

Anna Corsten

# A Different Perspective on Innovation in Holocaust Studies

## Abstract

When talking about the emergence of Holocaust studies as an academic field in the 1960s and 1970s, we often look at its development from a male perspective by focussing on the academic positions, honours, and the success of books. Thus, women are often excluded from this perspective since they chose different paths due to their career options and gender expectations at that time. Many female scholars therefore sought other possibilities to study the Holocaust, for example through teaching. In this article, I will look at the role played particularly by women but also male scholars through teaching Holocaust studies.

In the United States, Rita Steinhardt Botwinick is well-known for her textbooks about the Holocaust. The historian was born in 1923 in the town of Winzig (now Wińsko), which at that time belonged to the Prussian province of Lower Silesia but became a part of Poland in 1945. The Steinhardt family fled to the United States in 1939 because they were persecuted as Jews by the Nazis. After writing a dissertation in history about the National Socialist era, Steinhardt Botwinick did not embark on a career at the university level but instead taught at high school level. Her professional expertise as a teacher and as an expert on National Socialism, however, contributed to her later career in academia.

While the influence of certain scholars in the emergence of Holocaust Studies, particularly of émigré scholars, is currently being studied intensively,<sup>1</sup> the correlation between teaching and research has hardly been recognised. However, this connection offered an important possibility for participation in the institutionalisation of Holocaust studies, particularly for women. In this paper, I will therefore analyse how textbooks and the institutionalisation of high school and university courses contributed to the study of the Holocaust.

I am here particularly interested in the agency that female scholars obtained through teaching as well as their role in Holocaust studies. Consequently, I will focus on two examples: Rita Steinhardt Botwinick and Henry Friedlander. However, there

---

For their valuable comments on my research and this paper I would like to thank Breea Gould, Ronny Neidigk, and the anonymous reviewers.

1 René Schlott, Raul Hilberg (1926–2007). Eine jüdische Biografie im 20. Jahrhundert, in: Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook 16 (2019), 419–439; René Schlott, "Reflexionen". Ein frühes Übersetzungsfragment von Urs Müller-Plantenberg, in: René Schlott (ed.), Raul Hilberg und die Holocaust-Historiographie, Göttingen 2019, 223–228; René Schlott, Raul Hilberg and His "Discovery" of the Bystander, in: Christina Morina/Krijn Thijs (ed.), Probing the Limits of Categorization. The Bystander in Holocaust History, New York 2018, 36–51; Anna Corsten, Unerbetene Erinnerung? Emigrationshistoriker in den USA als Impulsgeber für die Aufarbeitung von Nationalsozialismus und Holocaust in der Bundesrepublik, in: Dominik Groß/Julia Nebe (ed.), Forschung zwischen Freiheit und Verantwortung. Die wissenschaftshistorische Perspektive, Kassel 2018, 199–232; Anna Corsten, "Immer wieder, wie ein Gespenst kommt sie zurück". Überlegungen zur Konfliktgeschichte von Hannah Arendt und Raul Hilberg, in: Schlott (ed.), Raul Hilberg und die Holocaust-Historiographie, 115–130; Anna Corsten, Unbequeme Pioniere. Emigrierte Historiker in der westdeutschen und US-amerikanischen NS- und Holocaust-Forschung, 1945–1998, Leipzig 2020, Dissertation.

are many different possibilities to shape Holocaust research other than teaching. Thus, I will also briefly hint at Lucy Dawidowicz and her contribution to Holocaust studies.

While an intellectual biography of Dawidowicz was recently written and published by Nancy Sinkoff,<sup>2</sup> there is only one article dealing with the work of Henry Friedlander, written by Doris Bergen,<sup>3</sup> and none dealing with Rita Steinhardt Botwinick. This paper relies on research conducted on the archival papers of Henry Friedlander, which can be found in the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), as well as research conducted for the dissertation *Unbequeme Pioniere* that I defended in July 2020. In addition, I conducted an interview in 2018 with Ronnie Laudner, the daughter of Rita Steinhardt Botwinick, who also provided material from her mother's papers. However, there are no archival papers pertaining to Steinhardt Botwinick so far. As a result, this paper is based on different types of sources and secondary materials.

### Rita Steinhardt Botwinick and the Career Opportunities for Women in Holocaust Studies

More than twenty years after she had left Germany as a young woman of sixteen years in 1939, Steinhardt Botwinick visited her hometown, Winzig, in her forties in order to participate in a get-together that the former minister of Winzig had planned for the former inhabitants of the town, most of whom had to leave after the town was declared to be part of Poland after the end of the Second World War in the Potsdam Agreement of August 1945. Steinhardt Botwinick, however, had already been persecuted before the Soviets arrived in Winzig.<sup>4</sup>

She was the youngest of four children. Her parents led a stock-breeding enterprise.<sup>5</sup> Like many members of her generation who fled to the United States, Steinhardt Botwinick wrote a memoir published in 2015 in which she recalled the memories of her youth. In retrospect, she described the street battles in the Weimar Republic, in which different political organisations fought for or against the government in place. According to Steinhardt Botwinick, many people in Winzig “yearned for the defunct monarchy”.<sup>6</sup> Hitler's rise to power in 1933 and the regime change that followed impacted the daily life of the Steinhardt family almost immediately. Starting in April 1933, SA troops watched the Steinhardt's house. Neighbours who wanted to visit the family were threatened with violence and soon avoided the house.<sup>7</sup> In so doing, the SA expelled the Steinhardt's from the community of the town. After the Nuremberg Laws came into force in 1935, the parents sent Rita Steinhardt (later Botwinick) and her youngest brother Friedel to Breslau (now Wrocław) since there was a bigger Jewish community there. Her older brother Dicker had followed a Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (HIAS) group to the Netherlands that was planning to leave

2 Nancy Sinkoff, *From Left to Right. Lucy S. Dawidowicz, the New York Intellectuals, and the Politics of Jewish History*, Detroit 2020.

3 Doris L. Bergen, *Out of the Limelight or In*. Raul Hilberg, Gerhard Weinberg, Henry Friedlander, and the Historical Study of the Holocaust, in: Andreas Daum/Hartmut Lehmann/James Sheehan (ed.), *The Second Generation. Emigrés from Nazi Germany as Historians*, New York 2016, 229-243.

4 Rita Steinhardt Botwinick, *Gratefully Yours, From Nazi Untermensch to a Patch in the Rose Garden. A Historic Memoir*, Amherst, NY 2015, 150-152.

5 *Ibid.*, 20-21.

6 *Ibid.*, 9.

7 *Ibid.*, 29-31.

for Palestine. When Germany invaded the Netherlands, he became part of the underground resistance.<sup>8</sup> Walter, the oldest brother, had received a student visa to the United Kingdom. After being declared an enemy alien during the course of the war, the UK sent him to Australia, where he was confined in Camp Hay but later allowed to return to the UK. All the siblings survived.

By 1938, Steinhardt Botwinick's parents had started to prepare to emigrate to the United States. In her memoirs, she emphasised the traumatic shock of the November Pogroms, during which her father was able to escape deportation only by accident. She suppressed the memory over many subsequent decades. On 9 November, her mother had taken Rita and her brother home from Breslau since she feared for their lives. In 1939, the parents and both younger children fled to the United States via the Netherlands. They settled in New York City.<sup>9</sup> Steinhardt Botwinick and her brother desperately wanted to fit in during the first few months in their new country, particularly after their experience in Nazi Germany. They even planned to convert to Christianity, but never did.<sup>10</sup> The family had relatives in New York and could stay with them until they settled. Steinhardt Botwinick went to school in Orange County, New York, where she experienced the support of the headmaster, teachers, and students, which helped her to graduate when she was eighteen years old.<sup>11</sup>

Steinhardt Botwinick planned to study journalism and history after finishing school. "The power of words had attracted me since I learned to read. History was a natural adjunct, an outgrowth of the Nazi years, of the war."<sup>12</sup> Like many émigré scholars, she perceived her biographical experience as having influenced her decision to study history. Thus, she enrolled at the University of South Carolina in Columbia, where she completed her bachelor's degree. She decided to go to South Carolina for two reasons: First, the university library had offered her a job and a stipend which allowed her to pay her tuition and other costs. Second, she was infatuated with her high school biology teacher, who had studied at the University of South Carolina.<sup>13</sup> When her professor encouraged her to proceed with a master's programme, she applied to different universities that were closer to New York City. At Columbia University, she was met with a refusal because the quota for Jewish students had already been filled.<sup>14</sup> Many US universities, particularly the Ivy League schools, applied quotas for Jewish students until the 1960s.<sup>15</sup> Other well-known émigré scholars, like George L. Mosse, were denied because of the same quota. Mosse, a pioneer of the study of fascism, was also not accepted at Columbia University due to the quota. Mosse went on to do his PhD at Harvard University. For Rita Steinhardt Botwinick, this was the first time that she encountered antisemitism openly in the United States, as she recalled in her memoirs. In Passaic, New Jersey, she started working at a small newspaper but soon decided to proceed with her master's at Brooklyn College. In the early postwar years, Steinhardt Botwinick received American citizenship.<sup>16</sup> She taught at a high school after raising her children and simultaneously wrote her dissertation on the history of Winzig between 1933 and 1946 at St.

8 Ibid, 45-46.

9 Ibid, 75-86.

10 Ibid, 91-93.

11 Ibid, 105-108.

12 Ibid, 110.

13 Ibid, 106.

14 Ibid, 136-137.

15 Jost Hermand, *Deutsche Juden jenseits des Judentums. Der Fall Gerhard/Israel/Georg L. Mosse*, in: *Jahrbuch für Antisemitismusforschung* 3 (1994), 178-193, here 183.

16 Botwinick, *Gratefully Yours*, 137-139.

John's University in Queens. Primarily due to the typical gender role allocation of the 1950s and 1960s, Steinhardt Botwinick's career was postponed, although she emphasised that her husband was emancipated and supported her finishing her PhD.<sup>17</sup> The historian received her doctoral degree in 1973. Until 1979, she taught psychology and social sciences at Herricks High School in Roslyn, New York.

In her dissertation, Steinhardt Botwinick studied a topic that was personally close to her. In her memoirs, she recalled that she had intended to write a history of Winzig for some time. One of her professors encouraged her to do so. Although Steinhardt Botwinick did not directly reflect on her decision to study a crucial part of her own life, it becomes obvious that her biographical experience drove her to do so. This can be seen in certain passages of her dissertation. In her book, *Winzig, Germany, 1933–1946*, Steinhardt Botwinick included her own memories about her life in the town, which was atypical for émigré scholars. Other Holocaust researchers like Raul Hilberg, Gerhard Weinberg, and Henry Friedlander, the latter of whom had survived several concentration camps and emigrated to the United States in 1947, did not include their experiences in Germany and Austria in their scholarly work. Hilberg even tried to hide his émigré background by emphasising that he had fought in the US Army during the Second World War in the biographical note to his opus magnum *The Destruction of the European Jews*, which was published in 1961, since he feared that his background could be seen as a limitation to his objectivity.<sup>18</sup> Steinhardt Botwinick, however, explained that her main motive to write her dissertation could be found in the “personal relationship of the author to the town”.<sup>19</sup>

Steinhardt Botwinick analysed sources from the city of Winzig, interviewed former residents, and incorporated her own memories, particularly when describing antisemitism in town.<sup>20</sup> She applied a “worms-eye view” in order to understand the behaviour of “ordinary” people.<sup>21</sup> Her aim was to explain why so many Germans suggested during the immediate postwar years that they had not been able to fight National Socialism. To do so, Steinhardt Botwinick told the story of Winzig in a chronological way, starting in the nineteenth century and then focussing on the time period from 1933 until 1946. Collaboration with the Nazis, the majority's passivity, and antisemitism were her main topics of interest. Winzig, a part of Silesia, belonged to Prussia. The majority, about 85 per cent, of the population was Protestant and held conservative views. Only about 15 per cent were Catholic and less than one per cent were Jewish.<sup>22</sup> Only five to ten per cent of Winzig's population had received a high school diploma. A handful of people went to university. Steinhardt Botwinick regarded the revolution of 1918, when the monarchy fell, as a caesura in the town's history, since most Winzigers had favoured the monarchy over democracy.<sup>23</sup> Nevertheless, the residents of Winzig were by no means convinced supporters of the NSDAP, as Steinhardt Botwinick emphasised. Instead, they were unable to resist the violent threat of the SA. After 1933, they remained “uncommitted to the Third Reich. They protected themselves with silence and conformity.”<sup>24</sup> However, the majority of the population welcomed the regime change in 1933 since it brought economic

17 Ibid, 138-140.

18 Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, Chicago 1961.

19 Rita Steinhardt Botwinick, *Winzig, Germany, 1933–1946. The History of a Town under the Third Reich*, New York 1992, 2.

20 Ibid, 43-45 and 70-76.

21 Ibid, 2.

22 Ibid, 42.

23 Ibid, 23-25.

24 Ibid, 64.

growth.<sup>25</sup> Only three people, all of whom had been unsuccessful in their lives thus far and had supported the NSDAP since 1930, were responsible for the antisemitic violence that followed, according to Steinhardt Botwinick.

Here, Steinhardt Botwinick analysed the support for the National Socialist regime in ways that had prevailed for the first two decades after the end of the Second World War. German historians in particular were convinced that only a small minority of Germans had given allegiance to National Socialism.<sup>26</sup> However, in the 1970s, when Steinhardt Botwinick wrote her thesis, different interpretations had become important. Studies by other émigré historians like George L. Mosse emphasised the role of ideology in the Nazi system – as Steinhardt Botwinick was to do in her later books as well. Mosse argued that a decisive part of German citizens had enthusiastically welcomed and followed Nazism.<sup>27</sup> Thus, Steinhardt Botwinick's interpretation was outside the main current of scholarship in the United States in the early 1970s. Historians like Mosse and Fritz Stern had argued that Nazi ideology and antisemitism had prevailed in large parts of the German population.<sup>28</sup>

Nevertheless, by writing the history of National Socialism from a micro-perspective, Steinhardt Botwinick applied an approach that was prominent among émigré historians of her generation but not too successful, especially not in Germany.<sup>29</sup> Her history of everyday life in Winzig from 1933 to 1946 was not translated into German. In addition, the scholar's approach differed from those of Holocaust researchers like Henry Friedlander, Raul Hilberg, and Gerhard Weinberg, who had studied the bureaucracy that held the Nazi system together.<sup>30</sup> In the United States, her work was disregarded as well. It was only published in 1992, twenty years after she received her PhD, by Praeger Publishers, an educational and academic publishing house which also produces textbooks for middle school through to university level. Winzig seemed to have been too insignificant for the study of National Socialism and did not provide new insights into the system of the dictatorship.

The fact that Steinhardt Botwinick depicted most Winzigers as bystanders, whereas she later (like Mosse and Stern) perceived many Germans as having been convinced of Nazi ideology, is difficult to explain. One reason might be found in her personal connection to her hometown. Having experienced former friends excluding her and insulting her at school, she was convinced that they did not act out of persuasion for Nazi ideology but because of fear. This belief was confirmed when her former best friend apologised to her when she visited a reunion of former Winzigers in Germany in 1966.<sup>31</sup> Ultimately, Steinhardt Botwinick had written a book about friends and neighbours, people she knew, not about anonymous Germans.

Although Steinhardt Botwinick focussed on the Nazi era, she also described its consequences until 1946. Soviet troops had occupied Winzig. It was later given to

25 Ibid, 3.

26 Nicolas Berg, *The Holocaust and the West German Historians. Historical Interpretation and Autobiographical Memory*, Wisconsin 2015.

27 George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology. Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich*, New York 1964; George L. Mosse, *Masses and Man. Nationalist and Fascist Perceptions of Reality*, Detroit 1987; George L. Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality. Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe*, New York 1984; George L. Mosse, *Nazi Culture. Intellectual, Cultural and Social Life in the Third Reich*, Madison 2003.

28 Fritz Stern, *The Politics of Cultural Despair. A Study in the Rise of the Germanic Ideology*, Berkeley 2002.

29 Henry R. Huttenbach, *The Destruction of the Jewish Community of Worms, 1933–1945. A Study of the Holocaust Experience in Germany*, New York 1981; Corsten, *Unbequeme Pioniere*.

30 Henry Friedlander, *The Origins of Nazi Genocide. From Euthanasia to the Final Solution*, Chapel Hill 1995; Raul Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, New Haven 2003; Gerhard L. Weinberg, *A World at Arms. A Global History of World War II*, Cambridge/New York 2005.

31 Steinhardt Botwinick, *Gratefully Yours*, 150-154.

Poland. The Polish local authorities then expelled the citizens who had stayed. "Winzig remains only as a memory, a memory that will grow fainter with the passage of time", Steinhardt Botwinick concluded.<sup>32</sup> She concluded that "justice was badly served" when the last people of Winzig left the town.<sup>33</sup> In her first book, she had not emphasised the Holocaust, which was typical for many historians studying National Socialism in the first decades after the end of World War II. Scholars like Friedlander and Mosse had also written their dissertations about other topics and only later shifted their focus.<sup>34</sup>

The weak academic response to her work and its late translation might have been a result of the outdated interpretations she had presented. Steinhardt Botwinick remained a high school teacher for several years. She received her first academic position as professor of history in the History Department at Sacred Heart University in Fairfield, Connecticut in 1981, where she taught Western civilization and a survey of American history as well as Holocaust history. While the process of institutionalisation of Holocaust studies was still in its beginnings, it advanced in the 1980s. Sacred Heart University was one of the institutions starting to offer courses on the Holocaust at an early stage. In 1987, Steinhardt Botwinick went to Florida Atlantic University (FAU), again as a professor of history, but now focussing on European and Holocaust history. FAU had a reputation for being a pioneer in offering courses on the Holocaust. For Steinhardt Botwinick, the possibility of an academic career opened when interest in the Holocaust advanced in public. However, there was no general need for scholars teaching the Holocaust yet. Nevertheless, interest in German and European history was higher and Steinhardt Botwinick was able to teach about German history, particularly the period of National Socialism.<sup>35</sup> Not many academics were experts in National Socialism with experience teaching in this field. Steinhardt Botwinick combined both expertise in teaching and in the time period that concerned the Holocaust.

In this regard, gender stereotypes of the 1970s also played a role for Steinhardt Botwinick's possibilities in the academic job market. Working as a scholar at universities, particularly in the field of Holocaust studies, was rare during that time. In becoming a high school teacher, Steinhardt Botwinick had chosen a path in which women were able to pursue a career. Holocaust studies at universities was male-dominated during its initial years. A reason for this can be found in the attitude of many prominent male scholars, like Raul Hilberg, who feared that women would damage the reputation of the young discipline.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, the principle that the history of National Socialism should be written in an objective manner without taking into consideration personal experiences contributed to the lack of attention towards her dissertation. In addition, she needed a job in which she could work during the morning and could take care of her children in the afternoon. Building a career in academia was not common for women who were seen as responsible for childcare and moreover often discredited by their male colleagues.<sup>37</sup>

32 Steinhardt Botwinick, *Winzig*, 133.

33 *Ibid.*

34 Henry Friedlander, *The German Revolution of 1918*, New York 1992; George L. Mosse, *The Struggle for Sovereignty in England. From the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to the Petition of Right*, New York 1968.

35 Catherine Epstein, *German Historians at the Back of the Pack. Hiring Patterns in Modern European History*, in: *Central European History* 46 (2013) 3, 599-639.

36 Doris L. Bergen, "Viele bleibt ungesagt". *Frauen in Leben und Werk Raul Hilbergs*, in: Schlott (ed.), *Raul Hilberg und die Holocaust-Historiographie*, 143-160; Corsten, "Immer wieder, wie ein Gespenst kommt sie zurück".

37 *Ibid.*

For Steinhardt Botwinick, changing to a university did not only provide her with an opportunity to teach the Holocaust but also to write about this genocide. One reason for this was that her children had become young adults and did not need as much care as before. Furthermore, while working at different educational institutions, she had witnessed the need for curricula and textbooks focussing on the Holocaust. Only a few other scholars had been active in this field as well. One of them was the survivor and émigré scholar Henry Friedlander.

### **The Holocaust in Academic Teaching: Rita Steinhardt Botwinick and Henry Friedlander**

The possibilities for researching the Holocaust grew during the process of institutionalisation of Holocaust studies. This process, in turn, benefitted from emerging teaching opportunities at high schools, colleges, and universities. In 1973, the survivor Henry Friedlander, who had been born in Berlin in 1930, attempted to establish a seminar on teaching the Holocaust in which important scholars would be able to discuss questions and problems in teaching the topic. Many renowned scholars like Peter Gay and Fritz Stern, both émigré historians from Germany working at Columbia University, declined to participate in this project.<sup>38</sup> This shows the reservation of many academics in putting efforts into this field since it did not belong to the canon of history writing at that time. Courses on the Holocaust were hardly taught at an academic level in the 1970s. The field of Holocaust studies was not institutionalised then as it is today. Chairs, research facilities, and academic journals had not yet been established.

Nevertheless, Friedlander continued discussing the question of how to teach the Holocaust with other scholars from different countries like Israel, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, Canada, Poland, and Austria at a conference held in Jerusalem in 1988. No scholars from Germany participated since the Holocaust was only taught rarely and in a limited way at German schools and universities at that time.<sup>39</sup> Friedlander criticised: “When talking about the unthinkable, reports use clichés. [...] Those who are sincere, must often become sensationalist when describing unbelievable accounts like the deportation of the children from Drancy.”<sup>40</sup> According to Friedlander, the Holocaust needed to be addressed in a sober manner which was supposed to be implemented in the teaching. For him, the role of a historian and the role of a teacher were intertwined. In this regard, the history teacher was able to influence the relation a student had to history. As a survivor, the meaning of history had changed dramatically in his life. He attempted to pass on the relevance of this history to his students.

“As a child, in a school where the teaching of general history was prohibited, I learned the history of Ancient Israel. It provided simple, uncomplicated, and reassuring answers. In 1941 reality intruded. When it was all over, in a

38 United States Holocaust Memorial Museum (USHMM), Friedlander/Milton Papers, Acc. No. 2011.138, Concept of the seminar, Box 105/Folder “Touro 1973”. Rejections were written by Peter Gay to Henry Friedlander on 27 March 1973, from Fritz Stern to Henry Friedlander on 25 October 1973, from Herbert Strauss to Henry Friedlander on 5 February 1997, and from Hannah Arendt to Henry Friedlander on 19 March 1973.

39 USHMM, Friedlander/Milton Papers, Acc. No. 2011.138, Workshop on Teaching of Jewish Civilization, International Center for University Teaching of Jewish Civilization, 18.–27.7.1988, Box 99/Folder “Jerusalem Conference”.

40 USHMM, Friedlander/Milton Papers, Acc. No. 2011.138, Manuscript “Yom Hashoah”, Box 106/Folder “Jewish History Lectures”.

Munich D.P. Camp in 1946, I returned to study history and I am still doing it. There were no longer simple answers; they died in the holocaust. But history has meaning for me. It has made it possible for me to accept an irrational and destructive world. Though history might speak differently to each generation, as a teacher I can only hope that some students will find meaning in the past. After all, I do not make history. I only talk about it.<sup>41</sup>

According to Friedlander, the task of the historian did not consist in preventing crises, wars, or genocides in the future. “The historian is not a peacemaker”, he concluded.<sup>42</sup> Instead, he stated that “if scholarship has any social value – and after the triumph of Nazism in one of the most educated nations I often doubt that it does – it is its commitment to a humane and disinterested search for the truth.”<sup>43</sup> Friedlander also linked his biography to his decision to study and later teach history. After primarily focussing on the question of how to establish a curriculum to teach the Holocaust at high schools and universities he began researching the Holocaust itself. As a result of this early involvement, his commitment became important in the process of institutionalisation in general. The historian was instrumental in organising the first conferences dealing with the Holocaust in the context of the Nazi regime and the Second World War and as a result of both Nazi ideology and bureaucratic machinery. These conferences took place in San José in 1978 and 1979.<sup>44</sup> In addition, Friedlander contributed to the first journal on Holocaust studies in the United States, the Simon Wiesenthal Annual. Friedlander was also engaged in debates on what textbooks on the Holocaust were supposed to address and what curricula at high schools and universities should look like.

Like Friedlander, the prominent scholar Raul Hilberg attempted to introduce courses on the Holocaust and “Contemporary Jewish History” since the 1960s.<sup>45</sup> The committee responsible for approving new courses at the University of Vermont (UVM) initially declined Hilberg’s application. This shows that establishing courses on the Holocaust was a protracted process not only in the Department of History but also as part of Jewish history courses. Thus, Hilberg himself remained in the Department of Political Science at UVM, where he felt that the study of the Holocaust needed to be placed at that time. His chair was only moved to the Department of History after his retirement in 1991.

Nevertheless, study programmes, teaching courses, and professorships were set up in order to teach the Holocaust at different academic levels from the 1970s on. For that reason, textbooks were written as instruction materials for teaching. At colleges and universities in the United States, in contrast to German-speaking institutions, these books are of paramount importance in academia. For example, the book *The Nazi Seizure of Power* written in 1965 by William Sheridan Allen, a professor at the State University of New York in Buffalo, remains a prominent book among students and professors five decades after it was first published.<sup>46</sup>

41 USHMM, Friedlander/Milton Papers, Acc. No. 2011.138, Folder “Mo. Conference on History” 1970, Missouri Conference on History, St. Louis, May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 1970, Comments on the Panel “Teaching History in an Age of Crisis” by Henry Friedlander.

42 Ibid.

43 Ibid.

44 Henry Friedlander/Sybil Milton (ed.), *The Holocaust. Ideology, Bureaucracy, and Genocide*. The San José Papers, Millwood 1982; Magnus Brechtken, Raul Hilberg, der Begriff Holocaust und die Konferenzen von San José bis Stuttgart, in: Schlott (eds.), *Raul Hilberg und die Holocaust-Historiographie*, 47-70.

45 University of Vermont (UVM), Burlington, Special Collections, Raul Hilberg Papers (RHP), Hilberg to Chairman Wolfe Schmokel, 17. 10. 1969, B 18/ F 9.

46 William Sheridan Allen, *The Nazi Seizure of Power*, Chicago 1965.

Rita Steinhardt Botwinick also wrote essential textbooks about the Holocaust. In 1996, her book *A History of the Holocaust* appeared as her first monograph after her dissertation.<sup>47</sup> In 2014, the publishing house Pearson Education published this book's fifth edition. In her introduction, Steinhardt Botwinick specified the aim of her book: "to offer students a readable, factual history of the Holocaust."<sup>48</sup> Throughout her life, she had kept asking the question why the Holocaust had to happen, but was never able to answer it. Thus, she perceived it as absolutely necessary to keep teaching the Holocaust in order to educate students who would do research about this in the future and who might be able to find answers to the question of why the Holocaust happened.

"My generation has provided the facts; the work is nearly completed. You, the next generation, will have to meet the next challenge: to find the ways and the means to prevent fanatical peddlers of hatred from finding buyers. Use your new technology to warn people around the globe that those who murder the innocent and those who stand by and avert their eyes will be held accountable. 'Never Again' must become your promise, your goal no matter where or who the victims may be."<sup>49</sup>

In this request, Steinhardt Botwinick went further than Friedlander. Her goal was not only to analyse the facts but particularly for the younger generation to prevent the past from happening again. In this sense, her students were supposed to become activists and transport the notion of 'never again' to their contemporaries. Friedlander, on the other hand, had emphasised that historians were not peacemakers. Here, we can see how different Holocaust scholars perceived their tasks as historians. Interestingly, Steinhardt Botwinick also believed that the fact-based study of the Holocaust had nearly come to an end in her generation. This is remarkable, since many archives in Eastern Europe only opened after the end of the Cold War. Raul Hilberg, for example, estimated in 2006 that we only knew twenty per cent about the Holocaust.<sup>50</sup> Unfortunately, there was no material available on why Steinhardt Botwinick came to this conclusion.

The availability of Soviet archival sources as well as the proliferation of Holocaust museums in the 1990s not only provided Steinhardt Botwinick with a possibility to enter academia but also other women. For example, Sybil Milton, born in New York City in 1941, became the head of the research facility at the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. She connected her scholarly interests, for example in the faith of Sinti and Roma, with the question of how Nazi crimes should be displayed in exhibits. In this context, Milton worked closely with her husband Henry Friedlander.

In her textbook, Steinhardt Botwinick emphasised the ideological reasons leading to the Holocaust more strongly than she had done in her PhD. In her textbook, she did not only outline facts about the Holocaust but also described what daily life in the Nazi dictatorship had looked like. In addition, she addressed the question of what importance leading Nazis like Heinrich Himmler or Joseph Goebbels had played in the regime. However, she did not only look at the perspective of the perpetrators but also that of the victims by asking why many Jews did not decide to emigrate in time. Steinhardt Botwinick hardly contributed new facts to the study of the Holocaust, but she did collect the available knowledge and made it accessible to her

47 Rita Steinhardt Botwinick, *A History of the Holocaust. From Ideology to Annihilation*, Upper Saddle River/London 1996.

48 Ibid, xiii.

49 Ibid, xviii.

50 Hans Rauscher, Holocaust: "Wir wissen erst 20%", in: *Der Standard*, 1 September 2006, available online: <http://derstandard.at/2475608/Holocaust-Wir-wissen-erst-20-Prozent> (14 March 2021).

students. Various studies of the teaching of the Holocaust have pointed to the relevance of Steinhardt Botwinick's work. In a quantitative analysis of which books were most widely read in courses on the Holocaust, Steinhardt Botwinick's *A History of the Holocaust* was ranked among the first five textbooks in 2009 alongside famous scholars like Christopher Browning, Doris Bergen, and Yehuda Bauer.<sup>51</sup>

In 1998, Steinhardt Botwinick published a book in which she had collected sources from the time of National Socialism and the Holocaust, called *A Holocaust Reader*.<sup>52</sup> American teachers and professors judged it to be a highly important contribution to courses.<sup>53</sup> The *Holocaust Reader* complemented Steinhardt Botwinick's first textbook by adopting the same structure and by presenting ideology as a main factor behind the genocide. Many émigré historians compiled source books since they were seen as a way to study the Holocaust and the Nazi era, which did not get enough attention in academia. As a major goal of her courses on the Holocaust, Steinhardt Botwinick emphasised that "we will confront the facts without reservations. [...] We will seek the truth and not dilute its realities with platitudes."<sup>54</sup> In this position, she showed similarities to other Holocaust scholars such as Henry Friedlander, Raul Hilberg, and Gerhard Weinberg, who had declared the unrestricted search for truth to be the major goal of their research.<sup>55</sup> By sticking to the facts and the sources presented to them, these scholars advocated a narrow form of empiricism. In contrast to Friedlander, Hilberg, and Weinberg, Steinhardt Botwinick particularly addressed students as her audience. This was also the target audience for her last book, *Up Close and Personal*, which was published in 2007 and contained portraits of historical figures whose perspectives Steinhardt Botwinick tried to reconstruct.<sup>56</sup> As we have seen, she also framed a certain activism in connection to the task of the Holocaust scholar which we can also see in the example of Raul Hilberg, who hoped that studying the Holocaust could prevent genocide and mass murder. After the genocide in Rwanda in 1994, Hilberg concluded: "History has repeated itself."<sup>57</sup>

While renowned at American universities, Steinhardt Botwinick's books are unknown in Germany and hard to find in libraries or bookstores. None of her works were translated into German, something Steinhardt Botwinick had not attempted to accomplish either. At the same time, textbooks do not have the same relevance in the German university system as in the United States, which might be a reason for her anonymity in the former.

### **The Role of Women in Holocaust Studies: Lucy Dawidowicz and Rita Steinhardt Botwinick**

The example of Rita Steinhardt Botwinick illustrates two aspects about the role of women in early Holocaust studies. First, it demonstrates the precarious position of women in the area of Holocaust research during the 1960s and 1970s. At a time when there was little interest in the Holocaust, it was particularly hard for women to find a

51 Lawrence Baron, What Do Americans Read When Reading about the Holocaust, in: Steven L. Jacobs (ed.), *Maven in Blue Jeans. A Festschrift in Honor of Zev Garber*, West Lafayette 2009, 250.

52 Rita Steinhardt Botwinick (ed.), *A Holocaust Reader. From Ideology to Annihilation*, London 1998.

53 Samuel Totten/Robert Hines, Using Primary Documents in a Study of the Holocaust, in: Samuel Totten/Stephen Feinberg (ed.), *Teaching and Studying the Holocaust*, Needham Heights 2009, 81-106, here 101.

54 Steinhardt Botwinick (ed.), *A Holocaust Reader*, xi.

55 Corsten, *Unbequeme Pioniere*, 259-264.

56 Rita Steinhardt Botwinick, *Up Close and Personal. Portraits from Socrates to Hitler*, Youngstown, NY 2006.

57 Hilberg, *The Destruction of the European Jews*, 1296.

place in this academic field. Steinhardt Botwinick received a position at a university when courses on the Holocaust were beginning to be implemented at an academic level. In this situation, she belonged to the few scholars who were able to offer both academic expertise on the topic and teaching experience in the field. Thus, the University of Miami relied on her in order to offer a variety of courses on the Holocaust. Second, this constellation points at the different fields of activity that were attributed to women and men. While a career as a high school teacher was open to Steinhardt Botwinick due also to her responsibility for childcare, a career in academia was not. Thus, women looked for other ways in which they could contribute to studying and informing the public about the Holocaust. This was emphasised in an exhibition on the first Holocaust researchers created by Touro College and the Gedenkstätte Haus der Wannsee-Konferenz.

“A glance at the majority of publications on the Holocaust gives one the impression that mainly men documented and researched the subject. Additionally, the existing structures and networks are also linked to the names of male founding members: The Wiener Library in London, the Jewish Historical Institute in Warsaw, named after Emanuel Ringelblum and the [Vienna] Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies. However, there were female researchers in all of the commissions and institutions that gathered documents, recorded survivors’ reports, and published their findings. These female researchers were driven by the same motivations and beliefs as their male co-workers, and they worked side-by-side. [...] Female workers seldomly reached leadership positions. Thus, public perception to this day focuses on male directors and leaders.”<sup>58</sup>

Nora Huberty, who contributed to the exhibition, hints at an important fact: By looking at scholars only by measuring their achievements, the success of their academic contributions, or the prestigious positions they held, we have excluded women and their significance for Holocaust research since the end of the Second World War. Women, as the example of Steinhardt Botwinick also shows, acted from positions that were less visible than those of their male colleagues. Thus, we need to broaden our perspective on the emergence of Holocaust research by also considering the impact of teaching and research assistants who often worked for male colleagues.

Steinhardt Botwinick’s example illustrates that women became active in different areas than men, which does not mean that these areas are less important or less meaningful. However, they have not been studied in great detail. Through the example of the prominent Holocaust researcher Raul Hilberg, Doris Bergen demonstrated that men were often critical of their female colleagues. Since female historians were in many cases not educated as historians or political scientists or had not worked in academia, male scholars regarded them as amateurs who would harm the reputation of Holocaust research in general.<sup>59</sup> However, men writing about the Holocaust without an education in history were also stigmatised, as the example of Joseph Wulf shows. Wulf was trained as rabbi but did not hold a PhD in history and was thus denounced as an amateur by West German historians who wanted to discredit his works on the Holocaust.<sup>60</sup> In this example, discrediting Wulf was a way to exclude his interpretations from the German discourse.

58 Nora Huberty, *Forgotten Female Researchers*, in: Hans-Christian Jasch/Stephan Lehnstaedt (ed.), *Crimes Uncovered. The First Generation of Holocaust Researchers*, Berlin 2019, 176-178.

59 Bergen, “Vieles bleibt ungesagt”.

60 Rorbert Frei, *Auschwitz und Holocaust. Begriff und Historiographie*, in: Hanno Loewy (ed.), *Holocaust: Die Grenzen Des Verstehens. Eine Debatte über die Besetzung der Geschichte*, Reinbek 1992, 101-109, here 103.

In addition, male scholars like Hilberg feared the competition that the works of the few female scholars meant for them. For example, Hannah Arendt's *Eichmann in Jerusalem* received broad public attention.<sup>61</sup> Lucy Dawidowicz was – in contrast to Hilberg – praised by Jewish agencies in the late 1970s for including the victim's perspective in her *The War Against the Jews*.<sup>62</sup> As a result, Raul Hilberg felt threatened in his eminent role as a pioneer of Holocaust studies.<sup>63</sup> Moreover, Dawidowicz had chosen another interpretation of the Holocaust which he vehemently opposed since he used perpetrator sources in all of his books.

During the war, Dawidowicz wrote in Yiddish about the faith of Eastern European Jewry, a topic about which she was highly aware since she still stayed in contact with friends in Poland. Dawidowicz was born in New York City in 1915. Her family had emigrated from Eastern Europe. After studying English and Jewish history at Hunter College and Columbia University, she decided to go to Poland in light of the events taking place in Europe in 1938 and 1939. She learned Yiddish and worked at the YIVO Institute in Vilnius. Thus, her perspective was different from many American Holocaust researchers who, like Hilberg, had fled from Germany and Austria but had not encountered the situation in Eastern Europe. By translating reports of the victims into English after the war, Dawidowicz laid the foundation for her work as a historian later. In addition, she became active in recovering the cultural possessions of YIVO for the organisation Jewish Culture Reconstruction.<sup>64</sup> Together with Hannah Arendt, she belonged to the major participants recovering Jewish cultural assets and distributing them to Jewish communities all over the world. This example illustrates the early commitment and activism of women in looking for assets stolen during the war. Through this work, they also learned about the looting conducted by Nazis and collaborators during the Second World War. They thus became active and participated in the formation of areas that had not been established before.

Dawidowicz was involved in an important network of Jewish scholars, wrote books about the Holocaust, and received various awards for these books.<sup>65</sup> She wrote *The War Against the Jews* in reaction to the scarce literature on the Holocaust, including on the perspective of the victims. When she began teaching at Yeshiva University in 1969, she became aware of this problem through teaching. She therefore started working on her book. At the same time, she was very active in commenting on other studies written by scholars on the Holocaust, especially in the journal *Commentary*.<sup>66</sup> Interestingly, Dawidowicz came to write *The War Against the Jews* when she discovered the necessity for such a book via teaching, as did Rita Steinhardt Botwinick with her textbooks. In addition, she analysed how the Holocaust was taught at secondary schools and discovered that when talking about National Socialism, the mass murder was not at the centre of the instruction.<sup>67</sup> She intended to change this. Dawidowicz was highly respected among her colleagues. Even Raul Hilberg discussed crucial matters with her at first.

61 Hannah Arendt, *Eichmann in Jerusalem. A Report on the Banality of Evil*, New York 1963.

62 Lucy S. Dawidowicz, *The War against the Jews, 1933–1945*, New York 1975.

63 Corsten, "Immer wieder, wie ein Gespenst kommt sie zurück"; Raul Hilberg, *The Politics of Memory. The Journey of a Holocaust Historian*, Chicago 1996, 148–156; Sinkoff, *From Left to Right*.

64 Elisabeth Gallas, *A Mortuary of Books. The Rescue of Jewish Culture after the Holocaust*, New York 2019, 239–241; Lucy S. Dawidowicz, *From that Place and Time. A Memoir, 1938–1947*, New York 1989.

65 Dawidowicz, *The War against the Jews*.

66 See for example: Lucy S. Dawidowicz on Karl Dietrich Bracher, *The German Dictatorship and Gerhard L. Weinberg. Hitler's Foreign Policy*, in: *Commentary* 52 (August 1971) 2; Lucy S. Dawidowicz/Neal Kozody (ed.), *What Is the Use of Jewish History?*, New York 1992.

67 Lucy S. Dawidowicz, *How To Teach the Holocaust*, in: *Commentary* 90 (1990) 6, 25–32.

Raul Hilberg and Lucy Dawidowicz initially respected each other's work and maintained friendly and cooperative contact. In early 1970, Hilberg wrote a review about a conference discussing the role of ghetto fighters, in which he criticised Yad Vashem for exaggerating the role of Jewish resistance fighters. The piece was declined by the journal *Midstream*. Hilberg consequently turned to Dawidowicz and asked for her opinion.<sup>68</sup> She answered probably by also taking into account an article Hilberg had written on "German motivations for the destruction of the Jews":

"It was stinking of *Midstream* not to pay. That they should have done. That's what I would have done. But I don't think I would have published your article either. [...] ... but all I want to say here is that by being harsh and critical and overly suspicious of other people's motives, you are not necessarily being objective and you are certainly not being dispassionate. Hannah Arendt protected herself against the passion and hatred for Germans by wrapping herself in a heavy cloak of irony. You, on the other hand, are all ice when you write of the Germans and aquiver when you come to the Jews. You protect yourself from the hurt with rage and aggressiveness. I am writing this to you personally and I hope I don't offend you. I don't mean to. I would never say this publicly, because I don't think one should try to psychologize scholars, but should rather deal with the work as it is. Let me say that I have enormous respect for your book. I use it as basic text in my course, but I don't like what I call the obiter dicta, the remarks about the Jews."<sup>69</sup>

Dawidowicz thus expressed her admiration for Hilberg's work but criticised him for not being objective, but rather aggressive when writing about the Holocaust. This indeed was an accusation that was often voiced in the debate about Hilberg's major book. Dawidowicz's main criticism, however, is to be found in her account of Hilberg's thesis on the collaboration of Jewish leaders with the Nazis, which she rejected. In the years that followed, the differences in their perspectives on the Holocaust remained.

While Hilberg had approached the Holocaust from a bureaucratic perspective, Dawidowicz saw antisemitism as a crucial factor in the genocide. Not the bureaucracy, but Hitler himself orchestrated the murder. According to Dawidowicz, ideas and ideology, not structures, were instrumental to the crime. As the title of her 1975 book implied, she claimed that "Hitler's assault on Europe was singularly focused on the destruction of the Jews."<sup>70</sup> With these interpretations, Dawidowicz contradicted the books by Hannah Arendt and Hilberg that had been published more than a decade before. In contrast to them, she defended the behaviour of the *Judenräte*, which Arendt and Hilberg had both criticised since, in their view, these had facilitated the Holocaust.<sup>71</sup>

Given these differences, it may not come as a surprise that Dawidowicz and Hilberg started confronting each other by the late 1970s. Dawidowicz, who had not reviewed the first edition of Hilberg's *The Destruction of the European Jews*, criticised the second edition in 1985 on account of Hilberg's thesis of collaboration. She also pointed to limits in the diary of Adam Czerniaków, the Jewish leader of the Warsaw Ghetto, which Hilberg had edited with his colleague Stanislaw Staron.<sup>72</sup> Unlike Hil-

68 Sinkoff, *From Left to Right*, 176-177.

69 UVM, RHP, Lucy Dawidowicz to Hilberg, 4 May 1970, B 8/ F 11.

70 Sinkoff, *From Left to Right*, 173.

71 *Ibid.*, 184.

72 Raul Hilberg/Stanislaw Staron/Josef Kermisz (ed.), *The Warsaw Diary of Adam Czerniakow 1939-1942*, Washington, D.C. 1999; Lucy S. Dawidowicz, Review: *The Warsaw Diary of Adam Czerniakow*, ed. by Raul Hilberg, Stanislaw Staron, in: *The New York Times*, 25 February 1979; Sinkoff, *From Left to Right*, 173-176.

berg, Dawidowicz did not find that Czerniakow's diary could bring new insights to the study of the Holocaust. She called it "so affectless and nonjudgmental that had a German police agent discovered it, he would have found nothing objectionable".<sup>73</sup> A few months later, Hilberg and Staron criticised her for writing that the "diary is a hardly readable text".<sup>74</sup> However, in the next sentence, she clarified that as a document it ought "to be studied and researched". Being neither history nor literature, she perceived the diary as "raw material from which history can be constructed".<sup>75</sup> Only in the end did she criticise the editors for not adding more notes on the context. In her view, they "appear to be unfamiliar with Polish Jewish history and culture".<sup>76</sup> This was not the first time such a critique was voiced against Hilberg. Scholars working at Yad Vashem had also hinted at his lack of use of sources from Eastern Europe, particularly from Poland.<sup>77</sup>

Hilberg, in turn, attacked Dawidowicz's books *The War Against the Jews* and *The Holocaust Reader* in a review. "The War against the Jews was not a significant contribution to knowledge, and neither is the Holocaust Reader."<sup>78</sup> Hilberg here took up a criticism that had often been voiced towards Dawidowicz's *The War Against the Jews*: that she had depicted antisemitism as the sole basis of Nazi ideology and the key motivation for the Holocaust; that she had portrayed Hitler as the planner of the Holocaust.<sup>79</sup> Whereas some of Hilberg's criticism can be seen as accurate, Hilberg's and Dawidowicz's dispute contained emotional arguments as well. Both had accused the other of not fulfilling their task as a scholar, of not being objective (as Dawidowicz accused Hilberg), or of not having written a significant study (as Hilberg accused Dawidowicz). With these examples, we can see that early Holocaust scholars defended their approaches by portraying each other as unscholarly. This might have been necessary in order to compete for the limited resources in early Holocaust studies.

However, we can discover differences in the way Dawidowicz and Hilberg argued with each other. Whereas Dawidowicz emphasised that she only wanted to help Hilberg understand why his article was rejected by *Midstream* – after he had asked for her opinion – Hilberg's comments towards Dawidowicz's work were often disrespectful. In their answer to Dawidowicz's review of the Czerniakow diary, Hilberg and Staron did not voice their position only at a scholarly level. They judged the importance of Czerniakow's diary as "the most important diary of the holocaust", and thus differently from Dawidowicz.<sup>80</sup> They condemned her account as "paltry" and as a "cavalier dismissal".<sup>81</sup> Voicing their criticism in this manner, they departed from a scholarly form of disagreement with her account and became insulting. As already indicated, this type of criticism was not uncommon in early Holocaust research. Hilberg himself had received almost condemnatory criticism when his first

73 Lucy S. Dawidowicz, "Brothers, Write Down Everything", in: *The New York Times*, 25 February 1979, 5, available under: <https://www.nytimes.com/1979/02/25/archives/brothers-write-down-everything.html?searchResultPosition=1> (11 February 2021).

74 Ibid.

75 Ibid.

76 Ibid.

77 Nathan Eck, *Historical Research of Slander*, in: *Yad Vashem Studies* 6 (1967), 385-430.

78 UVM, RHP, Raul Hilberg, Review: Lucy Dawidowicz, *The Holocaust Reader*, B 8/ F 11; Lucy S. Dawidowicz, *The Holocaust. How To Explain It All*, in: *The Washington Times Magazine*, 19 August 1985.

79 Sinkoff, *From Left to Right*, 170-176.

80 Raul Hilberg/Stanislaw Staron, Letter, in: *The New York Times*, 13 May 1979, 11, available under: <https://www.nytimes.com/1979/05/13/archives/letters-holocaust.html> (11 February 2021).

81 Ibid.

edition of *The Destruction of the European Jews* was published in 1961.<sup>82</sup> However, Dawidowicz did not portray him as an amateur scholar, which Hilberg did by calling her position “paltry”. In addition, he avoided being presented in the same scholarly programme as Dawidowicz. In 1977, he wrote to the organiser of the B’nai B’rith Lecture: “I do not think that anyone would want to hear us both, and in that sense an appearance by one of us would preclude a presentation by the other.”<sup>83</sup> Hilberg and Dawidowicz might have belonged to extreme ends of the early debate on how the Holocaust could happen, which might explain their conflict. However, we can also discover differences in how they voiced and reacted towards attacks from each other.

In contrast to Steinhardt Botwinick, Dawidowicz was a well-established scholar who contributed in many different ways to the study of the Holocaust but nevertheless did not receive a permanent position at a public university. One reason for this could be that she did not hold a PhD. This complicated her position in a male-dominated field that used her – in their view – insufficient academic background to delegitimise her work. In conclusion, the example of Dawidowicz underlines what Nora Huberty wrote about female scholars: Although her work was of paramount importance, her contribution was overlooked due to a male-centred perspective on academic honours and the attention scholars received. However, scholars started to also elaborate on the role of female scholars in Holocaust historiography. In 2019, Nancy Sinkoff, an expert in Jewish history, published a comprehensive biography of Dawidowicz. In addition, other factors played a role for women entering academia. The women’s movement of the 1970s and the 1980s was a crucial reason. Renate Bridenthal, born in 1935 in Leipzig, who emigrated with her family to the United States, became active in the movement through a Consciousness Raising Group and later devoted herself to studying the Nazi regime from a bottom-up perspective and by including the perspective of women in her work.<sup>84</sup> As a result, several political and scholarly developments led women to finding their place in academia.

### Conclusion: The Necessity of a Female Perspective

Steinhardt Botwinick gave her last lecture on 19 September 2017, in which she spoke about her hometown Winzig and her family history. Throughout her whole life, Steinhardt Botwinick remained grateful to the United States for saving her and her family’s lives.<sup>85</sup> She consequently named her memoirs *Gratefully Yours*. In the United States, she felt at home. At the same time, Steinhardt Botwinick offered her forgiveness to her childhood friend, representatively for her hometown, who had started bullying her after the Nazis came to power.<sup>86</sup> Nevertheless, Steinhardt Botwinick did not try to find German publishers for the many books she had written, and she did not go on reading tours in Germany, as many of her émigré colleagues did. Her hometown belonged to Poland now anyway. She is therefore hardly known in Germany. Still, an American and a German film producer from Calypso Media are producing a documentary called *Auf Wiedersehen in Winzig* (Goodbye in Winzig),

82 Eck, Historical Research of Slander.

83 UVM, RHP, Hilberg to Lily Edelmann, 15 December 1977, 8/5.

84 Renate Bridenthal, Out of Germany, in: Andreas Daum (ed.), *The Second Generation. Émigrés from Nazi Germany as Historians*, New York 2016, 130-140.

85 Steinhardt Botwinick, *Gratefully Yours*, 152-154.

86 *Ibid.*, 152.

which will be centred on Rita Steinhardt Botwinick but will also contain other interviews with eyewitnesses.<sup>87</sup> Thus, Steinhardt Botwinick's life and work might finally receive attention in Germany as well.

The establishment of Holocaust Studies would be unthinkable without its teaching as well as the collection and translation of sources and cultural goods. Women like Steinhardt Botwinick and Dawidowicz were instrumental in these fields. However, by tending to emphasise academic achievements, we often marginalise the impact of these women, although the efforts of these women are able to tell us a lot about the implementation of Holocaust studies. more studies are necessary to shed light on their relevance in this area.

**Anna Corsten** is a historian at the Institute for Contemporary History in Munich (IfZ). She is currently researching how the German government dealt with property of the NSDAP and other Nazi organisations. Between 2016 and 2020 she wrote her dissertation on German-speaking émigré historians and their impact on the study of National Socialism and the Holocaust at the University of Leipzig. She held several fellowships, for example, by the GHI in Washington D.C., the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute (VWI) and the Center for Holocaust Studies in Munich.

E-Mail: [corsten@ifz-muenchen.de](mailto:corsten@ifz-muenchen.de)

---

<sup>87</sup> Auf Wiedersehen in Winzig, <http://www.calypsomultimedia.com/uncategorized/auf-wiedersehen-in-winzig/> (14 March 2021).

---

Quotation: Anna Corsten, A Different Perspective on Innovation in Holocaust Studies, in: S:I.M.O.N. – Shoah: Intervention. Methods. DocumentatiON. 8 (2021) 2, 36-51.

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.23777/SN.0121/ART\\_ACOR01](https://doi.org/10.23777/SN.0121/ART_ACOR01)

S:I.M.O.N.– Shoah: Intervention. Methods. DocumentatiON. is the semi-annual open access e-journal of the Vienna Wiesenthal Institute for Holocaust Studies (VWI) in English and German.

ISSN 2408-9192 | 8 (2021) 1 | <https://doi.org/10.23777/SN.0121>

This article is licensed under the following Creative Commons License: CC-BY-NC-ND  
(Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives)

In appreciation to the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany (Claims Conference) for supporting this publication.