

The Understanding of the Holocaust and Its Influence on Current Perspectives of German Youth

An overview of a quantitative research project on attitudes of pupils and students¹

von Manfred Brusten, Bernd Winkelmann, Wuppertal

Zusammenfassung

Der vorliegende Forschungsbericht gibt einen ersten Überblick über die wichtigsten Ergebnisse einer empirischen Untersuchung zur Bedeutung des Holocaust für die heutige Jugend in der BRD. Hierzu wurden im Jahre 1989 die Einstellungen von insgesamt 610 Schülern im Alter von 15 - 18 Jahren aus verschiedenen Schultypen und 521 Studenten verschiedener Fachdisziplinen im Alter von 19 - 25 Jahren mit Hilfe eines strukturierten Fragebogens untersucht. Neben zentralen sozio-biographischen Daten wurden vor allem Kenntnisse und Meinungen zum Holocaust sowie Einstellungen zu Ausländern, Nationalbewußtsein und autoritären Denkstrukturen erfragt und diese dann über Faktoren- und Skalenanalysen ausgewertet. Im Vordergrund standen dabei der Versuch einer methodischen Erfassung der 'Aufarbeitung des Holocaust' in fünf aufeinanderfolgenden Stufen und die Messung der Bedeutung, die dieser Aufarbeitungsprozeß selbst heute noch für die Einstellung von Jugendlichen zu aktuellen sozialen und politischen Fragen der BRD hat.

Abstract

The present research report presents a first overview of the most important results of an empirical study on the significance of the Holocaust for the young people of the FRG today. The attitudes of 610 pupils between the ages of 15 and 18 and from various types of school, and 521 students from various disciplines and aged between 19 and 25 were investigated in 1989 by means of a structured questionnaire. Besides central socio-biographic data, the study concentrated on the respondents's knowledge about and opinions of the Holocaust, and their attitudes towards foreigners, national identity and authoritarian ways of thinking. The information obtained was processed by factor- and scale-analysis. The central aim was an attempt to reconstruct methodically the 'working-through' of the Holocaust in five consecutive steps and to measure the importance which this 'working-through' process still has today for the attitudes of young people towards current social and political issues in the FRG.

1. Introduction

The present paper deals with the 'Third Generation' after the Holocaust, pupils and students in the Federal Republic of Germany today, their attitudes toward the Holocaust and the possible influence their 'working through' this 'dark side' of German history may have on their current perspectives. What 'relevance' does the Holocaust still have for them? Do they perceive the Holocaust in general as irrelevant for their present life, or do they overestimate its importance? However, before we concern ourselves with questions like these, it must be emphasized that this research was by no means 'routine' research, but rather research which by virtue of the theme and because of its interdisciplinary and international character caused quite particular difficulties, which in themselves would be worth studying.

And although there is no space here to go into the details of the methodological and empirical design of the research, it is important to note that the investigation was conducted from the very beginning in close and continuous contact and collaboration with our colleagues at the University of Beer Sheva in Israel, who conducted the same research at the same time (in spring 1989) with the same kind of population (pupils and students), in order to make direct comparisons possible between the two countries, which as such can already be considered a rare case of international scientific cooperation². The present paper, however, will deal only with the main results of the German part of the research introducing the reader step by step to the complexity of its design:

1. basic information about the 'German Sample';
2. attitudes of pupils and students to current events, in particular attitudes towards foreigners, 'national identity' and 'authoritarian mentality';
3. attitudes towards the Holocaust: facts, emotional reactions, personal and political conclusions and behavioral consequences;
4. information on the social background of the youngsters which might have influenced the process of their 'working through' the Holocaust; and
5. the influence of their 'working through' the Holocaust on their 'attitudes towards current events'.

2. The German Sample

In all 1 131 young Germans took part in the research³ and gave answers to the questionnaire handed out to them in classrooms and lecture theatres; 610 of them pupils between the age of 15 and 18 from different types of schools in Northrhine-Westphalia; 521 students in the first year of their studies from different faculties of the University of Wuppertal (see table 1); most of them between the age of 20 and 25. Although for economical and technical reasons we could not afford to have a really representative sample in the strict sense, we tried to get as close as possible

by using quota sample procedures; aiming at a sample which represents at least in percentage the general pupil-population of the different types of schools and the student-population of the different faculties.⁴

Table 1: School and Faculty Affiliation of the Juveniles

School affiliation of the pupils ⁵	n	in%	Faculty affiliation of the students	n	in%
Hauptschule	168	27.5	Engineering	143	27.4
Realschule	137	22.5	Social sciences/ economics	130	25.0
Gymnasium	248	40.7	Natural sciences	65	12.5
Gesamtschule (comprehensive school)	57	9.3	Humanities ¹⁾	50	9.6
			Various disciplines ²⁾	105	20.2
			Other disciplines	28	5.4
Total	610	100		521	100

Remarks: 1) Languages, Philosophy, History and Theology. 2) Students who have chosen more than one major discipline for their undergraduate studies, mainly those intending to become teachers.

Table 2 shows quite clearly that with respect to age, sex and 'educational level' our 'total sample' in fact consists of two different 'sub-samples':

1. With respect to 'age' most pupils (66%) are at the age of 16 and none of them older than 18, whereas most of the students (71%) are between 20 and 25, 16% somewhat younger, and about 14% older than 25, some even older than 30.
2. With respect to 'sex' the sub-sample of the pupils is more or less of representative character, whereas in the student sub-sample the females (although representative for the student population) are underrepresented compared with the 'general population' of youngsters of that age.
3. Great differences are also to be noticed with respect to the 'educational level' between the two sub-samples: the pupils - again - represent more or less the 'general population' of that age, whereas the students not only have the 'highest school level' but at the same time are also a few years older and consequently have more formal education and life experience.

However, despite the fact that the total sample of our research splits into two quite different sub-samples the following first presentation of the research results will not result in two separate reports related to the two sub-samples, particularly where the differences are not too important.

Table 2: Age and Sex of the Juveniles (in percentages)

Age category	PUPILS (n=603)			STUDENTS (n=519)			TOTAL (n=1122)		
	m	f	total	m	f	total	m	f	total
15-16	63.8	68.2	66.2	-	-	-	27.7	46.3	35.6
17-18	36.2	31.8	33.8	-	-	-	15.9	21.6	18.3
19-20	-	-	-	10.6	27.6	15.6	5.9	8.9	7.1
21 and over	-	-	-	89.4	72.4	84.4	50.5	23.3	39.0
Total	46.8	53.2	100.0	70.7	29.3	100.0	57.8	42.2	100.0

2. Attitudes related to current aspects of the FRG

The first part of the questionnaire was originally composed of 21 statements dealing with the 'actuality' of the Federal Republic of Germany: current attitudes to German history, culture and economic achievements, attitudes to foreigners and so called foreign 'guest-workers' and - last but not least - attitudes representing an authoritarian character (vgl. Adorno et al. 1968). By factor-analysis 17 of these statements proved to be useful and highly significant for the following three actuality-scales:

A1 Reservation concerning Foreigners (Ausländerfeindlichkeit)

A2 National Identity (Nationalgefühl)

A3 Authoritarian Mentality (Autoritäres Denken)

The different statements which make up these attitude scales, and the distribution of the answers by the pupils and students of our sample are presented in detail in tables 3 to 5. The intercorrelation of the three 'actuality scales' shows highly significant correlation coefficients between them; with pupils as well as with students (see table 6). Although the relation between them is definitely of interdependent character, they not only underline the suspected strong relationship between 'authoritarian mentality' and 'national identity' but also support the assumption that a basic 'authoritarian mentality' and a strong 'national identity' promote strong 'Reservations concerning foreigners'.

Table 3: Scale A1 'Reservations concerning foreigners' (in percentages)

Statements	disagree						agree
	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
1. Durch das Zusammenleben und die gegenseitige Annäherung von Ausländern und Deutschen wird unsere eigene Kultur bereichert(n=1126)	7	7	9	18	14	18	26
2. Die Gastarbeiter in unserem Land sollten ihren Lebensstil ein bißchen besser dem der Deutschen anpassen (n=1128)	12	15	11	18	16	13	16
3. Wenn Arbeitsplätze knapp werden, sollte man die Gastarbeiter in ihre Heimatländer zurückschicken (n=1123)	35	15	14	13	8	5	9
4. Man sollte Gastarbeitern jede politische Betätigung in Deutschland untersagen(n=1124)	34	16	12	16	7	6	10
5. Gastarbeiter sollten sich ihre Ehepartner unter ihren eigenen Landsleuten wählen(n=1126)	62	11	6	13	3	2	4
6. Obwohl wir selbst viele Arbeitslose haben, sollten wir politisch verfolgten Ausländern Asyl gewähren (n=1124)	9	7	8	12	9	15	41
7. Wenn die sog. 'politischen Flüchtlinge' in ihrem Land verfolgt werden, dann müssen sie doch irgend etwas verbrochen haben (n=1124)	39	19	10	16	6	4	6
Scale A1 'Reservations concerning foreigners' (n=1103)	17	27	22	18	10	5	1

Cronbach's Alpha = .8709

Table 4: Scale A2 'National Identity' (in percentages)

Statements	disagree						agree
	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
1. In der Bundesrepublik Deutschland zu leben, gibt mir ein Gefühl von Geborgenheit und Sicherheit, das ich sonst nirgendwo hätte(n=1129)	10	13	15	30	17	9	5
2. Wenn ich unsere Nationalhymne höre, überkommt mich immer ein Gefühl der Verbundenheit mit meinem eigenen Land (n=1126)	32	18	9	15	10	7	9
3. Wenn ich an die wirtschaftlichen und technischen Leistungen Deutschlands denke, bin ich stolz, ein Deutscher zu sein (n=1114)	16	12	11	23	15	12	12
4. Denke ich an die literarischen, philosophischen und musikalischen Leistungen unserer Vorfahren, bin ich wirklich stolz auf mein Land (n=1118)	10	12	12	31	18	11	7
5. Bei genauer Betrachtung sieht man, daß die deutsche Wissenschaft und Kultur der wichtigste Motor des weltweiten Fortschritts waren(n=1111)	11	12	18	31	16	7	5
6. Die Deutschen haben eine Reihe von guten Eigenschaften wie Fleiß, Pflichtbewußtsein und Treue, die andere Völker nicht haben(n=1121)	39	16	11	16	9	5	4
Scale A2 'National Identity' (n=1085)	3	17	29	28	17	6	1

Cronbach's Alpha = .7801

Table 5: Scale A3 'Authoritarian Mentality' (in percentages)

Statements	disagree						agree
	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
1. Die meisten unserer sozialen Probleme wären gelöst, wenn wir irgendwie die Arbeitsscheuen, die Verbrecher und die Geisteskranken aus der Gesellschaft ausmerzen könnten (n=1126)	65	11	8	10	3	1	2
2. Der Fehler heutzutage ist, daß zu viele entscheiden, was getan werden soll und was nicht (n=1122)	40	12	9	18	10	5	6
3. Patriotismus und Staatstreue sind die ersten wichtigen Voraussetzungen für einen guten Bürger (n=1121)	42	15	13	16	8	3	4
4. Viele Deutsche haben einen übertriebenen Hang zu negativer Kritik an Deutschland und beschmutzen damit ihr eigenes Nest (n=1115)	39	16	11	16	9	5	4
Scale A3 'Authoritarian Mentality' (n=1101)	23	23	26	18	7	3	1

Cronbach's Alpha = .7283

Table 6: Intercorrelations (Pearson's r) between the 'actuality scales'

	Pupils		Students		Total	
	A1	A2	A1	A2	A1	A2
Reservations concerning foreigners(A1)	1.00		1.00		1.00	
National identity(A2)	.44	1.00	.54	1.00	.51	1.00
Authoritarian mentality(A3)	.55	.54	.53	.54	.65	.56

For further research purposes we have combined all three 'actuality-scales' into a 'superscale A' as a measurement of 'current attitudes' ranging from high to low attitudes related to 'authoritarian mentality', 'national identity' and 'reservations concerning foreigners':

Table 7: Superscale A 'current attitudes' (in percentages)

Sub-scales of 'current attitudes'	low						high
	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
Reservation concerning foreigners(A1)	17	27	22	18	10	5	1
National identity(A2)	3	17	29	28	17	6	1
Authoritarian mentality(A3)	23	23	26	18	7	3	1
Superscale A: current attitudes (n=1050)	7	26	30	25	9	3	1

Cronbach's Alpha = .8007

3. Attitudes toward the Holocaust

The second part of the questionnaire was composed of a very diverse set of 70 questions and statements related to World War II, the 'Third Reich' and in particular to the 'Holocaust'. According to the central theoretical perspective of the research this part of the questionnaire was to measure the process of 'working through' the Holocaust in five stages:

- stage 1: knowledge of facts related to the Holocaust
- stage 2: understanding the meaning of facts related to the Holocaust
- stage 3: emotional reactions towards the Holocaust
- stage 4: personal and political consequences derived from the Holocaust
- stage 5: acceptance of personal contact with Jews (social distance)

Factor and scale analysis of the research-data, however, showed that only 48 of the questions and statements were useful for further processing and that the scales and indices we obtained were somewhat different to what we had expected.

3.1 Knowledge and Understanding of Facts related to the Holocaust

To measure the 'knowledge and understanding of facts' the pupils and students had to undergo two different multiple-choice tests (see Appendix 1 and 2).

3.1.1 Knowledge of facts

Our test to measure the 'knowledge of facts' consisted of 5 multiple-choice-questions referring to central elements of the Holocaust.⁶ As we learn from Appendix 1 and table (8), in each of the five multiple-choice-questions a clear majority of the pupils/students marked the correct answer ranging from only 45% ('Treblinka') to 93% ('Reichskristallnacht') although - because of the multiple-choice-type of questions - 20-25% may have marked the correct answer only by chance. Altogether - with the exception of the 'Reichskristallnacht' - the results revealed a far from satisfactory standard of knowledge about central facts of the Holocaust. But the result of the research also shows quite clearly that the pupils/students very often did not know exactly what they were being asked; this becomes obvious not only from the comparatively high percentages of 'wrong answers' but also from the high percentage of pupils/students who had to admit that they were not at all confident that the answers they had marked were correct (see Table 9).

Table 8: *Correct answers to the multiple-choice-questions measuring the 'knowledge of facts' related to the Holocaust*

Topic of the Holocaust and its correct answer	Percentages of correct answers		
	Pupils (n=610)	Students (n=521)	Total sample
1. The 'Final Solution' was: The name of the program for the direct and total extermination of Jews from 1941 on.	53.8	73.0	62.8
2. 'Treblinka' was: An extermination camp for Jews from the Warsaw and other ghettos, where more than 800.000 people were exterminated.	44.8	71.1	57.3
3. 'Kristallnacht' is the name for: The night of the programs against Jews all over Germany, in November 1938.	92.5	97.3	94.7
4. The 'Nuremberg Laws' were: Decrees by the Nazi government in 1935 to establish the restrictions put on Jews and other minorities.	53.8	52.2	53.1
5. How did the Nazi state handle the mentally ill (Euthanasia program)?: They started a specific extermination program.	55.3	72.2	63.1

Table 9: *'Level of Confidence' in answering the multiple-choice questions measuring the 'knowledge of facts'(in percentages)*

Answer to question on:	Pupils				Students			
	not confident		very confident		not confident		very confident	
	0	1	2	3	0	1	2	3
1. The 'final solution':	15	21	33	32	5	11	40	44
2. 'Treblinka':	34	25	22	19	17	24	37	22
3. 'Reichskristallnacht':	3	4	11	83	1	2	8	90
4. 'Nuremberg Laws':	22	21	26	31	20	18	26	37
5. 'Euthanasia':	11	27	36	26	4	19	41	36

For scaling purposes a specific ranking system was developed by combining the answers marked and the degree of confidence. According to this system the

pupils/students could get on each of the 5 multiple-choice-questions 1 - 4 points. The results are shown in table (10):

- 4 points: correct answer with high degree of confidence (2+3)
- 3 points: correct answer with low degree of confidence (0+1)
- 2 points: incorrect answer with low degree of confidence(0+1)
- 1 point: incorrect answer with high degree of confidence (2+3)

Table 10: 'Knowledge of facts' related to the Holocaust (Scale B1)

Questions related to...	Points obtained by total sample			
	incorrect answers		correct answers	
	1	2	3	4
'Final solution' (n=1095)	21%	16%	10%	53%
'Treblinka' (n=1047)	14%	29%	22%	36%
'Reichskristallnacht' (n=1110)	4%	2%	3%	92%
'Nuremberg-Laws' (n=1072)	21%	26%	15%	39%
'Euthanasia' (n=1088)	21%	16%	15%	48%
Scale B1 'Knowledge of facts'(n=985)	0%	18%	59%	23%

Cronbach's Alpha = .4054

Table (10) shows again that the knowledge of facts is only satisfactory with respect to the 'Reichskristallnacht' and lowest with respect to 'Treblinka' and the 'Nuremberg Laws'.

The intercorrelation (Pearson's r) of the answers given to the 5 multiple-choice questions measuring the 'knowledge of facts' was - with one exception - only significant at 0.05 level, and scale analysis produced a non-significant reliability coefficient of a Cronbach's Alpha of .4054 and inadequate correlations between the individual 'items' (questions) and the total scale of approximately .20.⁷ For these reasons scale B1 was not applied in further analysis.

3.1.2 'Understanding' the facts

Another 4 multiple-choice-questions were designed to measure the 'understanding' and assessment of facts related to the Holocaust (see appendix 2). In contrast to the first set of questions this time there was no clear cut 'correct answer', but an assessment of which of the pre-fabricated answers would be most relevant and which least relevant. To provide a yardstick for the correctness of the assessment, 12 German 'experts'⁸ were asked to give their opinion; six of them answered. Only where at least 5 out of 6 agreed to define a specific answer as 'highly relevant' (2-

3), 'relevant' (1-2) or 'of little relevance' (0-1) was it considered to be correct and the answers given by the pupils/students rated accordingly.

Factor analysis of all 'items' (i.e. the assessments of all given answers) did not show any 'factor' to be good enough for interpretation. Therefore, these 'items' for 'understanding/assessment of facts' could not be used to develop a proper scale.

Because of the scaling problems with both sets of questions related to the 'facts' we finally opted for the formation of a 'common index' for 'knowledge' and 'understanding' of facts by just adding all the correct answers given by the pupils/students on both measurements, with a maximum of 23 possible correct answers⁹. The distribution of all the correct answers given to this combined index of 'knowledge and understanding of facts' (B1+2) is shown in table 11.

Table 11: Distribution of correct answers to the index of 'knowledge/understanding of facts' (B1+2)

Categories of numbers of correct answers	absolute number	percentage
0-10	88	7.8%
11-13	161	14.2%
14-16	405	35.8%
17-19	375	33.2%
20-23	102	9.0%
Total	1131	100.0%

3.2 Emotional reaction towards the Holocaust

There were quite a few questions included in the questionnaire which gave the youngsters the opportunity to express their emotional feelings concerning the Holocaust. After factor and scale analysis the following scale for 'emotional reaction' was obtained (see table 12).

Table 12: 'Emotional reactions to the Holocaust' (scale B3)

Statements given:	disagree				agree		
	0	1	2	3			
Wenn der Holocaust zur Sprache kommt,...							
..., fühle ich Scham (n=928)	35%	19%	21%	26%			
..., fühle ich Schuld (n=927)	59%	20%	13%	9%			
..., fühle ich Betroffenheit (n=956)	10%	6%	21%	63%			
..., fühle ich Ärger/Wut (n=926)	31%	17%	21%	32%			
..., fühle ich mich wie gelähmt (n=917)	50%	21%	16%	13%			
..., fühle ich Angst (n=947)	32%	16%	23%	20%			
Ich bin gefühlsmäßig tief betroffen, wenn ich an den Holocaust denke(n=1124) ¹⁰	8%	14%	30%	48%			
Scale B3: 'Emotional reaction' (n=836)	5%	11%	21%	26%	23%	12%	2%

Cronbach's Alpha=.7499; the comparatively low 'n's indicate that many of the pupils/students did not react to the statements given.

If we look at the reactions to each of the statements of scale B3, it is obvious that (according to our sample) German youngsters are more or less split into two groups as far as 'emotional involvement' in the Holocaust is concerned; many of them refusing to have the emotional reactions mentioned. If we look at the scale itself, about 37% disagree with the statements of emotional involvement, whereas another 37% agree. In particular, the majority deny - on the one hand - that they feel personally any 'guilt' or 'shame', although - on the other hand - a clear majority do admit that nevertheless they feel generally deeply affected by the Holocaust.

3.3 Personal relevance of the Holocaust

A central part of the questionnaire deals with attitudes to measure the 'personal relevance' of the Holocaust. In all 29 statements were offered asking the youngsters for their agreement or disagreement. According to stage 4 of the theoretical perspective of our research, this part of the questionnaire included in particular statements which were considered useful to measure the 'personal and political consequences' the pupils and students derive from the Holocaust. By factor and scale analysis of all the answers given in this section of the questionnaire, the following three sub-scales were obtained:

1. personal interest in the Holocaust (B4.1)
2. political consequences to be derived from the Holocaust (B4.2)
3. tendency not to accept responsibility for the Holocaust (B4.3)

3.3.1 Personal Interest in the Holocaust

Five statements constitute the scale of personal interest (see table 13). According to this scale about 2/3 of our sample see themselves as 'interested in the Holocaust' (or

claim at least to be 'interested') and only about 17 % admit that they are not interested in the Holocaust. Looking closer at the individual statements, it is clear that the youngsters disagree most strongly with the opinion that 'the Holocaust in general is not of any interest any longer today' (last statement) or that 'the Holocaust has no relevance for them personally' (second statement) and a majority of the youngsters claim that they are 'eager to know what their relatives did during the "Third Reich"'.

Table 13: Personal interest in the Holocaust (Scale B4.1) (in percentages)

Statements:	disagree						agree +3
	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	
1. Mein Wissen und Verständnis vom Holocaust beeinflussen mein Handeln und meine Weltanschauung(n=1120)	14	11	9	16	16	18	16
2. Was während des Holocaust geschehen ist, hat keine Bedeutung mehr für mich/für mein Leben (n=1122)	28	20	15	11	10	8	8
3. Ich bin sehr interessiert an den Ereignissen im "Dritten Reich" und versuche, mich umfassend zu informieren(n=1119)	6	6	9	22	21	18	17
4. Ich bemühe mich zu erfahren, was meine Großeltern (oder auch andere aus meiner Familie) im "Dritten Reich" konkret gemacht haben (n=1120)	8	7	7	15	18	21	24
5. Wen interessiert das denn heute noch mit dem Holocaust - mich jedenfalls nicht. Das ist doch von vorgestern(n=1122)	58	15	9	9	4	2	3
Scale B 4.1'Personal interest'(n=1099)	1	4	12	18	24	28	11

Cronbach's Alpha =.7749

3.3.2 Political consequences to be drawn from the Holocaust

According to our factor analysis, 5 statements were good enough to form a scale measuring the readiness to derive political consequences from the Holocaust (see table 14). More than half of the youngsters agreed that there must be 'political consequences' of the Holocaust even today and only about 20% seemed to disagree; in particular the youngsters feel, that - after what happened in the Holocaust - one should generally be concerned about all national minorities in all parts of the world, and that one should be politically active to prevent events similar to the Holocaust ever happening again.

Table 14: *The readiness to derive political consequences from the Holocaust (scale B4.2) (in percentages)*

Statements:	disagree						agree
	-3	-2	-1	0	+1	+2	+3
1. Damit so etwas ähnliches wie der Holocaust nicht mehr geschehen kann, sollte man in irgendeiner Weise politisch aktiv sein (n=1123)	4	3	7	20	22	22	23
2. Eine wichtige Lehre aus dem Holocaust ist für mich: starke nationale Gefühle darf es nirgendwo mehr geben (n=1118)	11	11	14	22	15	13	14
3. Nach dem, was im Holocaust passiert ist, sollten wir um die nationalen Minderheiten in allen Teilen der Welt besonders besorgt sein (n=1119)	4	4	7	16	23	23	23
4. Die deutschen Politiker unterschätzen meiner Meinung nach die Bedeutung des Holocaust für die heutige Zeit (n=1109)	11	12	17	30	15	10	6
5. Es ist heute noch Deutschlands Pflicht und Schuldigkeit, Entschädigungen an die noch lebenden Opfer des Nazi-Regimes zu zahlen (n= 1118)	17	8	9	15	15	17	20
Scale B 4.2 'Political Consequences' (n=1090)	1	4	14	29	33	16	4

Cronbach's Alpha=.6658

3.3.3 Non-acceptance of responsibility for the Holocaust

By factor analysis another 4 statements form a scale which was not expected but which might measure the tendency not to accept responsibility for the Holocaust (see table 15). Although most youngsters disagree with most of the statements which constitute the scale, the results may nevertheless be noteworthy, because the statements combined here represent some of the most striking attitudes to 'escape any personal involvement' related to the Holocaust, and it is remarkable enough that not all youngsters disagree with them strongly.

Table 15: *Tendency not to accept responsibility for the Holocaust (scale B4.3) (in percentages)*

Statements:	disagree		-1	0	+1	+2	agree	
	-3	-2					+3	
1. Der Holocaust wird nur verständlich, wenn man bedenkt, was die 'Juden' den (nicht-jüdischen) 'Deutschen' vorher angetan haben (n=1115)	67	15	6	8	2	1	2	
2. Hätten die Juden sich nicht wie Schafe zur Schlachtbank führen lassen, hätte der Holocaust nicht stattgefunden (n=1126)	54	20	10	8	5	1	2	
3. Ich bin stolz auf das Verhalten meiner Landsleute während der Zeit des Zweiten Weltkrieges, denn die meisten von ihnen verhielten sich menschlich unter unmenschlichen Bedingungen (n=1115)	48	20	11	13	4	2	2	
4. Für die Gestaltung der Zukunft kann nichts aus dem Holocaust gelernt werden (n=1120)	54	18	9	8	4	3	4	
Scale B 4.3 'Non-acceptance of responsibility' (n=1098)	35	34	19	9	3	0	0	

Cronbach's Alpha=.6279

For further research purposes we combined all our three attitude scales on 'personal interest', 'political consequences' and 'non-acceptance of responsibility' into a 'super-scale B4' measuring the 'personal relevance of the Holocaust' for the pupils and students we asked.

Table 16: *Superscale B4: 'Personal relevance of the Holocaust'¹¹ (in percentages)*

	disagree		-1	0	+1	+2	agree	
	-3	-2					+3	
'Personal interest' (B 4.1)	1	4	12	18	27	28	11	
'Political consequences' (B 4.2)	1	4	14	29	33	16	4	
'Non-acceptance of responsibility' (B 4.3)	0	0	3	9	19	34	35	
Superscale B4 'Personal Relevance' (n=1056)	0	1	4	22	37	31	6	

Cronbach's Alpha=.6784

3.4 The acceptance of having personal contact with Jews

According to the theoretical perspective of our research the process of 'working through' the Holocaust is supposed to have - in its final stage - some impact on 'behaviour'. To measure such behavioural aspects a social-distance-scale was developed similar to a Bogardus-Scale (Bogardus 1925). The aim was to have a measurement to examine the acceptance of having personal contact -in varying degrees of intensity - with Israeli pupils/students.

Table 17: The acceptance of having personal contact with Israelis (Social-distance-scale B5)

Statements beginning with: I can well imagine... with Jewish pupils or students:	Yes-answers
1. ...preparing for an exam...(n=1108)	95,3%
2. ...going out (to a party)...(n=1110)	95,0%
3. ...forming a close friendship...(n=1102)	92,2%
4. ...having sexual relations...(n=1071)	81,2%
5. ...marrying and having children...(n=1065)	75,3%

Cronbach's Alpha = .8198

69,2% of all pupils/students (n=783) were willing to have personal contact with Israeli pupils/students on all 5 levels, getting 5 points for it; the complete opposite behaviour was admitted by 45 pupils/students (= 4,0%), who were not willing to have any personal contact with Israelis, getting 0 points for it; 2,3% (n=26) got 1 point, 5,0% (n=56) got 2 points; 12,2% (n=138) got three points and 7,3% (n=83) got 4 points¹².

3.5 The 'working-through'-process

According to our theoretical perspective the indices and scales which we have developed so far are to be considered as different consecutive steps in the process of 'working-through' the Holocaust. Therefore it seemed to be reasonable to integrate them into a 'Superscale' 'working-through' (see table 18):

Table 18: Superscale B 'Working Through the Holocaust'¹³

Sub-scales of the 'working-through'	disagree				agree
	-2	-1	0	+1	+2
Knowledge/understanding of facts (n=1131)	8%	14%	36%	33%	9%
Emotional reactions towards the Holocaust (n=836)	16%	21%	26%	23%	14%
Personal relevance of the Holocaust (n=1056)	1%	4%	22%	37%	37%
Acceptance of personal contacts with Jews (n=1131)	6%	5%	12%	7%	69%
Superscale B 'Working through' (n=796)	1%	5%	21%	50%	23%

Cronbach's Alpha = .6332

The intercorrelations between the individual scales of superscale B 'working-through' and superscale A 'current attitudes' are shown in table (19):

Table 19: Intercorrelations between the indices and scales of superscale B as well as between superscale B 'working through' and superscale A 'current attitudes' (Pearson's r)

	<i>B 1+2</i>	<i>B 3</i>	<i>B 4</i>	<i>Superscale A</i>
B1+2 'knowledge of facts'	1.0000			-.3780
B3 'emotional involvement'	.2259	1.0000		-.3479
B4 'personal relevance'	.3315	.5574	1.0000	-.5962
B5 'social distance'	.2020	.2386	.3659	-.3925
Superscale B				-.5277

In order to test the basic theoretical approach of our research, assuming that the process of 'working through' the Holocaust in general develops in five steps from 'knowledge of facts related to the Holocaust' to 'acceptance of having personal contact with Jewish people', we tried to set up a Guttman-Scale from the different scales used so far by splitting each of them by the median into half. But the result did not comply with what was to be expected by the theory: the reliability coefficient was insignificant ($\lambda = .5009$) and the order of the scales was not in accordance with our theory: B5 - B1+2 - B4 - B3, instead of B1+2-B3-B4-B5, which in itself is - at the present 'exploratory stage' of our research - difficult to interpret: although at first sight the result may shed some doubts on the theory of the 'working through process', this may well be due to deficiencies in the empirical manner of testing the theory.

4. The social background of pupils/students as an independent factor influencing 'working through' the Holocaust

Our questionnaire finally included a long list of 'social background variables', which can be divided into the following two categories:

- a. Variables which were considered to be entirely independent of attitudes towards the Holocaust and current political issues:
 - age of the pupil/student
 - sex of the pupil/student
 - level of school education
 - parents' education
 - father's profession
 - religious affiliation
 - number of hours in school dealing with national socialism

- b. Variables which were considered to be independent of attitudes towards the Holocaust and current political issues, but which could, at least partly, be considered to be dependent on variables in category (a) or interdependent with attitudes towards the Holocaust or current political issues:
- family's involvement in the Holocaust (according to students' knowledge)
 - experience of learning about the Holocaust
 - involvement in youth-groups
 - political party preference

The main purpose of introducing these variables into our research was to test their possible influence on scales, correlations and factors we had established for the total sample and to test whether the research results continue to be true for specific sub-samples. But because of the complexity of such 'multivariate-analysis' we will have to restrict ourselves here to only a few further steps in our investigation.

4.1 Family's involvement in the Holocaust

Because attitudes towards the Holocaust may be related to the family's involvement in the Holocaust, all the pupils and students were asked for information on the 'political position' of their parents, grandparents and other close relatives during the 'Third Reich'. In all 6 possibilities were given to check whether the family supported or opposed 'National Socialism' or - possibly - both.

Considering the young age of our respondents, in most cases 'grandparents' were most relevant for the family's involvement in the Holocaust and/or World War II, whereas the parents of the pupils and students in most cases were too young at that time and other relatives most probably less important for the youngsters' attitudes. According to table (20) about 16% of the youngsters had grandparents who could be considered 'pro-Nazi', because they were members of the NSDAP or in other ways participated in Nazi activities. And about 19% of the youngsters had - at least in their own perception - grandparents who could be considered 'anti-Nazi', because they were killed in Nazi prisons or concentration camps, survived in concentration camps or in hiding, were members of an anti-Nazi resistance movement or fled Germany during World War II.¹⁴ Historical evidence, however, clearly indicates that a higher proportion of the German population (the grandparents' generation) supported the Nazis. Thus the youngsters appear to distort considerably the reality of their grandparents' fate. They tend to perceive their grandparents more in the role of victims and heroes against the Nazi regime rather than seeing them as followers, victimizers or bystanders.

Table 20: Grandparents' involvement in the Holocaust (n=1131) (percentage of pupils/students giving positive information)

Categories of grandparents' involvement in the Holocaust

1. were active Nazis	7,3%	
2. were members of the NSDAP (Nazi-Party)	9,0%	16,3%
3. were murdered in prisons or concentration camps	1,9%	
4. survived in concentration camps or in hiding	4,7%	
5. were members of a resistance movement	4,6%	18,9%
6. fled Germany during World War II	7,7%	

Using all the information given on the involvement of parents, grandparents and other close relatives in the Holocaust, we have set up an index C1 of 'family's involvement in the Holocaust' that is useful for further statistical analysis; see table (21):

Table 21: Index C1 'Family's involvement in the Holocaust' (n=1131)

pupils/students information	n	Number of giving positive in %
Family's involvement in the Holocaust		
neither 'pro' nor 'anti' Nazis	733	64,8%
only 'pro' Nazis (Nazi-supporters)	125	11,1%
only 'anti' Nazis (Nazi-opponents)	211	18,7%
'pro' and 'anti' Nazis	62	5,5%

4.2 Experience of learning about the Holocaust

As another important independent variable which in our opinion most probably had a great influence on the students' attitudes towards the Holocaust we considered the experience of learning about the Holocaust. To get reliable information a great number of questions had to be asked¹⁵.

Table 22: Index C2' Experience of learning about the Holocaust' (n=950)

Type of experience	Percentage of respondents who answered 'yes'
1. Has there often been discussion of the Holocaust in your family? (n=1101)	18,6%
2. Has there often been discussion of the Holocaust among your friends? (n=1104)	12,0%
3. Has there been discussion of the Holocaust at your initiation? (n=1013)	36,5%
4. Have you visited a Jewish institution or a memorial for the victims of the Holocaust? (n=1109)	41,4%
5. Have you participated in activities or protests against 'Reservations concerning foreigners', fascism or neo-fascism? (n=1114)	25,5%
6. Have you visited Poland, Israel or the USSR? (n=1131)	12,0%
7. Have you participated in a youth- or student-exchange-program with Poland, Israel or the USSR? (n=1131)	1,6%

Cronbach's Alpha = .4602

Considering all seven types of experience mentioned in index C2 , 30,0% of our sample did not have any of them, 30,5% had only one, 21,3% had 2, 10,7% had 3 and 7,6% had as many as 4 or more.

5. The influence of the 'working-through process' on attitudes towards 'current events'

To test our central question whether 'attitudes towards the Holocaust' or the process of 'working through the Holocaust' have an influence on 'attitudes towards current events' multiple regression analysis was applied.¹⁶

For this, 'social background variables' which had - according to their correlation-coefficients¹⁷ - a great influence on our superscale A 'current attitudes' were introduced as independent variables first (forced entry).¹⁸ Then the scales of the 'working-through-process' were added as a 'free entry'.

Table 23: Explaining the variance of 'current attitudes' (superscale A) by multiple regression analysis

Step	Variables in order of their explaining capacity	R	R ²	R ² change	F to enter	sign.
Forced entry:						
<i>Var. of social background</i>						
1.	political party preference (right to left)	-.55	.30	.30	201,1	.0000
2.	school-level/age of students (low to high) ¹⁹	-.46	.44	.14	181,5	.0000
3.	learning experience related to the Holocaust (low to high)	-.24	.46	.02	127.7	.0000
Free entry						
<i>Var. of 'working-through-process'</i>						
4.	political consequences derived from the Holocaust (low to high)	-.55	.53	.07	127,6	.0000
5.	non-acceptance of responsibility for the Holocaust (low to high)	.51	.56	.03	115,7	.0000
6.	knowledge/understanding of facts of the Holocaust (low to high)	-.34	.57	.01	98,8	.0000

The multiple regression analysis (in table 23) shows that the independent social-background- variables explain 46% of the variance of the 'current attitudes', whereas the 'working-through-variables' explain only an additional 11%. In more detail, the multiple regression analysis shows with respect to the 'social-background-variables' that 'right-wing-political-orientation', 'low education/low age' and less 'experience of learning about the Holocaust' cause more 'reservation concerning foreigners' as well as higher degrees of 'national identity' and 'authoritarian mentality'. With respect to the 'working-through-variables', however, our multiple regression analysis shows that - no matter what social background the participants come from -, high 'readiness to derive political consequences from the Holocaust', low 'non-acceptance of responsibility for the Holocaust' and high 'knowledge and understanding of the Holocaust facts' cause fewer 'Reservations concerning foreigners', as well as low degrees of 'national identity' and 'authoritarian mentality', whereas other elements of the 'working-through process' obviously do not have any important effect on the 'current attitudes'.

Concluding Remarks

Our quantitative - but nevertheless still exploratory - research has shown that the Holocaust is still at least of 'partial relevance' for the social and political perspectives of German youth today. But at the present stage of research the original theoretical assumption of a specific process of 'working through' the Holocaust in 5 steps (from knowledge and understanding of the facts to behavioral consequences with regard to Jewish people) could not be fully confirmed empirically.

The main hypothesis, however, that 'working through' the Holocaust might have an influence on current attitudes of young people related to specific social and political aspects of the FRG ('reservations concerning foreigners', 'national identity' and 'authoritarian personality traits') could be substantiated at least to a considerable degree, although 'social background variables' prove to be of more importance for the current attitudes of young people.

Our exploratory investigation has shown that further research in these matters is indicated before clear cut inferences can be drawn from it in educational policies and school education.

Remarks

- 1 The present article is a thoroughly revised version of Brusten/Beiner/Winkelmann 1991. For more details on the general concept of the research see Bar-On/Beiner/Brusten 1988; for comparative results of the German and Israeli parts of the research see Bar-On/Hare/Brusten/Beiner 1992. Without the financial support of the German Israeli Foundation (GIF) and the helpful, sometimes 'pushing' collaboration of our colleagues in Israel, in particular D. Bar-On, A. Gaon and O. Selah, this research would not have been completed the way it is now. We also thank S. Nippel, U. Leicht, K. Brendler and F. Beiner of the University of Wuppertal for the ideas and personal energy they have put into the development and realization of the present research. With respect to the translation into English we appreciate the help of C. Foskett.
- 2 The original common questionnaire was - for communicational reasons - developed initially in English and later translated into German and Hebrew, carefully trying to avoid producing different meanings in translating the agreed English version. The presentation of our research results will follow the same scheme as that of our Israeli colleagues as far as possible in order to match the findings (see Bar-On/Hare/Brusten/Beiner 1992). But despite these efforts a direct comparison of the results of the two research teams could not always be realized, because, although essentially the same instruments were used, factor analysis and other forms of data processing resulted in somewhat different indices and scales.
- 3 The original sample was n=1391 because it included young foreigners, who took part in the research but had to be excluded because of the specific 'German perspective' (in political attitudes, historical background of families etc.). Excluding them right from the beginning was considered to be too disturbing for the others in the same school-classes and seminars. The vast majority of those who took part in the research answered the questionnaire within 1 hour although some pupils, especially those of the 'Hauptschule', needed considerably more time.

These pupils also experienced the greatest problems as far as comprehension and concentration were concerned.

- 4 Cross checks with statistical data on pupils and students in Northrhine-Westphalia show that the 'structure' (distribution of age, sex, school-class, school-type, faculty discipline) of the sample is indeed more or less comparable with the general 'structure' of the population we intended to do research on.
- 5 There is no simple translation of German school levels into terms of foreign school systems. After four years at elementary school German pupils can choose between four different 'secondary schools', according to their academic capabilities. Although not intended, the educational levels of the different types of secondary schools in fact still correspond very much to the social stratification of the German population: The majority of pupils attending 'Hauptschule' come from lower social classes, those attending 'Realschule' predominantly from 'middle social classes' and those who originate from 'high social classes' tend to go to the 'Gymnasium'.
- 6 A similar procedure had already been used in the empirical studies of Raasch (1964) and Erlebach (1981). Only 16.8% of the pupils/students gave correct answers to all 5 questions, 27,2 % gave four, 26,6 % three, 19,9 % two, 7,4 % one and 2,0 % no correct answers.
- 7 In order to define a scale as internally consistent it must show a reliability coefficient of a Cronbach's Alpha of .7 (Bauer 1984, p.256) and a correlation coefficient of $r=.5$ for an 'adequate' Item-total-scale-correlation (Bauer 1984, p.249f).
- 8 The six experts were: Prof. Jäckel (University of Stuttgart); Prof. Klappert (Protestant Academy of Wuppertal); Prof. van Norden (University of Wuppertal); Prof. Peukert (Research Unit for Study of the History of 'National Socialism', Hamburg); Prof. Schoeps (University of Duisburg); Prof. Strauss (Centre for Research on Antisemitism, Berlin). Answers from the original questionnaire which the experts deemed to be confusing, ambiguous, contradictory and/or highly inconsistent were eliminated and are not included in the Appendix (2). The characters underlined in Appendix (2) are those which the experts agreed upon: 0-1= of little relevance; 1-2= relevant; 2-3= highly relevant.
- 9 Maximum of 5 correct answers for the questions of index B1 (knowledge of facts) and maximum of 18 for correct answers given in the multiple-choice test measuring the 'understanding of facts' (index B2). The correlation between the two indices was $r=.32$. Because of the different character of the statement with an original range of 7 steps for expressing 'agreement' the percentages of the answers had to be recalculated according to the 'dominant model' of possible reactions to scale B3.
- 10 The percentages of answers to this statement with originally 7 different possibilities to react (from -3 to +3) have been recalculated according to the 'dominant 4-step-model' of the other items only for the presentation in table (12). All reactions to all items of scale B3 have been recalculated by computer to a 7-step-scale for reasons of better comparison with the other 7-step-scales.
- 11 Because of the significance and 'face validity' of 'Super-Scale B.4' (Personal relevance of the Holocaust) it was decided to include the scale in further statistical analysis even though a sufficient reliability coefficient of a Cronbach's Alpha of $\geq .7000$ (cf. Bauer 1984, p. 256) was not quite reached.
- 12 The intercorrelations (Pearsons' r) between the items of the social-distance-scale B5:

	Item(1)	Item(2)	Item(3)	Item(4)
Item(1)	1.0000			
Item(2)	.6445	1.0000		
Item(3)	.5071	.6398	1.0000	
Item(4)	.3261	.4115	.5671	1.0000
Item(5)	.3211	.4133	.5101	.7904

- 13 To reduce the complexity all individual scales are reduced to five possible answers (from -2 to +2) by adding the percentages of the very extreme positions (-3/-2 into -2) and respectively +3/+2 into +2). Because of its significance and 'face validity', the super-scales' Cronbach's Alpha of .6332, although slightly below the minimum of .7000 (Bauer 1984, p. 256), was considered as satisfactory for using the superscale in further statistical analysis.
- 14 The youngsters were also asked about the involvement of their grandparents, parents and other close relatives in World War II. In contrast to the questions about their grandparents involvement in the Holocaust they could give more information about their grandparents involvement in World War II: 18.5 % said their grandparents 'were refugees after World War II', 18.1 % said they 'were killed during World War II', 5.2 % said they 'did not live in Germany during the Third Reich', and 0.9 % said they 'left Europe before World War II'. But about 1/4 of the respondents did not have any information about their grandparents involvement either in the Holocaust or in World War II.
- 15 The questions combined in Index C2 were somewhat more complex in the questionnaire, particularly with respect to the possible answers; for the index, however, only the simple yes-answers were counted. Because scale-analysis yielded only a non-significant Cronbach's Alpha of .4602 no scale was set up and there is only an index.
- 16 The criteria for applying multiple regression analysis (e.g. interval-scales/dummy variables) could not always be met and the n (=462) became very low because only those respondents were taken into account who had answered all the questions which were included in the regression analysis; in particular the 'n' is low because many youngsters said that they would not vote for any of the present political parties (Var: 'Party preference') and many others did not react to the statements on 'emotional reactions toward the Holocaust' (see table 12).
- 17 The correlations between the independent variables and Superscale A 'current attitudes' were as follows:
1. school level of pupils/students: Kendall's Tau B=.4596 (sign.=.0000)
 2. age of pupils/students: $r=.3687$ (sign.=.0000)
 3. political party preference: $\text{Chi}^2=.395,5$; (sign.=.0000); ETA=.5664
 4. experience of learning about the Holocaust $r=.2976$; (sign.=.0000)
 5. sex of pupils/students: $\text{Chi}^2=6,2$ (non significant); ETA=.0370
- 18 Other 'social-background-variables' than those in table 23 (such as sex, religion, school-lessons related to National-Socialism, parent's education and father's profession as well as 'family's involvement in the Holocaust') did not add to the equation of the multiple regression analysis, although further research on this aspect is needed.
- 19 Because of the fact that the sub-samples of 'pupils' and 'students' are very much linked with the subsamples of younger and older age-groups (see table (2)) leading to a Pearson's correlation coefficient of $r=.8$ between school-level and age, both variables are considered - at this stage of the research - as equally important for the variants of 'current attitudes' (super-scale A). In separate multiple-regression analysis for pupils on the one hand and students on the other hand the 'distorting effect' of this social-background-variable can be 'neutralized', whereas otherwise the results remain pretty much the same. For the sub-sample of 'pupils' the independent social background variables ('party preference', 'school-level' and 'learning experiences') explain 41 % of the variance of the 'current attitudes', whereas the 'working-through variables' ('non-acceptance of responsibility', 'political consequences' and 'knowledge/understanding') explain an additional 14 %. For the subsample of 'students' the social background variables ('party preference' and 'learning experiences') explain 32 % of the variance of the 'current attitudes' (because no effect of the variable 'school-level') is involved, the working-through variables ('political consequences' and 'non-acceptance of responsibility') explain an additional 13 %.

References

- ADORNO, T.W., U.A., *Der autoritäre Charakter. Studien über Autorität und Vorurteil*, Schwarze Reihe, Bd. 6, S. 387-427, Amsterdam 1986
- BAR-ON, D., BEINER, F., BRUSTEN, M. (Hrsg.), *Der Holocaust. Familiäre und gesellschaftliche Folgen*, Wuppertal 1988
- BAR-ON, D., BEINER, F., BRUSTEN, M., *Der Holocaust and its Relevance to Current Social Issues in the Federal Republic of Germany and Israel*, in: Bar-On, D., Beiner, F., Brusten, M. (Hrsg.), *Der Holocaust. Familiäre und gesellschaftliche Folgen*, S. 211-220, Wuppertal 1988
- BAR-ON, D., SELA, O., 'Partial Relevance' of the Holocaust. Description and Results of a Research with 1500 Students in Israel, in: Brendler, K., Rexilius, G. (Hrsg.), *Drei Generationen im Schatten der NS-Vergangenheit*, S. 187-203, Wuppertal 1991
- BAR-ON, D., HARE, P., BRUSTEN, M., BEINER, F., 'Working through' the Holocaust? Comparing the Questionnaire Results of German and Israeli Students, in: *Holocaust and Genocide Studies*, Israel, in print, 1992
- BAUER, F., *Datenanalyse mit SPSS*, Berlin 1984
- BOGARDUS, E.S., *Measuring Social Distance*. *Journal of Applied Sociology*, Vol. 9, S. 299-308, 1925
- BRENDLER, K., REXILIUS, G., *Drei Generationen im Schatten der NS-Vergangenheit*, Wuppertal 1991
- BRUSTEN, M., *Die Bedeutung des Holocaust für die Einstellung der deutschen Jugend zu aktuellen sozialen und politischen Fragen*, in: Ewald, U., Woweries, K. (Hrsg.), *Entwicklungsperspektiven von Kriminalität und Strafrecht*, Bonn 1992
- BRUSTEN, M., BEINER, F., WINKELMANN, B., *The Relevance of the Holocaust and Its Influence on Current Perspectives on German Youth*, in: Brendler, K., Rexilius, G. (Hrsg.), *Drei Generationen im Schatten der NS-Vergangenheit*, S. 164-186, Wuppertal 1991
- ERLEBACH, R., U.A., *Nationalsozialismus: Kenntnisse und Meinungen von Abiturienten 1961 und 1979*, in: *Politische Vierteljahresschrift, Sonderheft 12*, S. 337-343, 1981
- RAASCH, R., *Zeitgeschichte und Nationalbewußtsein, Forschungsergebnisse zu Fragen der politischen und allgemeinen Erziehung*, Berlin 1964
- WINKELMANN, B., *Einstellung heutiger Jugendlicher zum Holocaust. Zum historischen Bewußtsein 16-21jähriger*, in: Bar-On, D., Beiner, F., Brusten, M. (Hrsg.), *Der Holocaust. Familiäre und gesellschaftliche Folgen*, S. 194-213, Wuppertal 1988

Appendix (1): 'Knowledge of facts' related to the Holocaust

Introductory comment: Der Vernichtungsprozeß, dem Millionen europäischer Juden während des Dritten Reiches zum Opfer fielen, wird heute weltweit mit dem Wort "Holocaust" bezeichnet. Auch wir benutzen daher diesen Begriff, wenn es um den Massenmord an Juden in Deutschland und Europa während der Nazi-Diktatur 1933-1945 geht. Bitte kreuzen Sie bei den folgenden Fragen jeweils nur jene Antwort an, die Ihrer Meinung nach zutrifft.

Die "Endlösung" war:	pupils	students	all
(1) ein Deckname für das Ende des II. Weltkrieges	4,4%	0,6%	2,6%
(2) der Plan des oppositionellen Untergrundes, Hitler im Jahre 1944 umzubringen	7,8%	0,8%	4,5%
(3) die Idee der Judenausrottung, so wie sie in Hitlers Buch "Mein Kampf" beschrieben wurde	23,2%	18,4%	21,0%
(4) die Vernichtung aller Gegner des Nationalsozialismus während des Dritten Reichs	10,4%	7,0%	8,8%
(5) die Bezeichnung für das Programm der unmittelbaren und totalen Vernichtung der Juden ab 1941	53,8%	73,0%	62,8%

"Treblinka war:"

(1) ein Arbeitslager, in dem viele Zwangsarbeiter wegen Hunger und Krankheit umkamen	14,6%	9,2%	12,0%
(2) ein Konzentrationslager für Juden, die in den polnischen Ghettos keinen Platz hatten	22,0%	12,6%	17,5%
(3) ein Vernichtungslager für Juden aus dem Warschauer und anderen Ghettos, in dem mehr als 800.000 Menschen umgebracht wurden	44,8%	71,0%	57,3%
(4) ein polnisches Dorf, wo jüdische Überlebende nach dem II. Weltkrieg untergebracht wurden	18,2%	7,0%	12,9%

Die "Reichskristallnacht" ist der Name für:

(1) Die Nacht, in der 1939 die Wahl Hitlers zum Reichskanzler gefeiert wurde	3,3%	0,2%	1,9%
(2) die Nacht, in der die Nazis 1935 alle Reichsgegner ermordeten	2,7%	2,1%	2,4%
(3) die Nacht der Pogrome (Ausschreitungen) gegen die Juden im Jahre 1938	92,5%	97,3%	94,7%
(4) die Nacht, in der Deutschland den schwersten Luftangriff durch die Alliierten im Jahre 1944 erlitt	1,5%	0,4%	1,0%

Die "Nürnberger Gesetze" waren:

(1) Rechtsverordnungen der Siegermächte von 1945 für die Nürnberger Prozesse gegen die Naziverbrecher	22,6%	38,9%	30,2%
(2) Gesetze der Nazi-Regierung von 1935, in denen die Einschränkungen für Juden und andere Minoritäten festgelegt wurden	53,8%	52,2%	53,1%
(3) Gesetze nach der Machtergreifung Hitlers, um die deutsche Wirtschaft nach der Inflation in Gang zu bringen	5,6%	0,8%	3,3%
(4) Notstandsgesetze, die in Nürnberg nach Beginn des II. Weltkriegs 1939 in Kraft gesetzt wurden	18,1%	7,9%	13,3%

Wie verhielten sich die Nationalsozialisten gegenüber Geisteskranken ("Euthanasie-Programm")?

(1) steckten sie in Konzentrationslager	31,4%	20,2%	26,2%
(2) bauten für sie moderne Irrenanstalten	2,6%	0,6%	1,6%
(3) wiesen sie in Arbeitshäuser ein	2,6%	0,6%	1,6%
(4) starteten ein Massenvernichtungsprogramm	55,3%	72,2%	63,1%
(5) setzten sie als Versuchspersonen beim Probetauchen von Unterseebooten ein	7,2%	4,3%	5,8%

Appendix (2): 'Understanding/assessment of facts related to the Holocaust'

Introductory comment: There are several explanations possible for certain events of the Holocaust. Please use for your assessment of the explanation given the following numbers: 0=not true, 1=slightly true, 2=fairly true, 3= very true

	nicht zutreffend		sehr zutreffend
1. Motive und Ursachen für die Judenvernichtung waren:			
- wirtschaftliche Erwägungen: Aufbesserung der Staatsfinanzen für die Kriegsführung	0	1	2 3
- die "Rassentheorie" der deutschen "Experten"	0	1	2 3
- Hitlers Persönlichkeit	0	1	2 3
- eine durch unglückliche Ereignisse ausgelöste Entscheidung gegenüber Randgruppen und Minderheiten, die vorher nicht geplant war	0	1	2 3
2. Die Juden wurden das Hauptziel des Vernichtungsprozesses:			
- wegen ihrer Rolle in der deutschen Wirtschaft vor der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus	0	1	2 3
- weil Weizmann, der Vorsitzende der zionistischen Bewegung, den Deutschen gemeinsam mit den Alliierten 1939 den Krieg erklärte	0	1	2 3
- wegen der Ideologie der "Rassenhygiene"	0	1	2 3
- weil die Juden mit der Politik der Nationalsozialisten nicht einverstanden waren	0	1	2 3
- wegen des Antisemitismus bei Hitler und den anderen Nazi-Größen	0	1	2 3
- weil den Nationalsozialisten keine andere geeignete Lösung einfiel	0	1	2 3
3. Das "Euthanasie-Programm" (Tötung von Behinderten) wurde gestoppt:			
- wegen des Widerstandes einiger deutscher Kirchenführer	0	1	2 3
- wegen des Kriegsausbruchs und der damit verbundenen Mobilisierung aller Kräfte	0	1	2 3
- weil sich die deutschen Ärzte weigerten, auf diese Weise zu töten	0	1	2 3
4. Das Programm zur Ermordung der Juden wurde bis zum Kriegsende nicht abgebrochen:			
- weil es keinen internationalen Druck auf Deutschland gab, damit aufzuhören	0	1	2 3
- weil die Deutschen kaum Widerstand leisteten	0	1	2 3
- wegen des Judenhasses bei anderen Nationalitäten (Ukrainer, Letten,...)	0	1	2 3
- wegen der Entschlossenheit der deutschen Führung	0	1	2 3
- wegen des fehlenden Widerstands der Kirchen	0	1	2 3

Note: with respect ot the underlined characters see remark 8