel stories of Hana’s fate and Ishioka’s attempts to find out what happened to her. The exhibit based on Hana Brady, titled “The Holocaust Seen through Children’s Eyes,” had reached 60,000 people by 2003.

Interest in the Holocaust increased after the international release of *Schindler’s List* (1993), which in turn brought attention to the Japanese diplomat Chiune Sugihara who saved 6,000 Jews during the war. Japanese education programs have succeeded in reaching a significant part of the population. Over 100,000 people, including 45,000 school children, have
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visited the Holocaust Education Center in Hiroshima.\textsuperscript{106} Japanese Holocaust education initiatives have also succeeded quite well in the implementation of the IHRA’s suggestion to “help students think about the use and abuse of power, and the roles and responsibilities of individuals, organizations, and nations when confronted with human rights violations,” and especially to “help students develop an awareness of the value of diversity in a pluralistic society and encourage[ ] sensitivity to the positions of minorities.”\textsuperscript{107}

In spite of clear sympathy in Japanese popular culture for the victims of the Holocaust, a strain of Holocaust denial also exists in Japanese academia. In 1986, for example, Masami Uno published two books, \emph{If You Understand the Jews, You Will Understand Japan} and \emph{If You Understand the Jews, You Will Understand the World}, which blamed an international Jewish conspiracy for the state’s economic problems and trade disputes with the US in the 1980s. “Uno argues that the Holocaust is Jewish propaganda and that Hitler and Stalin killed millions of Jews to protect their nations from the Jewish threat. Not surprisingly, Uno quotes extensively from the infamous forgery, \emph{The Protocols of the Elders of Zion}.”\textsuperscript{108} These accounts, according to Richard Rubenstein, have “enjoyed an enormous publishing success in Japan.”\textsuperscript{109}

William Miles argues that the contradiction between sympathy for the Holocaust’s victims and Holocaust denial stems from the Japanese Imperial Army’s history of brutality in World War II, particularly in Nanjing. “The focus [at Japan’s sites of Holocaust memory] is on sensitizing children to the importance of tolerance rather than to their own country’s history of...”

state-sponsored war crimes.”

Significant evidence supports such a view. The Holocaust Education Center, for instance, articulates its purpose in the context of the assertion that “we learn from history that children have always been victims of the vicious plans of adults …. We hope that the center will contribute in deepening the understandings of the period and will help to enhance awareness for world peace among young people.”

The history of Japanese atrocities in China, the Philippines, and Singapore during World War II has led to popular accounts of the Holocaust that do not identify Holocaust victims as the targets of antisemitic racism but instead as victims of an amorphous intolerance, thus allowing anti-Jewish conspiracy theories to exist alongside sympathetic accounts of Anne Frank.

By focusing so much on the event as a lesson in universal tolerance and not enough on the historical development of the Holocaust and its perpetrators, students are deprived of some of the other benefits, as outlined by the IHRA, of Holocaust education. For example, without “gain[ing] insight into the many historical, social, religious, political, and economic factors that cumulatively resulted in the Holocaust,” students are deprived of “an awareness of the complexity of the historical process and a perspective on how a convergence of factors can contribute to the disintegration of democratic values.”

A deeper understanding of the racism involved in World War II, of course, carries deep implications for the historical understanding of Japan. The fact that Holocaust education in Japan has not engaged extensively with the Holocaust as a historical event has allowed the coexistence of reverence for the Anne Frank narrative and anti-Jewish conspiracy theories. “Among the least understood aspects of Western
civilization in Japan,” writes Richard Rubenstein, “have been Judaism and the fate of the Jews during World War II.”

Holocaust awareness in China has been growing rapidly in the last 20 years. The city of Shanghai housed some 30,000 Jewish refugees during World War II, but Chinese awareness of the Holocaust during and immediately after World War II did not extend much beyond the city. As Jewish studies professor Xu Xin points out, the “reason was not a lack of sympathy or indifference on the part of the Chinese, but rather their own substantial suffering ….” Further, the Chinese Communist Party, following the lead of the Soviet Union, only emphasized the Holocaust as a Nazi violation secondary to the persecution of communists.

Following the détente between China and the West in the 1970s and the subsequent establishment of normal diplomatic relations between China and Israel in 1992, a “newfound interest in Judaic studies” and similar scholarly interest in the Holocaust blossomed in China. Yang Mansu and Zhu Jianjing published scholarly accounts of the Holocaust in 1995, while Xu added his own the next year. In 1996, Nanjing University and Tel Aviv University also co-sponsored the first international conference on Jewish studies in China. A Chinese-language documentary on the Holocaust was produced in 1998. In 2005, Xu organized a conference titled the “International Symposium on the Holocaust and the Nanjing Massacre during the Second World War.” The symposium attempted to reach Chinese educators and, as the name indicates,
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attempted to link atrocities in Europe with those in China during World War II.\textsuperscript{116} Since 2007, Facing History and Ourselves has worked with 250 Chinese educators to train them to use Holocaust-based curricula. The city of Shanghai also features the Jewish Refugees Museum, and the first Chinese-language version of Anne Frank’s \textit{The Diary of a Young Girl} was available in 2008, selling 500,000 copies. For the last two years, an exhibit sponsored by the outreach program of the Anne Frank House has been traveling in China, visiting Beijing, Guangzhou, and Hainan.\textsuperscript{117}

Though China has no mandate for Holocaust education, the scholarly interest in the subject as well as the work of international programs like Facing History and Ourselves is promising. In August 2005, the London Jewish Cultural Center’s Holocaust and Anti-Racism Education Department organized a teacher-training seminar in Nanjing, during which university professors, graduate students, and museum curators discussed Holocaust education. This seminar’s success has inspired annual events throughout the country.\textsuperscript{118} In 2009, China adopted a National Human Rights Action plan, the “first formal document of the Chinese government that explicitly provides for human rights education in the Chinese primary and secondary schools.”\textsuperscript{119} Still, China’s recent human rights record presents a major challenge to broadening Holocaust education, as there are plausible parallels between antisemitism in Europe and the Chinese state’s repression of ethnic minorities. According to the most recent report of Human Rights Watch, China continues to crack down heavily on Tibetans and to pursue a policy of “discrimination

against Uighurs and other ethnic minorities” in Xinjiang. Further, the one-party state censors the news, restricts access to content on the Internet, and represses dissenting viewpoints.\textsuperscript{120} As Macao-based Judaic Studies scholar Glenn Timmermans has recently asked, “Can you discuss the Holocaust without discussing Xinjiang or Tibet?”\textsuperscript{121}

**Macao** (Macao) and **Hong Kong**, though formally under Chinese sovereignty, represent the most immediate areas of China in which Holocaust education might be expanded. “Though there is increasing pressure to ensure they conform to Beijing’s will,” Hong Kong and Macau’s historical independence from China (Hong Kong returned to Chinese sovereignty only in 1997 and Macau in 1999) means that they still enjoy autonomy in education and economic policies.\textsuperscript{122} Since curricula are instituted on a school-by-school basis in the two regions, individual schools can initiate Holocaust education programs. Recently, the Jewish community in Hong Kong opened the Hong Kong Holocaust and Tolerance Centre, designed to promote Holocaust education in schools there.\textsuperscript{123}

Though China and Japan represent the East Asian countries with the most public awareness of the Holocaust, other states have shown signs of engagement. In 2007, **Indonesia**, the world’s largest Muslim state, hosted a Holocaust conference in Bali. The conference, chaired by the former Indonesian President Abdurrahman Wahid, featured rabbis, Holocaust witnesses, historians, and other participants. The conference focused on the importance of education and remembrance, and set a precedent for future international cooperation on Holocaust studies.
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and Muslim leaders and attempted to refute the 2006 Tehran conference designed to discredit the Holocaust.\footnote{124} Driven by UN programs, both Burma (Myanmar) and the Philippines have held Holocaust remembrance events over the past two years. In January 2012, for instance, the Burmese government, the United Nations, and Yad Vashem co-sponsored a Holocaust commemoration program. The follow-up seminar in Rangoon “provided many teens and young adults in Burma with rare first hand insight into the Holocaust.”\footnote{125} In early 2011, the Holocaust and the United Nations Outreach Programme and the Jewish Association of the Philippines co-sponsored a Holocaust lecture for 400 students at the University of the Philippines Integrated School. The next month, the United Nations Information Center in Manila hosted an exhibit on the Holocaust at the Department of Foreign Affairs.\footnote{126} Both the Burmese and Filipino civilian populations suffered atrocities under Japanese occupation during World War II; these events could make for an interesting connection to the European Holocaust. Further, in the case of Burma, the recent establishment of a National Human Rights Commission to shed light on human rights abuses under the military dictatorship has made international observers cautiously optimistic about the prospect of a more liberal public forum.\footnote{127} The Holocaust might be relevant to such a discussion.

South Korea has also engaged in Holocaust remembrance events. To commemorate the 2012 International Holocaust Remembrance Day, 5,000 South Koreans rallied in Seoul to “tell the world that genocide must stop.” The rally, organized by the Worldwide Coalition to Stop Genocide in North Korea, linked memory of the Holocaust to human rights violations by the North Korean government. In March 2013, the Busan Israel Center was established. This Israeli cultural center aims to promote Holocaust education. Combined with the work of a robust human rights commission in South Korea that brought a human rights curriculum into schools as well as the historical memory of Japanese atrocities in Korea during World War II, there would appear to be ample opportunity for further awareness of the Holocaust on the southern half of the Korean peninsula.

South Korean Holocaust scholar Ho-Keun Choi has recently argued for the relevance of the Holocaust in Korean history. The “three burdensome memories” of Korean history—Japanese colonial rule from 1910–45 that instituted slave labor as well as sexual slavery for many Korean women, the violence directed at South Korean civilians during the Korean War under “false charges of being communists,” and the human rights violations against those who opposed authoritarian military rule in South Korea until the 1980s—represent atrocities with some analogue in the Nazi atrocities in Europe. Further, the Holocaust, according to Choi, is also significant in viewing the contemporary political situation of North Korea: “Yoduk Concentration Camp and the human rights conditions represented by an increasing number of

refugees remind us of Nazi Germany before the Final Solution … . The Holocaust shows clearly what kind of tragedy can occur when sovereignty comes before universal human rights.”\textsuperscript{131}

India, Mongolia, and Thailand represent countries in which many people have misconceptions about the Holocaust. In recent years, events in the latter two countries have highlighted distorted popular views of the Holocaust. In September 2011, students at a Thai Catholic school participated in a sports-day parade dressed in Nazi attire, according to observers, apparently unaware of the implications of such action.\textsuperscript{132} In Mongolia, a group of ultranationalists called Tsagaan Khass (translation: White Swastika) have taken up the Nazi cause in the name of ethnic purity.\textsuperscript{133}

Views of the Holocaust in India are equally complex. Vocal members of the Indian National Congress during World War II, including Jawaharlal Nehru and Mohandas (Mahatma) Gandhi, spoke out against the Nazis and offered their support for Jewish victims. The situation was complicated by Hindu attempts to maintain solidarity with Indian Muslims. These efforts led India to restrict postwar Jewish immigration to the subcontinent.\textsuperscript{134} Partially as a result of the Muslim influence in Indian politics and partly because of India’s attempts to distance itself from the West, “ignorance about Jews is widespread” in India. In the words of Navras Jaat Aafreedi, a university professor at Gautam Buddha University:

Few Indian followers of non-Semitic religions know much about Judaism, and the knowledge they have comes mainly through various secondary sources. They rely on English literature, media reports on the Arab-Israeli conflict, the accusation of deicide, and the lessons they received in European history at the school or
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university level with half-hearted passing references to the Jews. An example of which is the University of Lucknow [the university where Prof. Aafreedi took the Ph.D.] which never asked its students any question about the Holocaust in its examination history in spite of the fact that it teaches courses on European history. It is noteworthy considering the tendency of students to give more attention to the topics on which questions are likely to be asked in the examination. The Holocaust isn’t even a footnote.135

Aafreedi further points to a growing wave of Holocaust denial on the sub-continent as books on the subject have found their way to India. “The anti-Jewish posture of the Muslim press … negatively affects the Indian Muslim perception of Jews in general. A large section of South Asian Muslims denies that the Holocaust ever took place, or raises doubts about its magnitude and scale.”136 As a university professor, he is attempting to change this culture. In 2009, he offered a two-week-long “Holocaust Films Retrospective” in addition to forming a Facebook group titled “Holocaust Education in South Asia.”137 Yad Vashem has encouraged Holocaust education in India, hosting 20 educators from India as well as Australia, New Zealand, Singapore, and South Korea in December 2012 and January 2013.138 This encouragement has inspired grassroots projects, including the Art of Living Foundation’s Holocaust-related exhibition.

Cambodia is a state where, in spite of a limited presence of Holocaust education, the national history might make instruction on Holocaust history relevant. A genocide perpetrated by the Khmer Rouge from 1975 to 1979 killed roughly 1.7 million people. Unfortunately, factional

fighting within the government in the years following the defeat and exile of the Khmer Rouge largely meant Cambodian students were not taught the history of the genocide. In 2002, the government removed the Khmer Rouge genocide from the public school curriculum and, until very recently, there was no mention of it in official textbooks.139 Though the establishment of the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia—or the Khmer Rouge Tribunal—in 2007 brought optimism that the genocide would be brought more firmly into popular consciousness, the tribunal has been seen as largely ineffective and appears to be on the verge of collapse.140

Still, there are two sites devoted to historical memory of the Cambodian genocide—the Tuol Sleng Genocide Museum in Phnom Penh and the Choeung Ek (Killing Fields) Memorial just outside the city. The Documentation Center of Cambodia (DC-CAM) represents an important extra-governmental attempt to bring knowledge of the genocide into the public school system. In 2007, it published Kamboly Dy’s *A History of Democratic Kampuchea* and, in 2012, distributed 500,000 copies to more than 1,700 high schools. The book can also be downloaded for free on the DC-CAM website in multiple languages.141 This has been the first textbook about the Khmer Rouge era to reach students on a large scale since the government-imposed moratorium in 2002. DC-CAM also offers teacher’s guides for the textbook, which are available for download in both English and Khmer, and which emphasize student-centered learning. The
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Ministry of Education, Youth, and Sport has partnered with DC-CAM to distribute the materials.

The teacher’s guide explains the goals of the lessons as follows:

Your questions empower and give meaning to those who have suffered. Asking your parents and grand-parents about the Khmer Rouge will further the reconciliation of the Cambodian nation.

Teaching children about the Khmer Rouge regime means teaching students the difference between good and evil and how to forgive. Broken societies must know their past in order to rebuild for their future.

Teaching children about the history of the Khmer Rouge regime, as well as stimulating discussion between children and their parents and grand-parents about what happened, are important to preventing genocide both in Cambodia and the world at-large.142

The teacher’s resource book uses the Holocaust as a case study to compare with the genocide perpetrated by the Khmer Rouge. The inclusion of the Holocaust built off an effort in 2002 and 2003 to distribute Khmer versions of Anne Frank’s *The Diary of a Young Girl* to around 2000 high school students in Phnom Penh.143 As Cambodians embrace a deeper understanding of the Khmer Rouge genocide, a discussion of the Holocaust might continue to enrich such an effort. As in Rwanda, where the Holocaust provides a case study with enough historical distance for Rwandans to discuss it without fear of retribution, so might the Holocaust serve a similar purpose in Cambodia.

Conclusion

---
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Though the Holocaust is unknown across much of Asia, Japan and China represent states where the history of the Holocaust has been known for some time. Chinese scholars have demonstrated interest in disseminating knowledge of the Holocaust in the context of Chinese victimization during World War II, while Japanese engagement with the Holocaust has minimized the atrocities committed in the Pacific theater of the war. For societies coming to terms with their own historical tragedies, greater awareness of the Holocaust might be useful.
RUSSIA AND EASTERN EUROPE

This section includes Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus. They have been grouped together because all three countries have a long history of significant Jewish populations and were also Soviet republics. The people in each state were thus provided with the official Soviet view of the Nazis as, above all, enemies of communism and with the war as less about the Holocaust and more about the heroism of the Russian people.

Russia, Belarus, and Ukraine have each experienced a long history of antisemitism going back to the Russian Empire in the 19th century. Through military conquests in the early 19th century, Russia acquired territory that was home to a large Jewish population. Russia restricted the Jews’ mobility inside this territory, known as the Pale of Settlement. The late 19th century and early 20th century saw widespread attacks on Jewish communities in the Russian Empire. These attacks prompted the invention of the term “pogrom,” which has since acquired a universal meaning to indicate a targeted ethnic attack. These attacks influenced the decision of many Eastern European Jews to immigrate to the Americas during this period, especially during the first third of the 20th century. The lives of Jews in the Soviet Union continued to be precarious, as Jews were disproportionately persecuted as political prisoners and disproportionately restricted from emigrating.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁴ For background on 19th century pogroms, see John Doyle Klier, *Russians, Jews, and the Pogroms of 1881–1882* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); and on the USSR’s policy with regard to Jews, see Stuart
According to Russian Holocaust scholar Ilya Altman, “from the mid-1940s until the late 1980s, the Holocaust was omitted from school and university textbooks, encyclopedias, and monographs for exclusively political reasons. The ideological mechanisms of forgetting the memory assumed different forms: omitting it in silence, distorting historical facts, and direct falsification.”

Holocaust education in Russia, then, really began in the early 1990s, following the formal disintegration of the Soviet Union. In 1991, a group of 200 historians, journalists, teachers, researchers, and students formed the Russian Research and Educational Holocaust Center (RREHC) in Moscow. Altman currently co-directs the center. In 1997, the Interregional Holocaust Foundation created a regional framework for representatives in several more Russian cities and in the Belarusian city of Brest to coordinate Holocaust awareness efforts. Since the 1990s, the RREHC has pushed to bring Holocaust education into Russian schools, publishing scholarly articles, training educators, and providing source materials to both private Jewish and public school teachers in Russia. These materials include teaching and study aids published in the series The Russian Library of the Holocaust as well as documentary films. In 2009, Yad Vashem received a sizeable grant in part to promote Holocaust education in Russian-speaking countries and has worked with the RREHC and other partners to do so, largely in the realm of teacher training.

Besides RREHC, Eva and the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture serve as charitable and cultural organizations for the Jewish communities of St. Petersburg and the former
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Soviet Union, respectively. Eva opened the city’s first Holocaust museum and coordinates the Jewish Society of Concentration Camp and Ghetto Survivors. In November 2008, Eva organized the “Festival of Tolerance” to celebrate the 130th anniversary of the birth of Janush Kordack. The festival included an exhibition about the Holocaust and educator workshops.\(^{148}\) The Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, established in 1965 and based in the United States, has also forged awareness in the Jewish community and, more generally, the former Soviet Union, of the history of the Holocaust in Eastern Europe.\(^{149}\)

Only in the past few years has the Russian government developed a serious interest in formally supporting Holocaust education. Rising xenophobia and antisemitism following the collapse of the Soviet Union have led Russian politicians to take steps to promote Holocaust education in the public schools. A report on a 2010 country visit by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) highlighted Russia’s official efforts to discourage antisemitism after several high-profile attacks earlier in the decade. The Ministry of Education currently “considers fighting antisemitism to be a focus of its efforts.” It worked with the RREHC to develop a program called “Lessons of the Holocaust—a Path to Tolerance” within the existing curricular framework. Though the Russian Ministry can set federal education standards, it can only suggest the materials to be used in school curricula. According to the OSCE report, however, the Ministry is working to distribute materials from the “Lessons of the Holocaust”


There have been two recent unique events regarding Holocaust education in Russia. First, in early March 2012, the Russian Ministry of Education announced that the Holocaust would become a mandatory part of the national curriculum and that new textbooks would be distributed to allow Russian teachers to teach it adequately. The second, later that month, concerned an episode of a popular game show that gained international attention. Two telegenic twins competing on a Russian game show were asked, “What was the Holocaust?,” and admitted that the term “says nothing” to them, guessing that “We think that the Holocaust is wallpaper paste.” The clip went viral on YouTube, as the total lack of knowledge exhibited by the twins seemed to indicate that awareness of the Holocaust is limited in Russia.\footnote{“Russian Schools Will Study Holocaust and Jewish Heroism,” Israel National News, March 7, 2012, www.israelnationalnews.com/News/Flash.aspx/234171, accessed June 11, 2012; Mumin Shakirov and Aleksandr Kulygin, “Game Show Shocker Raises Questions about Russia’s Holocaust Education,” Radio Free Europe Radio Liberty, March 29, 2012, www.rferl.org/content/game_show_shocker_raises_questions_holocaust_education_russia/24531474.html, accessed June 11, 2012.}

The state of Holocaust education in Ukraine is similar to that of Russia. Since the early 1990s, World War II and the Holocaust have been part of the secondary school curricula, and in 2000, following the Stockholm Forum, the Ukraine Ministry of Education and Science “decided to recommend the Universities to introduce the course of Holocaust history in Europe and Ukraine.” Further, since 2006, high school graduation exam questions have included the
Holocaust. However, the practical effect of such recommendations has been limited by the fact that there are neither enough trained teachers, nor do they have the appropriate curriculum to teach the subject. Thus, Anatoly Podolsky argues, “in the modern Ukraine, we have a situation, when the State and the Ministry create no formal hurdles for Holocaust teaching; however, the real possibilities … are also non-existent.”

Just as in Russia, most of the momentum for Holocaust education has come from NGOs, most prominently the “Tkuma” All-Ukrainian Center for Holocaust Studies (hereafter, Tkuma) and the Ukraine Center for Holocaust Studies (UCHS). Tkuma mostly publishes books on the Holocaust, particularly as they pertain to the persecution of Jews and ethnic Ukrainians. Typically, the organization releases about a dozen books a year, including textbooks, memoirs, and other primary source collections. Igor Shchupak’s textbook on Ukrainian history, used by about 160,000 school students, includes an entire unit on the Holocaust. Further, Tkuma is “working to create the largest museum of Jewish history and the Holocaust in post-Soviet territory,” a museum that opened in October 2012 in Dnipropetrovsk. Since the UCHS’ inception in 2002, it has partnered with foreign NGOs to promote Holocaust education. With the Anne Frank House, the UCHS developed a program called “Tolerance and Holocaust Education in Ukraine,” and with the Visual History Foundation of the University of Southern California,
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the UCHS developed multimedia resources ‘to accompany the film *Nazvy svoie im’ia (Spell Your Name)*, a documentary about the Holocaust in Ukraine.’ The center has trained 3,000 teachers of students ages 14–18 in the use of these resources.\(^{156}\) It received funding from the OSCE to disseminate teaching materials on ‘discrimination, racism, and antisemitism.’\(^{157}\)

Finally, the UCHS cooperated with the Euro-Asian Jewish Congress to run a teacher training program called ‘Lessons of the Holocaust, Lessons of Tolerance’ in Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, and Uzbekistan.\(^{158}\)

Finally, Father Patrick Desbois in partnership with the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum has investigated sites of mass shootings and mass graves in Ukraine. The president of the research organization Yahad-in-Unum, Father Desbois has published *The Holocaust by Bullets: A Priest’s Journey to Uncover the Truth behind the Murder of 1.5 Million Jews.* In September 2011, an exhibition of Desbois’ research opened for the first time in Ukraine.\(^{159}\)

Information on the state of Holocaust education in **Belarus** is limited by the limited number of Belarusian sources on the topic. Further, Jewish scholars there have pointed out that the national curriculum, as recently as 2003, did not include the Holocaust. A Belarusian scholar noted that the entry for “Holocaust” in the Belarusian Encyclopedia did not mention the Jews killed in Belarus from 1941–44. “And this [absence],” he argued, “illustrates the state’s stance.”\(^{160}\) Though little additional information could be found at this time, Belarusian teachers
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have participated in educator programs through Yad Vashem, and, as mentioned above, the RREHC has conducted outreach to at least one Belarusian city.\textsuperscript{161}

**Conclusion**

The state of Holocaust education in Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus has been influenced by the region’s history of antisemitism as well as the memory of the Soviet regime. It appears that many Eastern Europeans view the Holocaust as inextricably linked to the enormous Slavic casualties during the war and, as an event coterminous with the Soviet Union’s expansion in the region following World War II, also linked to the atrocities committed by the Soviet state after the war. Though local and foreign NGOs have undertaken initiatives to advance Holocaust awareness, it is likely that more profound commitments from the respective national governments will be needed for further advances to occur.

THE BALKANS AND THE CAUCASUS REGIONS

The Balkans and the Caucasus regions include those states on the Balkan peninsula, those on the Anatolian Peninsula, and those in the area around the Caucasus Mountains. These states are grouped together because of the intense ethnic struggles within and between many of them. These modern states were all part of the Ottoman Empire and 20th-century political realignments created national polities that included sizable ethnic minorities. Although most of these states had some level of historical engagement with the Holocaust, many of them view World War II almost strictly in terms of their own national histories. The Holocaust, therefore, is generally not a substantial topic of interest unless it fits into a larger national narrative.

Most states in the Balkans had a direct relationship to the war and to the Holocaust. For instance, Albania was occupied first by the Italian fascist forces and then by the German Nazi army, the wartime Bulgarian regime allied itself with the Nazis and deported virtually the entire Jewish population in Macedonia to the Treblinka killing center. Most notably, Croatia’s wartime fascist regime, the Ustasha, established the Jasenovac concentration camp complex, in which an estimated 77,000 to 90,000 Jews, Serbs, Roma, and other minorities perished. Still, the memory of World War II in these states almost exclusively focuses on their individual national experiences during the war with little reference to the Holocaust.

Bulgaria’s postwar engagement with the Holocaust is mostly limited to its commemoration of its role as one of the few European countries not to deport its Jewish population of about 50,000 to the killing centers. Though its fascist government allied itself with
the Nazis and passed anti-Jewish legislation, it nonetheless refused Germany’s request to hand over the state’s Jews for extermination. The Bulgarian narrative is complicated, however, because the regime did deport non-Bulgarian Jews from areas under its control, notably in Macedonia and Thrace. The memory of the Holocaust in Bulgaria, however, has focused almost exclusively on its protection of its native Jewish population. For example, the Bulgarian day of Holocaust remembrance is March 10, named “The Day of the Holocaust and the Saving of Bulgarian Jews.” Though the Holocaust is taught in Bulgarian schools in the context of World History (10th grade), Bulgarian history (11th grade), and the history of the Balkans (12th grade), the curriculum emphasizes that “Bulgaria did not allow the Holocaust on its territory, that the Bulgarians stood decisively against the implementation of the Law for Protection of the Nation, which was passed under the pressure of National Socialist Germany.”

Further, there is no specific training for Bulgarian teachers on the teaching of the Holocaust. Though most of Bulgaria’s Jewish population left the country after World War II, Bulgaria has, nonetheless, in the past few years, seen a significant upsurge of antisemitic activity, including “vandalism, inflammatory rhetoric, and offensive graffiti.” In reaction to this emergent antisemitism, NGOs have attempted to broaden Bulgarians’ awareness of the Holocaust. A local Jewish organization in the country’s capital, the Carmel Lodge of Sofia, began a Holocaust education program in five high schools that culminated in a multimedia and
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More recently, World ORT (a Russian NGO devoted to Jewish vocational training), with funding from the Claims Conference, has established an online Holocaust Education Research Centre as “a repository for lesson plans and other material which teachers can access and […] help each other’s efforts to raise awareness and understanding of the Shoah among teenagers.” In addition, World ORT funds training programs for about 180 Bulgarian teachers. According to Professor Albana Taneva, the program is particularly important because “the lack of Holocaust education has created a vacuum which has the potential of being filled with extremist ideas, including from abroad.”

**Albanian** historical memory of the Holocaust also centers on the Albanian refusal to deport Jews to the Nazi killing centers, even after German occupation. There are, in fact, accounts of Albanian Muslims who hid Jews from Nazi persecution. When Albania recognized the International Day of Holocaust Remembrance in 2004, it became the first predominantly Muslim state to do so. While high school students learn about the Holocaust within the larger context of World War II, their teachers are not provided sufficient training.

On the other hand, virtually the entire Jewish population of modern-day Macedonia, about 7,000 people living mostly in Skopje, was deported by the Bulgarian occupying forces in 1943 to the Treblinka killing center. Currently, students learn about the Holocaust in the high
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school curriculum, though according to Holocaust educator Goran Sadikarijo, “students know only data and facts about this genocide but very little about ordinary life of the Jewish community in Macedonia before 1943. Additional efforts should be made for conducting researches [sic] on Jewish life before WWII and [for those stories] to be included in the curriculum.” In 2011, the Holocaust Memorial Center in Skopje opened with the task of personalizing the stories of Holocaust victims in Macedonia. The center not only provides exhibits but also produces documentary films about the Holocaust in Macedonia and in the former Yugoslavia more generally.\footnote{Goran Sadikarijo, SGS paper, permission pending.}

**Bosnia and Herzegovina** committed itself to including Holocaust education in its national curriculum at the 2000 Stockholm Forum, though it has yet to fulfill its commitment. This delay is due in part to the country’s long rebuilding process following the 1990s civil wars as well as its federated government structure, which impedes uniform curricular reform.\footnote{ODIHR, *Education on the Holocaust and on Anti-Semitism*, 36–37.}

**Armenian** national identity is very much tied to the nation’s collective memory of the genocide perpetrated by the Ottoman Empire from 1915 to 1918. The events were instrumental in leading to the very coining of the term “genocide” by Raphael Lemkin in 1944. Further, not only does the genocide figure prominently in Armenian memory, but since the independent Armenia, which emerged briefly after World War I, included only a fraction of the traditional Armenian lands, there are geopolitical reasons for putting the genocide at the center of national identity. Though the Holocaust might be useful for conversations about Armenian national trauma, this analogy has not undergone much public discussion. According to anthropologist Harutyun Marutyan, Armenians view the Holocaust strictly as a part of “Jewish history” and not
relevant to Armenian history. Additionally, many Armenians regard the politically controversial status of the Armenian genocide as evidence that the world does not view it with the same legitimacy as the Holocaust.\(^{172}\) The fact that Israel has not yet officially acknowledged the Armenian genocide,\(^{173}\) Marutyan argues, is especially important because of the particular role the Holocaust plays in Israeli national identity. Thus, students in Armenian schools only indirectly acquire knowledge of the Holocaust through the study of World War II in world history or through the study of human rights.\(^{174}\)

**Turkey’s** government has demonstrated willingness to support Holocaust education. Turkey was the only predominately Muslim state to attend the 2000 Stockholm Forum. The Turkish delegation asserted that “throughout history the Jews who lived in Turkey enjoyed great freedoms and they did not face any kind of discrimination and persecution. The Turkish people have shared a common past with the Jews. The contribution of Turkey to this intergovernmental event, thus, is becoming increasingly important.”\(^{175}\) Though Turkey’s Jewish population of 17,600 does indicate some level of tolerance, there have nonetheless been some anti-Jewish attacks in Turkish history, most notably in Eastern Thrace in 1939 and the Istanbul riots in 1955 directed at Jews in addition to ethnic Greeks and Armenians. Still, it is apparent that the narrative of tolerance is an important piece of Turkish official policy, as demonstrated by the pledge of the
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\(^{174}\) Harutyun Marutyan, SGS presentation. As Marutyan points out, an example of how students might encounter the Holocaust is in the middle school manual, *Diversity and Tolerance*: “The genocide of 1.5 million Armenians in 1915 and the extermination of 6 million Jews are not just episodes in the history of these two peoples; they are tragic events in the whole of humanity…. Every educated person of the 21st century ought to understand where humankind would be in a world without tolerance, and that the violation of human rights on ethnic, racial, religious, social, or any other grounds will lead to another genocide, another Holocaust.” This, however, is as far as the curriculum goes to discuss the Holocaust.

\(^{175}\) Turkish delegation statement, *Proceedings, Stockholm International Forum*, 145.
Turkish delegates at the Stockholm Forum to “revise text books ... to cover sections on awareness and remembrance of the Holocaust.”\footnote{Ibid.} This revision has not yet taken place. For instance, the only mention of the Holocaust occurs in a paragraph of the “Contemporary Turkish and World History” textbook. In the view of Turkish sociologist Kenan Cayir, this paragraph is possibly the sole reference to the Holocaust in Turkish textbooks.\footnote{Kenan Cayir, Comments on the draft, SGS, permission pending.}

As of April 2012, Ertan Tezgör, a Turkish ambassador, told a B’nai B’rith Canada roundtable that “Turkish academics and historians are consulting with the IHRA, Yad Vashem, and other experts to create a new, expanded Holocaust curriculum for high school students, which should be in place within the next five years.”\footnote{Joanne Hill, “Turkey Devising Different Holocaust Curriculum for Schools,” 
\textit{Jewish Tribune}, April 10, 2012, \url{www.jewishtribune.ca/features/2012/04/10/turkey-devising-different-holocaust-curriculum-for-schools}, accessed May 28, 2012.} This statement is not unimportant by any means and is buttressed by Turkey’s formal observer status within the IHRA, its declared intention to become a full member, and its work with the Paris-based, UNESCO-sponsored NGO Projet Aladin to bring awareness of the Holocaust to Muslim countries. In 2011, Claude Lanzmann’s \textit{Shoah} was screened at the Istanbul Film Festival, and it was shown on television in early 2012 with Turkish subtitles, the first time a Holocaust film had been shown in a predominately Muslim state.\footnote{Pinar Dost-Niyego, unpublished paper, in the possession of the author.} Even more recently, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum has undertaken outreach work to familiarize educators there with Turkish language sources on the Holocaust as well as working with the Anne Frank House to pilot a teacher training program in Turkey. Ambassador Tezgör has met with officials of the United
States Holocaust Memorial Museum on several occasions.\(^{180}\) Finally, in April 2012, Turkey’s Bahçeşehir University hosted a two-day forum titled “Jewish Refugees from Nazism and their Role in Modernization of Higher Education in Turkey.” The forum was sponsored by Projet Aladin and Princeton University; attendees included UNESCO Director-General Irina Bokova, underscoring UNESCO’s commitment to bringing knowledge of the Holocaust to Turkey.\(^{181}\)

Conclusion

The study of the Holocaust in this region has been limited largely by local concerns. The populations do not develop a full picture of the Holocaust as either a historical event or an event relevant for the universal scope of human rights. The direct connection between national histories and the Holocaust in the Balkan regions as well as the potential relevance of the Holocaust to the Armenian genocide, however, might provide logical starting places for a further development of Holocaust education in this region.
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AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND

Australia and New Zealand have been included as a separate section for several reasons. First, each was a British settler society, and they both still deal with the legacy of the British subjugation of an indigenous people. As we will see, this history has implications with regard to the memory of the Holocaust. Second, each society limited immigration of non-whites for much of its history in order to maintain racial purity on each respective island. For the most part, this restriction applied to Jews, and there is a strain of guilt in each society for turning away Jewish refugees during the war. Finally, each country, in spite of immigration quotas, did absorb Holocaust survivors, and the Holocaust has become part of popular memory.

Though neither Australia nor New Zealand has a national mandate for Holocaust education, the history curricula allow teachers the discretion to teach the event, and there are extra-governmental infrastructures in place to facilitate it. Further, a history of Holocaust survivors and perpetrators immigrating to the region, especially to Australia, has led to a degree of popular awareness of the event, particularly after the international notoriety of the Adolf Eichmann trial in 1960. In 1933, there was already a small Jewish community of 23,000 in Australia, and over 15,000 immigrated to the country before the end of World War II. Still, the Australian government refused to raise its strict quota of 5,000 immigrants a year during the war, and the state’s representative to the 1938 Evian Conference (an international conference devoted to solving the problem of Jewish refugees in Europe) offered perhaps the most well-known single encapsulation of the outside world’s reluctance to assist Hitler’s victims during the war: “As we have no real racial problem, we are not desirous of importing one by encouraging any
scheme of large-scale foreign migration.”\textsuperscript{182} Jewish refugees continued to come to Australia, however, within the confines of the immigration quotas, and by 1961, the number of Jews in Australia had increased from 23,000 in 1933 to 60,000 in 1961. Most of that increase was comprised of Holocaust survivors. Thus, in the words of Suzanne Rutland, “Australian Jewry is largely a post-Holocaust community … . Melbourne has a larger percentage of Holocaust survivors than any other place [in Australia]; worldwide, only Israel has a larger percentage.” The Holocaust has also become an important topic in recent years, as immigrant Muslim communities have exhibited a large degree of intolerance toward Jews and skepticism toward learning about the Holocaust.\textsuperscript{183}

There is some degree of knowledge about the Holocaust in Australia. David Ritter has argued that in spite of Jewish refugee immigration to the island continent during the war, public consciousness of the Holocaust did not really exist until “the [Adolf] Eichmann hearing created an interpretive threshold after which, for the first time in Australia, the extermination of the Jews began to be understood as a phenomenon apart, known as the ‘Holocaust.’”\textsuperscript{184} The Eichmann trial, indeed, was one of the most important Australian news stories of 1961 and galvanized a significant discussion of the Holocaust there. Still, as Suzanne Rutland has shown, among the Jewish population of Australia, it was not until the 1970s that a substantial interest in education around the history of the Holocaust developed. Jewish day schools there—such as Moriah College, which was begun by Jewish refugees in 1942—placed a growing emphasis on teaching
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about the Holocaust once the second generation of immigrants came of age and began teaching.  

In 1984, the Jewish Holocaust Centre in Melbourne was established under the patronage of Yad Vashem. The museum’s education program, which has served some 400,000 Australian students since opening, provides a historical introduction to the Holocaust, a documentary video, and features its own survivor testimony program. The museum display focuses in particular on the Australian perspective on the Holocaust—commemorating European Jews’ attempts to get entry visas as well as Aboriginal protests of Nazi policies.  

The Sydney Jewish Museum opened in 1992 and has worked closely with Australian teachers to bring the Holocaust into schools. Australia’s government is a federation, and the optional federal curriculum does include the Holocaust. The state of New South Wales (NSW), which includes Sydney (the country’s most populous city), does not mandate Holocaust education, but it does mandate that students learn “respect for the cultural diversity of Australian society” in fostering their “intellectual, social, and moral development.” The Holocaust is included as one optional case study in this curriculum.  

The Sydney Jewish Museum works closely with the NSW Board of Studies to train teachers to use the Holocaust within the framework of the existing curriculum. First, the museum runs two teacher training programs, and the NSW Institute of Teachers has accredited the
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programs so that teachers receive professional development credit for attendance.\footnote{188} Second, the museum partners with Yad Vashem in the Gandel Holocaust Studies Program for Australian Educators. Teachers throughout Australia are eligible, and the roughly two dozen who are funded each year take a “pre-seminar” at the Sydney Jewish Museum before a ten-day intensive course at Yad Vashem’s International School for Holocaust Studies. Finally, the museum has published Australia’s premier Holocaust curriculum—\textit{Teaching the Holocaust}—for Jewish teachers and its own training program.\footnote{189}

The curricular source book, written by Sophie Gelski and originally published in 2003, has an interdisciplinary scope, appropriate for English, Geography, History, Religious Education, Society and Culture, and Visual Arts. The material attempts to link the Holocaust to Australian history, noting the state’s “cold and unwelcome” attitudes toward Jewish refugees fleeing Nazi Europe while also pointing out the large proportion of Holocaust survivors in Australia. Notable units in the text focus on multiculturalism, Holocaust poetry, Australia’s response at the Evian conference and connections to contemporary refugee crises, and the “choices” of different individuals in the Holocaust (i.e., perpetrator, resister, etc.). One version is geared toward students in the final years in Australian secondary school, while another, for years six to nine, is devoted to younger teenagers.\footnote{190}

\footnote{190}{Sophie Gelski, \textit{Teaching the Holocaust, Years 9–12} (Sydney: Sydney Jewish Museum, 2003). Quotation is from p. 1; Sophie Gelski with Tami Wassner, \textit{Teaching the Holocaust, Years 6–9} (Sydney: Sydney Jewish Museum, 2003).}
Courage to Care, a program created and funded by B’nai B’rith, has, since 1998, offered “student-centred” programs, which use the Holocaust as the central case study, in New South Wales and neighboring Victoria. Courage to Care “focuses on the rescuers—those who had the ‘courage to care’ and who risked their lives to save victims of the Nazis”—in order to instill in students their own agency in combating racism and intolerance in the world. The program targets several communities each year. In its first eight years, Courage to Care reached 150,000 participants, 55,000 of whom were school children.\(^{191}\)

Not nearly as many Holocaust survivors entered New Zealand as Australia. New Zealand’s record on allowing Jewish refugees was even less forthcoming than its neighbor across the Tasman Sea, but a not insignificant number of survivors did immigrate there.\(^{192}\) The Holocaust has thus entered popular consciousness to some degree, following a similar, though later trajectory to that of Australia, with some popular consciousness stoked by the Eichmann trial in 1961 and the television miniseries *The Holocaust* in the late 1970s. One scholar has argued that greater awareness of the Holocaust in the 1980s and 1990s stemmed from four events: an increase in public commemoration of the Holocaust beginning in 1985, discussions of possible Nazi war criminals in New Zealand in the late 1980s, a resurgence of pseudo-scholarly Holocaust denial in New Zealand beginning in the 1990s, and a comparison of the subjugation of the Maori with the Holocaust. Of these, the last has received the most international attention.\(^ {193}\)

In 2000, a government official stirred up international controversy by comparing the European
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Holocaust to the subjugation of the indigenous Maoris by European colonists. The then-Associate Maori Affairs Minister Tariana Tura, argued for an “acknowledgment of the holocaust suffered by many Maori tribes during the Land Wars [in the 19th century].” This statement was especially controversial because, in the words of David MacDonald, she “equated Maori experiences with those of European Jews.”  

Though there is no national mandate for Holocaust education, the secondary school social studies curriculum does offer educators considerable latitude to teach the Holocaust on their own initiative. The major effort in New Zealand to push social studies teachers to include the Holocaust comes from the Holocaust Research and Education Centre of New Zealand, which originally opened in 2007 but unveiled a new facility in April 2012 called the Holocaust Centre of New Zealand. The museum’s website provides downloadable research articles of use for local educators, such as “New Zealand Immigration Policy” and “The Jewish Doctors in New Zealand, 1933–1945,” and it explains to teachers how to incorporate study of the Holocaust into the “key concepts” or broad goals for New Zealand students and “achievement objectives” or specific goals for individual grade levels of the senior history curriculum. For instance, one key concept is that students understand that “there are multiple perspectives of the past, and these interpretations are contested.” The Wellington center suggests a lesson in which students “study perspectives of the Holocaust, using the views of bystander, perpetrator, victim, collaborator, rescuer.” An achievement objective for Level 8 (students of age 12 or 13) requires that students

“understand that the causes, consequences, and explanations of historical events that are of significant to New Zealanders are complex and how and why they are contested.” The Wellington Center suggests a lesson in which students “analyse the intentionalist versus functionalist arguments of the Holocaust—did Hitler intend for the Holocaust to happen from the start or was it a decision made by underlings . . . . Was the Holocaust inevitable? Is it right to even compare genocides through history?” These suggestions point to an intellectually developed attempt to bring Holocaust education to New Zealand students in a meaningful way. At this time, however, it is difficult to ascertain how many teachers have implemented these suggested lessons since there are virtually no standardized curricular requirements in the nation.

Conclusion

Australia and New Zealand each have a level of historical engagement with the Holocaust. As European settler societies, they have a firmer connection to the European theater of World War II than most Asian states. Quite clearly, the level of Holocaust education is more advanced in Australia, largely because of the Jewish refugees who came during the 1930s and 1940s. Still, both states would appear to have an interest in facing the racial politics in their own past either vis-à-vis the original indigenous inhabitants or with regard to an exclusionary immigration policy. Holocaust education here is limited only by the lack of government commitment to funding programming and teacher training.

CONCLUSION

Around the world, Holocaust education is often relevant to memorializing the sites and events in the lands where it occurred or had direct influence, illuminating and reconciling conflicts within traumatized societies, and examining contemporary inequalities and injustices where they occur. In many states, the primary influence is the historical link between a particular state, region or continent and the Holocaust itself; this shared history includes the specific events of the Holocaust as well as the post-war migration of survivors and perpetrators to lands beyond Europe. In Ukraine, for example, the Babi Yar massacre by the Nazis has become a significant part of national memory. In Australia, the influx of Holocaust survivors in large numbers added to the already established Jewish community, making for an ever-growing network of individuals and groups interested in promoting Holocaust education even decades after the end of World War II.

Second, some countries seeking to reconcile their own traumatic pasts have found the Holocaust to be a powerful arena for resolving their own internal challenges. In South Africa, the Cape Town Holocaust Centre has found in the history of the Holocaust a rich narrative around which to discuss the legacy of the Apartheid era. Holocaust education is a part of the Centre’s
teacher training programs and outreach to the general public. Through this process, citizens of South Africa can find a voice and context through which to heal their divisions and work toward a strong democratic future. In Cambodia, the Khmer Rouge murdered millions of Cambodians and destroyed the internal memory and identity of an entire nation. The story of the Holocaust has proven to be an appropriate and successful narrative for the Documentation Center of Cambodia to help the nation rebuild its collective understanding of itself and to share that understanding with younger generations.

Third, several societies seeking to promote a new awareness of human rights and human dignity have engaged the history of the Holocaust to promote the values that bind the modern world together. In Ecuador, a government and school partnership has built a strong foundation for understanding the Holocaust. The goal is to help the diverse national communities to respect the rights and privileges of all citizens. The Holocaust tells the story of the failure of democracy, and the study of the Holocaust allows Ecuadorians to understand, support, and promote the ideals of a dynamic, pluralist society. In Turkey, educators are seeking to learn more about the Holocaust in order to develop a human rights curriculum. Foreign experts such as the Anne Frank House and the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum have provided training and material to Turkish educators. These educators, in turn, are teaching their students to support human rights and democracy around the world.

International bodies such as the United Nations, UNESCO, and a variety of NGOs are working in many states to promote an understanding of the Holocaust in ways that appreciate local narratives. These programs currently exist in Africa, Latin America, and Asia. For example, the Holocaust and the United Nations Outreach Programme has broadcast survivor testimonies to
such countries as Madagascar and Senegal. UNESCO’s Holocaust outreach has produced conferences and trainings in sub-Saharan Africa. Additionally, NGOs such as Facing History and Ourselves in the United States and Yad Vashem in Israel run international training programs for teachers in many countries, including Rwanda, South Africa, Mexico, and China.

Political challenges are also a key factor in the public awareness of the Holocaust. In the Middle East, the post-World War II establishment of the state of Israel has dramatically influenced local Holocaust understanding. Today, the Holocaust is largely viewed as synonymous with the complicated history of the state of Israel. While Iranian television stations have broadcast Holocaust-related films, the Ahmadinejad regime has also been a vocal proponent of Holocaust denial and antisemitism. While other states such as Morocco have hosted conferences or participated in Holocaust related events, the majority of the population in this region is more significantly influenced by the current debates around Israel than by the strict historical narrative of the Holocaust. This political conflict poses an ongoing challenge to any organization seeking to promote the memory and lessons of the Holocaust.

In other regions, additional challenges include historical memory and geopolitical realities. In former Soviet bloc countries, the memory of the Holocaust competes with the memory of Soviet rule. The Soviet narratives minimized the history of the Holocaust and especially the distinct anti-Jewish focus of Nazi persecution. In both the Ukraine and Russia, the legacy of this narrative complicates current efforts to promote accurate history and relevant lessons about the Holocaust. Finally, certain societies struggle with the necessary educational infrastructures such as proper training of teachers and supplying adequate resources for learning.
This is the case in much of sub-Saharan Africa, as well as states in southeast Asia, such as Cambodia.

In conclusion, the world has seen an increased exchange of both information and educational initiatives around the Holocaust in the past two decades. At the same time, the importance of place and culture has not been diminished, and local relevance is crucial to understanding the value of Holocaust education. In fact, the conclusion that can be drawn from an examination of the way the Holocaust has been understood both historically and in the contemporary world is that local, national, and regional contexts have refracted the memory of the Holocaust in many different ways. Those organizations that have been most successful in teaching citizens about the Holocaust have done so by understanding the importance of engaging with the history of the Holocaust within the contexts and social understandings of local histories and traditions.
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MacDonald, David. “Daring to Compare: The Debate about a Maori ‘Holocaust’ in New
Zealand,” Journal of Genocide Studies, 5 (2003), 383–403. MacDonald’s article shows how
Maori activists became embroiled in a controversy in the late 1990s after comparing European
conquest in New Zealand to the Jewish Holocaust. He also provides a useful discussion of the
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APPENDIX B: MAJOR ORGANIZATIONS IMPLEMENTING GLOBAL OR REGIONAL OUTREACH PROGRAMS IN HOLOCAUST EDUCATION

Aegis Trust (www.aegistrust.org)—The Aegis Trust, formed in 2000, is a British-based organization dedicated to the prevention of genocide worldwide. It funds both research and education and runs both the Holocaust Memorial and Educational Centre in the UK and (along with the Kigali City Council) the Kigali Genocide Memorial in Rwanda.

Aladdin Project (www.projetaladin.org/en/home.html)—Formed under the patronage of UNESCO and Mémorial de la Shoah in 2009, the Aladdin Project is a Paris-based NGO with members on its board from around the globe. It is designed especially to combat antisemitism and Holocaust denial in the Middle East. Its website and online library have been visited by substantial numbers of Turks, Iranians, Egyptians, Moroccans, Tunisians, and Algerians, and in early 2010, it organized conferences on the Holocaust in cities such as Istanbul, Baghdad, Tunis, and Rabat.

Anne Frank House (www.annefrank.org/en/Worldwide/)—The Anne Frank House (AFH) is a Dutch organization growing out of the original museum in the Netherlands. The AFH has brought its flagship exhibit “Anne Frank: A History for Today” to over 40 countries in Europe, Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The Anne Frank House often tailors its programming to be more relevant in local societies and typically trains young people as “peer guides” to present the group’s curriculum to other young people.

Auschwitz-Birkenau State Memorial and Museum (en.auschwitz.org/m/)—The Auschwitz-Birkenau State Memorial and Museum was created in 1947 by the Polish government to memorialize the brutality of the Nazi Reich’s deadliest extermination camp. Over a million visitors from all over the globe tour the museum each year.

Conference on Jewish Material Claims against Germany (www.claimscon.org)—The Claims Conference, founded in 1951, has received billions of dollars from the German government for restitution for victims of Nazi policies. Most of the funds have been given specifically to former property holders and/or their families, but the organization uses unclaimed funds to help elderly and poor Jews across the world. Yearly, the organization also spends about $18 million toward education, documentation, and research programs “to ensure the memory and lessons of the Holocaust are preserved for current and future generations.”

Council of Europe (www.coe.int)—The Council of Europe promotes, among other platforms, human rights standards across Europe. It is a permanent observer of the IHRA and assists member states in developing remembrance and education activities, including through the dissemination of Holocaust-related education materials.

Facing History and Ourselves (www.facing.org)—The US-based Facing History and Ourselves, founded in 1976, began its outreach programs in the United States and has recently broadened its reach to, most notably, South Africa, Rwanda, China, and Mexico. The group uses the Holocaust as a case study of universal interest to understand the roots of racism and to prevent its future
occurrence. Its seminal curriculum—*The Holocaust and Human Behavior*—has been adapted to local situations in several of the aforementioned countries, and it is available as a free download on the group’s website.

Mémorial de la Shoah (www.memorialdelashoah.org)—The Center of Contemporary Jewish Documentation began collecting evidence of the persecution of Jews in France in 1943. In 2005, the CCDJ opened the Mémorial de la Shoah. In the past few years, the Mémorial has begun international outreach programs. Mostly through the United Nations Information Centre, Mémorial has been particularly active in the French-speaking countries in Africa such as Cameroon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Senegal. It has also held seminars for Moroccan teachers and scholars as well as for both teachers and federal judges in Argentina.

Nunca Olvidar Foundation (nuncaolvidar.com/en)—The Nunca Olvidar Foundation, a US-based organization, has, since 1983, used the Holocaust to “increase awareness and strengthen responsible leaders who will help the growth and development of the nation under a system of tolerance and goodwill towards all its citizens and to the rest of the world’s nations.” It has done outreach work in Venezuela, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, and most recently, begun training teachers in Panama.

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (www.osce.org/odihr/44474)—The OSCE is committed to promoting Holocaust remembrance and combating antisemitism and the ODIHR is tasked with carrying out these two goals. It produces studies on antisemitism and Holocaust remembrance in Europe and has worked with Yad Vashem to assist member states with remembrance and educational activities.

Salzburg Global Seminar Holocaust Education and Genocide Prevention Initiative (www.salzburgglobal.org)—SGS’s Holocaust Education and Genocide Prevention Initiative focuses mainly on bringing scholars spanning the globe together to share research and teaching methods. Building on an initial conference in 2010, the 2012 conference represented the next major effort in the process.

South African Holocaust and Genocide Foundation (www.ctholocaust.co.za)—The SAHGF, the umbrella organization administering South Africa’s three Holocaust museums, has mostly been concerned with Holocaust education in South Africa. However, it also recently began outreach work in the neighboring countries of Namibia and Rwanda.

United Nations (www.un.org)—The United Nations, by order of UN Resolution 60/7 in 2005, is tasked with promoting Holocaust remembrance and educational activities. It does this through the Holocaust and the United Nations Outreach Programme, which disseminates information on best practices to UN member nations and through the 63 UN information centres dispersed throughout the world.

United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (www.unesco.org)—UNESCO resolution 34c/61, adopted in 2007, task the organization with assisting the Holocaust and the United Nations Outreach Programme in commemorating Holocaust Remembrance activities,
researching the way the Holocaust is understood, and with disseminating materials regarding how best to teach Holocaust awareness and combat Holocaust denial. UNESCO is involved in a wide range of scholarly activities, such as its current project, which is a global survey of textbooks’ treatment of the Holocaust. Further, it partners with many of the other NGOs listed here in programs designed to further Holocaust education, and it also sponsors and promotes remembrance activities in many of its 193 member states.

United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (www.ushmm.org)—Although its efforts are mostly concentrated in the United States, the US Holocaust Memorial Museum works with international organizations such as the IHRA and the Salzburg Global Seminar to advance Holocaust scholarship and genocide prevention research. The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum has also worked with the IHRA to train Latin American teachers, and its Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies hosts scholars from around the world to undertake Holocaust research. It has also recently done outreach work in Morocco, South Sudan, and Turkey.

University of Southern California, Shoah Foundation Institute for Visual History and Education (sfi.usc.edu)—Inspired by his experience directing Schindler’s List, Steven Spielberg established the Survivors of the Shoah Visual History Foundation in 1994 to collect testimonies from Holocaust survivors and other witnesses. In 2006, the University of Southern California acquired the Shoah Foundation and broadened its mission to emphasize the educational use of the video testimonies. In addition to this international educational outreach, the Foundation collects the testimony of survivors and witnesses of other modern genocides.

Yad Vashem, The Holocaust Martyrs’ and Heroes’ Remembrance Authority (www1.yadvashem.org)—The oldest organization dedicated to commemorating the Holocaust, the Israeli museum and research institute works with educators abroad to further awareness of the Holocaust. Yad Vashem’s International School for Holocaust Studies works with educators on six continents.

World ORT (www.ort.org/)—World ORT, an organization devoted to Jewish education programs across the world, has funded and helped institute Holocaust education programs in areas as diverse as Bulgaria and Argentina.
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