Adriana Krawiec
Uniwersytet Jagielloński
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9552-2818

34/2023
Political Dialogues
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12775/DP.2023.002

The Interpenetration of Politics and Culture in Education on the Holocaust. The Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum and The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*

Abstract:
A monument – metal chairs from Plac Bohaterów Getta in Kraków, Poland, symbolize the absence of millions of Jews in Poland due to the Holocaust. But in Poland, there is a more horrifying symbol of the Holocaust, and that is Auschwitz. Knowledge of the uniqueness of Nazi genocide against the Jews in Auschwitz has been obvious since 1945, but the Polish People's Republic's historical policy has blurred it and presented it in the context of the extermination of millions of people from different countries (Huener, 2003, pp. 123–127). The fact that Auschwitz is the symbol of the Holocaust is attributable to the USA, and the President's [Carter] Commission, which gave rise to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum (*Report to the President…*, 1979). The article aims to compare Polish and American education on the Holocaust, thus cultural and memory politics on this issue over the decades.

Keywords: memory policy, education on the Holocaust, Auschwitz, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum

Introduction

The Holocaust is a lesson that we have to learn from. Such a meaning was influenced by the American culture in the late 1970s. It was then that the federal institution on the Holocaust was established (and opened a few decades later). It was the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum, a living memorial. Here, the Holocaust living memorial

* The work is based on the author's visit to the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum financed by a subsidy of the Faculty of International and Political Studies of Jagiellonian University for research activities as well as the visit to the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum.

means an educational function of the memorial, which is reflected in the exhibitions and strictly educational units of the museum. Since then, the center has aimed at bringing Holocaust education globally – as a lesson glorifying democratic values. The USA was the first country after Israel to include Holocaust education. However, it was in Poland that the sites of the Holocaust have marked the country. It was here that the Nazi camp Auschwitz existed. After the Allies won the war against the Nazis, the first commemorative exhibitions in Auschwitz were organized. The displays, however, built an image of a different Auschwitz than today.

Appropriation of the history of the Holocaust in the Polish People's Republic

In Poland, after the war, the authorities took the decision to create a state museum in the former Auschwitz camp (Dz.U. 1947 Nr 52, poz. 265). The titles of the press articles concerning the opening of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum testified to what it was supposed to be, i.e., "The opening of the Museum of Polish Martyrdom in Oświęcim" (Lechendro, 2007, p. 70). At that time, Auschwitz sent to Poles a heroic and romantic imaginarium about *Poland the Christ of Nations* (Ziębińska-Witek, 2021). The authors of the articles were often Polish political prisoners, as well as those writing on the basis of their accounts (Lachendro, 2007, p. 71).

The design of exhibitions was also entrusted to former Polish political prisoners, which was associated with the Polish commemoration of the place (*Projekt ramowy Muzeum w Oświęcimiu dr. Heina*). There were no representatives of the Jewish community among them, for whom the center of gravity of Auschwitz was the camp in Birkenau, underlining of which would thus show the essence of Auschwitz and the essence of Nazi totalitarianism (Arendt, 1951). Such a narrative of the museum was in fact defined from above on 1 February 1946, when the Deputies' Committee for Culture and Art unanimously adopted the deputies' motion "on the creation of a place of commemoration of Polish and international martyrdom in Oświęcim and Birkenau" (*Sprawozdanie z X-letniej działalności Muzeum w Oświęcimiu-Brzezince*). It took place in the face of the political agreement on Polish-Soviet friendship, which was signed by Bolesław Bierut, who headed the self-proclaimed government body of Poland in the post-war period (Dz.U. 1945 Nr 47, poz. 268). The aim of the agreement was to continue the fight against post-war Germany. Auschwitz fit perfectly into this rhetoric. Until the end of the Polish People's Republic, the narrative of Auschwitz was to be based on the Introduction, which "emphasized the methods by which the German

people fight through their representatives […] be it Julius Caesar or the Fuhrer" (*Zasady rozplanowania muzeum*…). One pavilion was dedicated to Jewish martyrdom, which, although it emphasized the Jewish martyrdom in Auschwitz, was entitled: "The Extermination of Millions", thus blurring the history of the Holocaust (Heuner, 2003, p. 123). However, reconstructing the history of the Holocaust in Auschwitz-Birkenau Museum was difficult, both for financial reasons and for shortcomings in the documentation of the center. It was the Soviet Army that liberated the camps and the Soviet commission working there was in possession of most of the documents from the crime scene (*Sprawozdanie z X-letniej działalności Muzeum w Oświęcimiu-Brzezince*).

In the first years after the war, the USSR did not protest that Auschwitz was becoming a symbol of Polish martyrdom. Thanks to Auschwitz, the occupation in the public perception was only one, i.e., German, and there was silence about the Soviet occupation (Huener, 2003). However, with the progressive Sovietization of Poland, the exhibition aroused more and more controversy in the USSR. In the 1950s, Auschwitz was to serve the Marxist idea by showing the class struggle and was to be a tool of the USSR in the Cold War, i.e., presenting the policy of the Anglo-American imperialists as converging with the totalitarian system of the Nazis (Choriew, 2000, pp. 257–265). This took place not only through exhibitions, but also peace demonstrations in Auschwitz and anniversary celebrations at the memorial site including that related to the liberation of the camp by the Soviet Army. This was interrupted by the death of Stalin, which brought about the so-called thaw, i.e., a period of reforms and liberalization of repressive politics and the collapse of Marxism. However, the new authorities in communist Poland filled it with nationalism in an extreme form, up to the anti-Semitic campaign, which referred to the negative stereotypes of Jews: 'Agents of the West' and 'former Stalinists', which was connected with the fact that Jews associated the new Stalinist regime with carrying hopes for 'normality'. These years were a period (Young, 1993) of total silence over the presence of Jews in Polish history (Ziębińska-Witek, 2021).

Company trips to Auschwitz were fashionable in the Polish People's Republic (Kucia, 2005, pp. 68–70). Auschwitz was also visited in connection with state ceremonies, which could not be organized by the institution by virtue of the statute. From the 1960s, visitors, mainly Polish people, could read the inscription under the Monument in Birkenau, unveiled at that time: "The place of martyrdom and death of 4 million victims murdered by Nazi genocide between 1940–45" (Kucia, 2005, p. 30). Therefore, visitors came to the place associated with official remembrance and oblivious to the Holocaust.

From history from below to federal institution on the Holocaust in the USA

When everything in Poland was censored under the Iron Curtain, the free media in the USA began to raise topics so far unaware of in American society. In 1944, *Life* magazine published photos of the concentration camps, drawing attention to the horror of Nazi crimes, although not specifically for the destruction of Jews (Fallace, 2008, p. 12). Still, Americans wanted to return to optimism after winning the war, not paying much attention to what had happened far from the U.S., in distant Europe. Also, many of the survivors who stayed here wanted to build substitutes for normality, inscribed in the optimistic American culture. It is no wonder that their stories in American society were ignored or considered improbable and impossible (Fallace, 2008, p. 13).

American Jews, however, wanted to commemorate the tragedy of their ancestors under Nazi rule (Fallace, 2008, p. 13). The Holocaust began to be taught in Jewish evening and Sunday schools, which was a compromise for Jewish families living in the U.S., who wanted their children to preserve the memory of their heritage and, at the same time, assimilate into American society by attending American schools (Fallace, 2008, p. 16). Over time, the publications of Jewish organizations, for example, The Anti-Defamation League (ADL) began to gain publicity in the media, and popular culture promoted elementary books on the Holocaust such as *The Diary of a Young Girl* by Anne Frank. Films began to be made (including the American series called "Holocaust" from 1978) (Linenthal, 2001, p. 12). Dealing with the subject of the Holocaust, they simplified it for the needs of 'ordiners'. As a result, the Holocaust became more digestible – there were no fallen masses, there was nothing that still seemed improbable (Arendt, 1952) but heroes with whom you could identify. One of them was Elie Wiesel, a surviving Jew who was gaining more and more popularity, and scraps of this incredible history could no longer be ignored. Traumatized minorities began to demand the commemoration of their memory in the public sphere. There was a phenomenon called *memory boom*, which concerned the reconstruction and commemoration of history – not the winners, but victims, not the construction of monuments to national heroes, but to national minorities. The problem made it onto the public affairs agenda. Since then, politicians have had to face past violence. To this end, in 1978, President Jimmy Carter established a special commission known as the President's Commission on the Holocaust (Linenthal, 2001, p. 3).

The United States Holocaust Museum in Washington, D.C. (USHMM), one of the most prestigious institutions studying the history of the Holocaust, developed on the politics of regret (Sodaro, 2018, pp. 12–15). But even if Carter was motivated by grief,

the elite made the Holocaust a lesson for the future, thus showing what America is not and why the Holocaust could not exist here, setting its compass on the way to the promotion of democratic values, especially civil society: “We have learned not to be neutral in times of crisis, for neutrality always helps the aggressor, never the victim. We have learned that silence is never the answer” (Wiesel, 1979). These recommendations by the President’s Commission on the Holocaust have been accepted as expressed by a unanimous act of Congress establishing the U.S. Holocaust Council in 1980, which was mandated with the creation of a living memorial to the six million Jews and millions of other victims of the Nazis (*A Proposal to Fund the Mandel Teacher Fellowship Program*).

The very building of the exhibition, which was supposed to be understandable to every American who had not experienced totalitarianism, took years of deliberation of the members of the Council. At the same time, the educational programs of the future museum were fledgling, but an educational project of teaching on the Holocaust of an NGO was ready, namely “Facing History and Ourselves”, which the Department of Education recognized as an exemplary curriculum in 1980 for teaching on the Holocaust in the USA, recommending its introduction in schools throughout the United States (Fallace, 2008, p. 87). “Facing History” played a rather supporting role before the emergence of an American and even world leader and a real leader in Holocaust education on a US and global scale, i.e., the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum, a federal institution. The Council’s goal from that moment was education to support human values that were sacrificed in the crucible of the Holocaust (*A Proposal to Fund the Mandel Teacher Fellowship Program*).

Redefinition of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum. A driving force for change

The 1980s saw the decline of the USSR as a result of the policy of non-communist states under the leadership of the USA, and in Poland the decline of the Polish People’s Republic, to which the social movement “Solidarity” contributed, arose on the wave of strikes in August 1980. The People of “Solidarity” were intellectuals who cooperated with the working class and increasingly demanded a change in historical policy (Cebulski, 2016, p. 119). What is more, the Polish underground began to discuss a role other than the martyrological one of Poles during World War II. It was the social capital that laid the foundations for a new democratic political system and a new historical policy. The new historical policy initiated by the first democratic government of Tadeusz Mazowiecki was *de facto* a policy of remembrance and was not identified with the state-owned view of history (Chwedoruk, 2018).

Between 1990 and 1994 (*Sprawozdanie z Działalności Muzeum za 1994, 1995*), the issue of inscriptions on the monument in Birkenau divided the scientific community. The empty plaques that could be seen at that time were a testimony to the ongoing redefinition of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum. Ultimately, the new inscription brought back the memory of the Holocaust, and the new exhibition captures the center of gravity of Auschwitz. An important event was the creation of the International Council of the Auschwitz-Birkenau State Museum, which strongly contributed to democratic changes in the center: official history was replaced here by critical history. Still, the framework of the discourse in Auschwitz is set by the Ministry of Culture; it is a state museum. On 26 October 1999, the name of the Ministry of Culture and Art was changed to the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, which was tantamount to the fact that cultural policy focused on the protection of national cultural heritage (Dz.U. 1999 Nr 91, poz. 1014). Administrative and legal conditions show that the protection of heritage belongs to the Polish state, and the state does it through public museums (*Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej*). However, already in the first democratic government in Poland, it was stressed that the cultural policy of Poland would never again rely on centralized management (*Polityka kulturalna państwa…*).

Jews in Poland are now a national minority, which constitutes a small percentage of the population, as confirmed by the 2011 census, in which 7,353 citizens declared such affiliation (*Mniejszości narodowe…*). Thus, the protection of the cultural heritage of Jews living here before the war depends on the cooperation of Polish communities with the government. This topic is raised by citizens' initiatives, such as the private Galicia Jewish Museum through the "Traces of Memory" photographic exhibition, which documents changes that have taken place in the area of Polish Galicia since 2004 in terms of preserving Jewish heritage: from a disastrous photo that depicts a synagogue that was converted into a mall, to the picture of a renovated Jewish cemetery in a small Polish village.[1]

The memory of the Holocaust becomes an American memory

In 1993, thanks to decades of hard work of the Council, the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) was opened. The memory of the Holocaust was to become an American memory from now on. And it was ordinary citizens who at the beginning of the Council's activities sent letters of protest: "[…] as a white, Catholic American do I feel guilty for the horrors of the slave trade or the *Spanish Inquisition*

[1] Based on the author's visit to the Galicia Jewish Museum in Kraków.

[…] I could support a public monument and museum to the atrocities committed in America against Native Americans and Blacks" (*Letter to President Ronald Reagan*, 1983). Maurice Halbwachs (1992) was the first to define collective memory as "impersonal remembrance in the interest of a group". Ordinary Americans did not understand the meaning of the Holocaust, nor did they understand the idea of commemorating it in America. It did not seem to be their memory.

From the beginning, too, the museum of the Holocaust in Washington, D.C., was intended to integrate commemoration with education (*Report on The Status of Holocaust Education…*). It had the support of the government, Jewish communities, academics, religious leaders, and survivors (*Report to the President…*). It had the best planners and consultants to respond to the demands placed on it. A great three-part narrative was created, work on which became possible after Wiesel's resignation from the position of chairman of the Council and thus resistance that the story of the Holocaust could not be told (Sodaro, 2018, pp. 16–17). Its author was Michael Barenbaum. It is a story that begins with the horrific accounts of American soldiers from liberated camps. They are supposed to raise the question in visitors: How could this happen? (*Exhibition Story Outline Presented to the Content Committee…*). Wiesel said that there was no answer (*Remarks of Elie Wiesel…*) but the Council found it. The answer lies in the subsequent exhibition boards, which educate about the politics of the Third Reich based on, among others, fear and pseudo-medicine. The third floor, the story of the Holocaust process, is, in a way, the core of the exhibition, but it would not make sense without an introduction to how it came about.

In the USHMM, viewers come into contact with artifacts from the places of the execution of Jews, which provoke fear and terror in them, and these emotions are intensified by discursive elements of space, i.e., winding corridors and twilight. It was this part of the exhibition that aroused some controversy at the beginning of the opening of the center. Philip Gourevitch, one of the most popular journalists in the USA, called the museum another American theme park. However, this was a misunderstanding of the idea of this construction of the exhibition, which took 15 years of efforts and works of leading intellectuals, Jewish communities, and planners, who certainly did not want to create a thematic park, but as Bernard-Donals, a researcher of the topic based on the content of the conversations of the members of the Council, stated, a rhetorical instrument, which offers to bring the past into contact with the future by forcing an ethical orientation in the present (Bernard-Donals, 2016, p. 3).

The Americanization of the Holocaust, thanks to the most renowned museum, resulted in the promotion of the number of 6 million Jews who perished in the Holocaust throughout the world. What is more, because the Holocaust Museum and Memorial stood in the National Mall in the capital of the democratic world, no one

could appropriate the Holocaust, nor deny, or blur it. From that moment on, the Holocaust was inscribed in the national heritage of the USA; it was supposed to correspond with the memory of the so-called farmer from the south and financier from the north. This took place from the bottom up, thanks to civil society, without the Ministry of Culture imposing a narrative framework. The government only made it possible to tell an impossible story, but it was the Commission on the Holocaust that stated why it should be commemorated in the U.S. The U.S. cultural system is very different from the Polish model, and the government does not play a direct role in it, so it is a free-market system. This system is created by private entrepreneurs, public benefit institutions and philanthropists. It is an excellent example of a civil society of culture, where industry promotes and distributes American culture around the world (Martel, 2008).

Education about the Holocaust in Poland

"On Zgody Square [now Ghetto Heroes Square in Kraków] an innumerable number of wardrobes, tables, sideboards and other furniture is deteriorating, moved for one time from place to place" (Pankiewicz, 2003). These words of a witness to the liquidation of the ghetto in Kraków were used by artists to create an unusual monument, i.e., from chairs. Chairs were erected on the Ghetto Heroes Square in 2005. They symbolize what Poland lost as a result of the Holocaust, i.e., 3 million Polish Jews. It seems that the issues related to the Holocaust in Poland are overworked, but there is still a lot to do, especially as Poland lost such a huge and rich legacy of cohabitation of two communities as a result of the Holocaust, and the memory about it is on a fledgling level.

In 2011, a study was conducted of young people aged 15–19. Its results show that 41% of them have not heard about Jedwabne. This is the result of not using this information in the public space after a heated debate that was supposed to change it. As a result, this information shifted to the periphery of memory and was not activated in the case of the study (Szuchta, 2008, p. 71). This event has not been inscribed in the school framework, and educators do not take up the subject, so the memory of Jedwabne may be blurred with the entry into the life of subsequent years of youth, states Szuchta (2008). Moreover, it is difficult for Poland to dissociate itself from the heroic imaginary, which is facilitated by conservative-nationalist circles and counter-museums to centers such as Auschwitz; it is about the Museum of Poles Saving Jews in the case of World War II named after the Ulma Family in Markowa (Markowa Ulma-Family Museum of Poles Who Saved Jews in World War II). This institution

in the face of findings that the attitudes of Poles towards the Holocaust were from a hostile active attitude, through passivity, to bona fide help and helping for material fluid (Kłoskowska, 1988, pp. 11–127), returns to heroic and martyrological visions known from the propaganda of the Polish People's Republic. This is happening in the face of program reforms of 2009, under which the teaching of humanities, including history and the Polish language, was changed in a particularly innovative way. In both subjects, there were issues related to the Holocaust and the cohabitation of the Jewish and Polish communities (Żurek, 2014, p. 19).

The power of the USHMM – the power to make politics moral

The educational mission of the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM) was to promote the message about the uniqueness and, at the same time, the universality of the Holocaust in the context of making politics moral. This was achieved not only by the impressive building itself within the exhibition and archival facilities, which were to serve as the national repository for educational resources, but everything through developing and providing 'distance learning' opportunities and a variety of recommendations for teachers such as avoiding simple statements to complex historical questions (*Educational Committee Meetings*). Today, national educational outreach programs are the responsibility of The William Levine Family National Institute for Holocaust Education. In turn, "advance research and scholarship about the Holocaust and relationships between American and foreign scholars ensuring the collection and accessibility of Holocaust-related archival materials" is provided by the Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies. The Center invites a number of scientists as part of annual competitions, who can use its Library and Archives, and the knowledge acquired by them results in many publications in the field of the Holocaust; thus, education within the museum acts as a snowball effect (*Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies*). Moreover, although the museum is not the only center in the U.S. that educates about the Holocaust (there is, for example, the famous Museum of Jewish Heritage in New York and many more), none, however, had any right to speak within the American state. The Holocaust Museum in Washington DC is the only federal institution that speaks for the entire United States, and certainly not for Israel, as it has sometimes been accused of doing (Linenthal, 2001, p. 3). The museum, through the Commission of Conscience, can also advise the United States Government, as the only museum center, in order to prevent any repetitions of history, and thus is able to influence the U.S. Government in the event of conflicts (Bernard-Donals, 2016, p. 99).

Conclusions

The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum is associated with American democratic traditions, but in a complex way. First of all, the story itself is alien to American life and it reinforces American identity by revealing what America is not. But, at the same time, the Holocaust is shown as tendencies found in every culture and individual, and the museum serves as an institution presenting the so-called lesson of the Holocaust (Novick, 2001, pp. 106–107). The museum talks more about American heritage than the Lincoln Memorial. Thanks to years of USHMM education, the memory of the Holocaust is inscribed in the national history of this country. This memory has become the basis for building and maintaining political structures that protect against a return to the wrongs of the past. The U.S. was also the first state after Israel to do so, being the leader of Holocaust education outside of Israel, and thanks to its economic and cultural power, it spread it around the world.

In Poland, conflicts over the restoration of the memory of the Holocaust have been averted, and the history of the Holocaust is no longer appropriated. This stage is already behind Poland in the 21st century. Another is to avert the resurgent national megalomania, which blocks the pluralism of memory in the name of its own interpretations of what is a national heritage and what is not. Auschwitz manages to achieve this pluralism of the discourse, and today Auschwitz is religious and atheistic, Jewish, Roma, Polish, and international. And it will be difficult to take away this heritage developed in a democratic state.

Bibliography

Archives

Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies, The USHMM Institutional Archives, accession no 2009.014, box 9.

Educational Committee Meetings 1990-1994, USHM Educational Programs, The USHMM Institutional Archives, accession no. 1998.005, box 2.

Exhibition Story Outline Presented to the Content Committee The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum May 11, 1988, The USHMM Institutional Archives, accession no. 1997-004.

Facing History and and Ourselves. Annual Report 2009, The USHMM Institutional Archives, no. 2009.014, box 8.

Letter to President Ronald Reagan, May 1983, by Richard P. Stevens, The USHMM Institutional Archives, accession, no. 1997-014.

Projekt ramowy Muzeum w Oświęcimiu dr. Heina, Zespół Materiały, tom 56, Archiwum Państwowego Muzeum Auschwitz-Birkenau (Eng. Archive of the Memorial and Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau).

A Proposal to Fund the Mandel Teacher Fellowship Program, The USHMM Institutional Archives, no. 1998.005, box 1.
Remarks of Elie Wiesel, Chairman, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council at the museum transfer ceremony, U. S. Capitol, April 13, 1983., based on the data provided by Jeffrey Carter, Former Management Officer & Institutional Archivist of the USHMM.
Report to the President. President's Commission on the Holocaust, September 1979, The USHMM Institutional Archives, accession no. 2001.165.
Report on The Status of Holocaust Education in the United States and Resources Available to the Elementary and Secondary School Teacher, USHMM Institutional Archives 1980-89, accession no. 2001.165.
Sprawozdanie z Działalności Muzeum za 1994, 1995, Zespół Materiały, tom 120c, Archiwum Państwowego, Muzeum Auschwitz-Birkenau (Eng. Archive of the Memorial and Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau).
Sprawozdanie z X-letniej działalności Muzeum w Oświęcimiu-Brzezince, Zespół Referaty, tom 4, *Sprawozdanie Kazimierza Smolenia*, 10.10.1956, Archiwum Państwowego Muzeum Auschwitz-Birkenau (Eng. Archive of the Memorial and Museum Auschwitz-Birkenau).
Wiesel, E., *Holocaust: beginning or end? Speech by Elie Wiesel at the Museum's annual Days of Remembrance Ceremony*, 1979, based on the data provided by Jeffrey Carter, former Management Officer & Institutional Archivist, USHMM.

Print sources

Arendt, H. (1951). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.
Bernard-Donals, M. (2016). *Figures of Memory: The Rhetoric of Displacement at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum*. Albany: Suny Press.
Cebulski, T. (2016). *Auschwitz po Auschwitz. Historia, polityka i pamięć wokół Państwowego Muzeum Auschwitz-Birkenau 1980–2010*. Kraków: Libron.
Choriew, W. (2000). *Ingerencja ZSRR w życie kulturalne Polski (1944–1953)*. "Napis. Pismo poświęcone literaturze okolicznościowej i użytkowej", 6, pp. 257–265.
Chwedoruk, R. (2018). *Polityka historyczna*. Warszawa: PWN.
Diner, H. (2009). *We Remember with Reverence and Love: American Jews and the Myth of Silence After the Holocaust, 1945–1962*. New York: NYU Press.
Fallace, T. D. (2008). *The emergence of Holocaust Education in American Schools*. New York: Palgrave Macmillian.
Halbwatch, M. (1992). *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Huener, J. (2003). *Auschwitz, Poland, and the politics of commemoration, 1945–1979*. Ohio: Ohio University Press.
Kłosowska, A. (1988). *Polacy wobec zagłady Żydów polskich. Próba typologii postaw*. "Kultura i Społeczeństwo", 4, pp. 111–127.
Konstytucja Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej z dnia 2 kwietnia 1997 r. (Dz.U. 2009 Nr 114, poz. 946 21.10.2009).
Kucia, M. (2005). *Auschwitz jako fakt społeczny*. Kraków: Universitas.
Lachendro, J. (2007). *Zburzyć i zaorać…? Idea założenia Państwowego Muzeum Auschwitz-Birkenau w świetle prasy polskiej w latach 1945–48*. Oświęcim: PMA-B.

Linenthal, E. (2001). *Preserving memory. The Struggle to Create America's Holocaust Museum*. New York: Columbia university Press.

Martel, F. (2008). *Cultural Policy of the United States*. Warszawa.

Mniejszości narodowe i etniczne. Żydzi. Serwis Rzeczypospolitej Polskiej. https://www.gov.pl/web/mniejszosci-narodowe-i-etniczne/zydzi (accessed: 8 January 2023).

Novick, P. (2001). *The Holocaust and Collective Memory. The American experience*. London: Bloomsbury.

Pankiewicz, T. (2003). *Apteka w getcie krakowskim*. Kraków.

Polityka kulturalna państwa – założenia. Wersja wstępna (1992). "Przegląd Powszechny. Miesięcznik poświęcony sprawom religijnym, kulturalnym i społecznym", 11 (855).

Rozporządzenie Rady Ministrów z dnia 26 października 1999 r. w sprawie utworzenia Ministerstwa Kultury i Dziedzictwa Narodowego (Dz.U. 1999 Nr 91, poz. 1014).

Sodaro, A. (2018). *Exhibiting Atrocity: Memorial Museums and the Politics of Past Violence*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Reughters University Press.

Szuchta, R. (2008). *Zagłada Żydów w edukacji szkolnej lat 1945–2000 na przykładzie analizy programów i podręczników szkolnych do nauczania historii*. [In:] *Auschwitz i Holokaust. Dylematy i wyzwania polskiej edukacji*, ed. P. Trojański. Oświęcim: PMA-B.

Układ o przyjaźni, pomocy wzajemnej i współpracy powojennej między Związkiem Socjalistycznych Republik Radzieckich i Rzecząpospolitą Polską (Dz.U. 1945 Nr 47, poz. 268).

Ustawa z dnia 2 lipca 1947 r. o upamiętnieniu męczeństwa Narodu Polskiego i innych Narodów w Oświęcimiu (Dz.U. 1947 Nr 52, poz. 265).

Young, J. E. (1993). *The Texture of memory*. New Haven–London: Yale UP.