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There can be little doubt that one source of friction between groups is dislike of members of a group other than one’s own. This aversion may be expressible as an aversion to an entire group. Although such aversions are often claimed to be based on a perceived historical insult, this cannot directly explain aversion to the descendants of the offending group, insofar as they were not even alive at the time of the offense.

Some scholarly attention has been paid to trauma and resiliency in survivors (e.g., Suedfeld, Krell, Wiebe, & Steel, 1997), and even to the transmission of trauma to future generations (Bar-On et al., 1998). Our interest is in another consequence of “ethnic” trauma, which is aversion to the perpetrators and descendants of the conflict, among survivors, and in the broader culture (here, in Jewish American college students who were born well after World War II). We have shown for American Jewish Holocaust survivors that some are averse to even being in the proximity of Germans who were not yet alive during World War II (Cherfas, Rozin, Cohen, Davidson, & McCauley, 2006). One psychologically important question is what maintains such an aversion, something of particular importance now in a world filled with long-running ethnic conflicts.

What is particularly surprising is the degree of variability that people show in such aversion. In our prior article on this topic (Cherfas et al., 2006), we assessed German aversion in 29 American Holocaust survivors in two ways. One was a measure of degree of discomfort in being a next-door neighbor to a person with a link to Germany (from an old, formerly active Nazi, to a grandson of a German soldier during World War II; 13 relevant exemplars, in all), and the other was a measure of discomfort in interacting with objects or being involved in activities that had some link to Germany (e.g., eating at a German restaurant, using a German-manufactured product; 12 relevant exemplars). We found a surprising variation in German aversion on both of these measures, across the 29 survivors, anchored by a few individuals with discomfort (aversion) to anything German, to, at the other end, survivors who were comfortable with anything German so long as it did not have a direct link to Nazis. Such a range of variation is not easy to account for given the horrific exposure that these individuals had to Nazi Germans.

In our prior study (Cherfas et al., 2006), we initiated a search for accounts for variation in German aversion. In the present study, we supplement the results from the 29 American survivors, which we present again here in somewhat modified form, with results from 30 Czech Holocaust survivors (Study 1), and 154 Jewish American college students (Study 2). These three groups enable us to see how such aversion is represented in groups that differ along a number of interesting dimensions. But because of procedural differences and the cultural and generational differences between our samples, we present them in separate studies.

The young Jewish sample may be particularly interesting because in recent years the level of resentment toward Germans has declined; it may be that this could be because of Germany’s wide-scale acknowledgment of the Holocaust and reparation efforts, which does increase willingness to reconcile (Vollhardt, Mazur, & Lemahieu, 2014). Nevertheless, there may still be a wide range of aversion, and it will be interesting to see whether the structure and predictors of such aversion are the same or different than among survivors. Given that how people represent genocide varies across individuals in some important ways (Bilali, 2013; Bilewicz & Jaworska, 2013; Vollhardt, 2013), we examined several candidates to explain variation in German aversion.

One candidate was the degree of trauma experienced in the Holocaust. It is intuitively sensible that those people who were most victimized and lost the most family members would evidence the most aversion. However, our prior results (Cherfas et al., 2006) did not support this as a predictor of aversions.

A second candidate explanation was German origin. We previously reported suggestive data supporting this hypothesis: 5 of the 29 survivors we interviewed were of German birth, and they showed lower German aversion. In the present study, we can compare Czech or Slovakian survivors (subsequently referred to as Czech) and American survivors, because, on account of both physical proximity to Germany and strong German cultural influences, Czechs had much more pre- and post–World War II exposure to Germans than did the American sample, most of
whom were born in eastern Europe, and now live in the United States.

There are several reasons why being born in Germany or being familiar with Germans and Germany could result in less aversion. The principle of latent inhibition in classical conditioning, which applies to phobias, may be relevant. Prior innocuous or positive exposure to a person or object makes it resistant to subsequent aversive conditioning. For example, individuals who have prior safe exposure to dogs are less likely to develop dog phobias when traumatized by a dog, compared with those with minimal dog experience (Rozin, Wrzesniewski, & Byrnes, 1998). The first Germans many Holocaust survivors met were Nazi SS soldiers herding them into ghettos, cattle cars, or overseeing them in concentration camps.

Additional, more social–cognitive reasons why being born in Germany could result in less aversion are outgroup homogeneity and stereotyping processes. To the extent that people had more cultural contact with Germans before the war, they might have perceived Germans as a more heterogeneous group, and not believed that all Germans were complicit in the genocide. Finally and relatedly, seeing Germans as a less homogeneous group would probably reduce essentialism, the idea that Germans are all the same, because of some hidden essence that makes them German (Haslam, Rothschild, & Ernst, 2003).

A third candidate account for degree of aversion is degree of identity with the victimized group (here, Jews). A possible account of such an aversion is that victim groups encourage such a response, and inculcate it in succeeding generations (Wohl & Branscombe, 2004), perhaps through cultural identity and religious identity processes. Social identity theory says that people’s self-definitions are affected by their membership in social groups, along with the value they place on, and emotional significance of, such memberships. People robustly prefer their ingroups to outgroups (Deaux, 1996; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The more Jews identify with Judaism, the more they should be willing to derogate a salient outgroup (here, Germans). All of our survivors and college students are at least nominally Jewish. Jewishness is often defined by parentage (Cohen & Hill, 2007), and this was the way the Nazis defined it. However, individuals vary in the importance they attach to various ingroup identities, and Jews are no exception. Jewish ethnic or religious identification is secondary for some Jews, and central for others. In our initial work (Cherfas et al., 2006), we reported a positive relation between religiosity and German aversion. We explore this relation with two other samples in this study, and with a more extensive measure of Jewish identity (derived from Brown, Condor, Matthews, Wade, & Williams, 1986).

A fourth candidate account explored in our initial study was degree of blame toward Germans of different degrees of direct responsibility for the Holocaust. One aspect of attributions that has been studied in the context of the Holocaust is accounts for why some individuals survived (e.g., being particularly resourceful, looking relatively more Aryan, speaking German, blind luck), and in more general attributional styles (Suedfeld, 2003). We expected some correspondence between blame and aversion. On the one hand, it certainly stands to reason that people would be more averse to Germans who were directly or indirectly to blame for the Holocaust. On the other hand, blame and aversion are clearly not isomorphic, and one of the primary motivations for this study and the prior one (Cherfas et al., 2006) was the observation that many modern Jews are averse to Germans who were born after World War II (Cherfas et al., 2006). In our prior work, we created a measure of German blame using the same 13 individuals who formed the basis for our German person aversion measure. There was a substantial and significant relationship here, even with only 29 survivors, with a correlation of a blame score of .58 with German person aversion and .45 with German activity discomfort.

A fifth candidate account to explain variation in German aversion is forgiveness. In prior work we have shown that a general disposition to be forgiving when it comes to everyday offenses is a separate issue for Jewish people than is forgiveness for even one murder. Jewish law and tradition highly encourages forgiveness, but Judaism treats some offenses as unforgivable, even by God. Even one murder is unforgivable in Jewish law because some offenses are too severe to forgive; only victims can forgive; and forgiveness must be predicated on acts of repentance by the offender toward the actual victim (Dorff, 1998). Thus, forgiveness is a com-
plicated issue psychologically, culturally, and
theologically, when it comes to genocide, in
Judaism. Empirically speaking, Jewish partici-
pants do endorse these reasons for nonforgive-
ness much more so than Christians do, and these
reasons fully mediated a lesser willingness to
forgive a Holocaust offense on the part of Jews,
compared with Christians (Cohen, Malka, Ro-
zin, & Cherfas, 2006). Forgiveness would
clearly be hypothesized to go with less aversion,
but again (as with blame), these are hardly the
same thing; we can forgive and still be averse to
a person, and we can be averse to people who
share no objective blame for an offense.

Finally, a possibility not explored in our prior
research, is German essentialism. Many indi-
viduals hold essentialist views about ethnic and
other groups (Haslam et al., 2003). Another
possible account is the conception, in some peo-
ple, that ethnic identity is indelible, and passed
from one generation to the next. This identity
could be conceived to carry with it a set of
attitudes, behavioral dispositions, and preju-
dices. Indelibility and transmission across gen-
erations relates to the idea of essentialism (e.g.,
Gelman, 2003; Haslam et al., 2003). The idea is
that “Germanness” is an essential, indelible cat-
egory, and uniformly distributed property,
passed down to a considerable degree, from one
generation to the next. Essentialism would be an
obvious way of explaining both blame for and
aversion to German descendants of Germans
active during World War II. Nonetheless it
seems possible to make a more tentative but
competing hypothesis. When people are per-
ceived to act immorally because of some in-
born, biological trait, people may judge the ac-
tor as being partially exculpated by their lack of
perceived control over their behavior (Mon-
terosso, Royzman, & Schwartz, 2005). Thus,
we were open to the possibility that more es-
sentialism could go with less blame and aver-
sion.

Current Goals

In the present study, we aim to build on this
prior work with Jewish American Holocaust
survivors, by also examining Czech Holocaust
survivors (Study 1) and American Jewish col-
lege students born well after World War II
(Study 2). The two additional samples allow us
to confirm our previously observed levels of
blame and aversion, and to examine in some
degree, what accounts for the wide range in
attributed blame (limited by the elderly nature of
our two survivor samples, and the small
sample sizes). We aimed here to:

(a) further document the wide range of Ger-
man aversion, measured as both a person and an
activity aversion, in two other Jewish samples
(Czech survivors and college students);

(b) gain further evidence on prewar familiar-
ity with Germans, religiosity (adding a Jewish
identity measure), and degree of blame for Ger-
mans in accounting for variability in German
aversion;

(c) obtain evidence to explore two hypothe-
ses (essentialism and forgiveness) that were not
addressed in our prior work (Cherfas et al.,
2006).

Study 1

In this study, we report on our Czech survi-
vors, and compare them to our previous data
from U.S. survivors.

Participants

The basic protocol used in this study and
the methods of subject recruitment were ap-
proved by the Institutional Review Board at
the University of Pennsylvania. The Ameri-
can Holocaust survivors were recruited in
2002, from three New York organizations and
one Philadelphia organization, and by word of
mouth. Eight were born in Poland, 7 in the
Ukraine, 6 in Czechoslovakia, 5 in Germany,
2 in Hungary, and 1 in Israel (who emigrated
to Europe before the War). Four of the inter-
viewees comprised two pairs of spouses. The
interviews were held in participants’ homes,
or at the meeting places of their organiza-
tions. To acknowledge participation, investi-
gators made donations to Holocaust charities
of respondents’ choosing. Participants were
told that the interviews were part of a study of
Holocaust survivors’ current lives and atti-
dutes, as opposed to primarily recording their
war experiences, and were ensured of the
confidentiality of their responses. Interviews
were recorded on audiotape, and lasted 90
min to 3 hr, with one of the authors always
present (LC). Seven of the interviews were
conducted in Russian (by LC, a native speaker).

The Czech survivors were contacted through personal networks by two of the authors (TR and JR), the former being himself a Holocaust survivor. The data were collected in 2006, 4 years after the data collection from the American survivors. All participants agreed to an anonymous 2- to 3-hr interview, and signed appropriate consent forms. Of the 30 Czech survivors, all were born in Czechoslovakia (currently Czech Republic or Slovakia). Two listed German as one of their native languages, and all but one reported that they spoke fluent German. This is not surprising, because Germany borders on Czechoslovakia, and German was the principal foreign language taught and used in pre-World War II Czechoslovakia.

The protocol was essentially identical to our prior article except that for the Czech survivors, items about their experiences during World War II were obtained through a handwritten paragraph or two summarizing these experiences. The Czech protocol was translated from English into Czech by an individual fluent in both languages and was back-translated and then verified by another person fluent in both languages. Some minor changes were made. In addition, a few of the questions in the Czech sample (particularly about German essentialism) were not subject to data analysis because of translation difficulties.

Measures

Given wide variation in the education level and English fluency of our participants, we used a simplified dichotomous card sort task. We presented each item on a laminated card, so it was in full view for the respondent as the questions were read by the interviewer. This two-category card sort procedure was designed specifically for this study to measure aversion (discomfort) to German-related people, blame for these same people, German-related products and activities with varying relations to the Holocaust, and whether people had actually done each of these activities. Cards were presented in the same, quasi-random order to each participant, balancing intensity as a reminder of the Holocaust. The departure from random order involved not beginning the sequence with overly aversive or traumatic examples. Unlike a Q-sort, participants were not asked to sort the cards into any number of piles that made sense to them. The cards were just used to make the questions easier to understand for our sample of older adults.

Aversion. Participants were given a set of 15 cards describing target people with varying relationships to the Holocaust (Table 1). For example, cards included an “80-year-old former German army soldier who served in France” and a “65-year-old German who was in the Hitler Youth at age 8.” Participants were asked to sort the cards into two labeled piles, according to whether they would feel “comfortable” or “uncomfortable” living next door to each of these hypothetical target persons. The proportion of 13 of the 15 items that individuals sorted as “uncomfortable” is our score of aversion. (Two items not included in this score are as follows: (a) an American/Czech pediatrician [a control item] and (b) A Kapo [camp inmate who assisted the Nazis] [because this person was not German].) A score of 100 indicates discomfort for all exemplars, including individuals born after World War II, and individuals of German origin who were not in Germany during World War II. A score of 0 means no discomfort at any of the exemplars. The same exact items, in the same randomized order, were presented to all respondents. The items and their order of presentation are indicated in Table 1.

Activity. For this measure participants were given a set of 19 cards (or items on the survey for the students) describing activities related to Germany or Germans; for example, “Using a German kitchen appliance” and “Riding in a new Volkswagen.” In retrospect, four of these instances were found to be ambiguous or otherwise problematic for interpretation, and three were control items not about German-related activities (such as petting a greyhound dog). Our analyses depend upon results from the remaining 12 cards/choices (fully described, with order information, in Table 3). Participants were asked to sort the cards into “comfortable” and “uncomfortable.” The percentage of the 12 items called “uncomfortable” constituted for each respondent the German Activity Aversion score. The same exact items, in the same order, were presented to all respondents.

Blame. We directly assessed blame for each of the 13 German person “targets,” using exactly the same procedure (cards for the sur-
vivors, questionnaire for the students) we used to assess Aversion. Instructions for the survivors were: “Here are two category cards: one says ‘has some blame for the Holocaust’ and the other says ‘Has NO blame for the Holocaust.’ I ask you to put each person where he or she belongs in your opinion: some blame or no blame at all.’

**Religiosity and identity.** We used two measures of Jewish “affiliation” or identity. One
was a simple six point religiosity scale: “How religious are you?” scored from 1 (not at all) to 6 (deeply). Jewish identity is based on the 6-item group identity scale of Brown et al. (1986). The six items, all rated on a standard 5-point agreement scale (from strongly agree to strongly disagree), are as follows: “I identify with other members of my religious group; My religious group is important to my identity; I think of myself as a member of my religious group; I feel close to other members of my religious group; When someone criticizes my religious group, it feels like a personal insult; When I talk about members of my religious group, I usually say ‘we’ rather than ‘they.’” Identity is the mean response from the six items. This Jewish identity scale was not completed by our U.S. survivors, in our prior article. The U.S. survivors and the Czech survivors completed the religiosity question.

General procedure. The order of events in both sets of interviews was as follows: introductory materials, demographics (including religiosity) and history of the individual (or family for students) during World War II, current health, multiple example card sort or survey measures of blame, aversion, activity, and identity. The interview included other items not reported here, located primarily in the middle of the sequence of items. These items included a repetition of the 19 German activity items, but asking whether the respondent had done any of these activities. We do not include these results because much of the variance in these items was caused by amount of opportunity to engage in the various activities. The excluded questions also included some about perceived anti-Semitism, views of threats to current Judaism, aversion to Arabs, and attitudes to Palestinians.

Results

Demographics

The Czech and American Holocaust samples are quite similar in many respects. The American sample was 72% female, and the Czech sample was 70% female. The mean age for the Americans was 77.6 (SD = 6.2), while the Czech mean was 79.3 (SD = 4.2). The Czech sample was actually slightly younger when they experienced the Holocaust, because their data were collected 4 years later than the American data. The Czech sample was more highly educated: 17 of 29 had a college degree as their highest educational attainment and 7 had a post baccalaureate degree. For the Americans, 5 had 3 years of post high school education, 5 held a bachelor’s degree as their highest educational level, and one held a graduate degree.

German Aversion (Aversion)

The items are listed in Table 1. These results were almost identical in ordering to the results from the Holocaust survivors. Percentage reporting discomfort are presented in Table 1 and Figure 1 (in order of decreasing aversion).

The strongest, and almost unanimous discomfort, comes from active German partici-
pants in the Holocaust: Joseph Goebbels and the former Auschwitz SS officer (last two lines of Table 1). The next most aversive category (27% to 77% for Czech survivors, 79% to 88% for U.S. survivors) included people who were alive in Germany during World War II, including a soldier in the German army (in France), a corporate executive, and a young member of the Hitler Youth. (Also at this level is a Kapo [non German “collaborator” in the concentration camps], but we do not include that item in our analysis, because the person is not German.)

A yet less aversive (discomfort producing) category, involving for most instances and groups less than a majority of participants, (0% to 13% for Czech survivors, 45% to 74% for U.S. survivors) is those who are descendants of individuals active during World War II (e.g., grandson of an Auschwitz SS officer, son or grandson of a German soldier who served in the German army in France). Mixed in with this group is a German mother/housewife from World War II, who might technically belong in the active-during-World-War-II group. A final group, which elicits minimal aversion, is people of German origin who were not in Germany during the War, or a German who was in the resistance movement to the Nazis 0%–13% for Czech survivors, and 17%–36% for U.S. survivors). It is notable that well above 25% of the respondents showed discomfort toward Germans who were descendants of World War II Nazis, but not alive during World War II. Such participants can be described as averse to Germans. A lower number of participants were averse to individuals of German origin who were not in Germany during World War II.

As shown in Figure 2 and Table 2 (line 1), there are substantial differences in aversion across the U.S. and Czech groups. Aversion was much higher in the U.S. survivors than in the Czech survivors (34%), significant by a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Perhaps the most striking finding on aversion, reported originally for the U.S. survivors (Cherfas et al., 2006), is the very wide range of aversion (Figure 3). Six of the 29 U.S. survivors showed aversion scores of 80% or more, and 6 showed less than 20%. For the 30 Czech survivors, with notably lower levels of aversion, 13 showed less than 10% and three more than 40%. To assess the resemblance of the patterns of aversion across the three samples, we calculated a Pearson correlation across the pair, with the entries being the percentage discomfort for each of the 11 items (excluding the two Nazi exemplars, the Kapo, and the control American pediatrician). The agreement is extremely high: the correlation was .84.

**German-Related Activity**

The precise text of the activity items is presented in Table 3. The link of these items to the Nazis is much looser than the link with specific persons. Only three items could claim to have such a link: owning stock in a World War II German company, watching movies about the war with Germany, and petting a German sheepdog (the dogs typically used by the Germans in the camps). In addition, Wagner is associated with some positions that later be-
came part of Nazi ideology. Owning stock from a German company active during the war produces the most discomfort for all groups (88% for U.S. survivors, 17% for Czech survivors), and averaging across groups, watching movies about the war with Germany ranks second. Petting the German shepherd and listening to Wagner rank considerably lower (Table 3). Two items showing substantial aversion involve close and/or extensive contact with either Germans (traveling in Germany) or their language (hearing German spoken). The other contacts described, such as eating at a German restaurant or using German-made products show weak effects. Generally, for the set of persons and activities we selected, aversion is considerably higher than activity. The only major violation of the finding that U.S. survivors show the highest discomfort and Czech survivors show the lowest discomfort comes from the very high discomfort of Czechs concerning “watching World War II movies about the war with Germany.”

There are major differences between the groups in activity. The average score for the U.S. survivors (52) was much higher than the scores for Czech survivors (15; Table 2; Figure 2). Many participants, especially among the Czech survivors (13/30), showed less than

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range scale</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Czech survivors</th>
<th>U.S. survivors</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Group differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aversion</td>
<td>0–100</td>
<td>43 (18)</td>
<td>28 (19)</td>
<td>58 (27)</td>
<td>17.659</td>
<td>S-Z: .001 S-U: .001 U-Z: .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>0–100</td>
<td>22 (21)</td>
<td>15 (13)</td>
<td>52 (28)</td>
<td>29.491</td>
<td>S-Z: .001 U-Z: .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>0–100</td>
<td>34 (12)</td>
<td>24 (12)</td>
<td>48 (20)</td>
<td>25.062</td>
<td>S-Z: .01 S-U: .001 U-Z: .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>1–6</td>
<td>3.06 (1.35)</td>
<td>1.60 (.89)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.60)</td>
<td>15.121</td>
<td>S-Z: .001 U-Z: .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Jewish identity</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>4.04 (.69)</td>
<td>3.83 (.59)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Essentialism</td>
<td>1–5</td>
<td>2.52 (.64)</td>
<td>3.28 (.62)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>S-U: .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The students, Czech survivors, and U.S. survivors columns show the mean group score (SD). For students, n varies from 153–154. Fs are from analysis of variance (ANOVA) tests with 2 between-groups df and 209–210 within-groups df. The Group Differences column shows significant differences between groups by Scheffe tests: S = students; Z = Czech survivors; U = U.S. survivors. The difference indicated is followed by the two-tailed p level for that difference.

Figure 3. Cumulative number of participants, ordered by degree of aversion. The x-axis represents the cumulative number of participants as a function of increasing discomfort score, with 30 for Czech survivors, 29 for U.S. survivors. Because of the much larger n (154) for students, the plot represents the mean for each group of five students, so, for example, the first value indicates that for the lowest first five students, the mean was zero.
10% activity aversion, and even the most averse Czechs (3) showed only 42%. In contrast, only 3 U.S. survivors scored less than 10%, and 6 scored over 90%. Overall, as with aversion, there was wide variation in response to German objects/activities (Figure 4). To assess the resemblance of the patterns of discomfort across the three samples, we calculated a Pearson correlation, with the entries being the percentage discomfort for each of the 12 items. The agreement is small to moderately high: .24 for Czech survivor versus U.S. survivor.

Aversion and activity were substantially correlated: \( r = .71 \) for Czech survivors, and \( r = .68 \) for U.S. survivors. Correlations in this range strongly suggest a common element in negativity to Germans and German activities/products, but also some distinct difference between persons and nonhuman entities. For this reason, we kept these two scores, separately, as the dependent variables we wished to explain.

### Predictors of Aversion and Activity

**Blame.** The most obvious explanation of the degree to which a Jew is averse to Germans is the degree to which each of the German person “targets” is deemed to be responsible for the Holocaust. For this reason, we measured blame for each person.

The results (% blame) are presented by group for each person in Table 1. We see the familiar group differences: The U.S. survivors assigned the most blame, with a mean of 48% of the 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Czech survivors</th>
<th>U.S. survivors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Listening to the music of Beethoven</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Using a German kitchen appliance, like a Krups coffee maker</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Petting a German Shepherd dog</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Listening to the music of Wagner</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Riding in a new Volkswagen</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Handling German paper Deutschmarks made in 1980</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Owning stock now in a German company that was formed after World War II</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Eating at a German restaurant in the U.S.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Watching World War II movies about the war with Germany</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hearing the German language spoken</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Traveling to Germany</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Owning stock now in a German company that was active during World War II</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The order is based on the increasing values for students. Position means the position of the item as presented to the participants.

Figure 4. Cumulative discomfort at engaging in a range of German-related activities (see Figure 3 legend).
instances, compared with 24% for Czech survivors (Table 2; all group pairs significantly different at \( p < .01 \) or better).

The most critical question is the extent to which individuals assign blame to the descendants of World War II Germans, descendants who were not alive during the War. Whereas only 3% of Czech survivors assigned some blame to a “25-year-old German male whose grandfather was a German army soldier who served in France,” 31% (\( n = 9 \)) of U.S. Holocaust survivors did. In particular, the Czech survivors seemed to restrict their blame to people who played some military or corporate role in World War II.

To assess the resemblance of the patterns of blame across the three samples, we calculated a Pearson correlation, with the entries being the percentage blame for each of the 13 items. The agreement was very high (\( r = .90 \)) for Czech survivor versus U.S. survivor. Because the same 13 items are measured for aversion and blame, we can look at the relation between the pattern of aversion across targets and the pattern of blame. The correlation between these 13 pairs of scores was \( r = .93 \) for Czech survivors, and \( r = .88 \) for U.S. survivors. These very high correlations support a substantial link between blame and aversion.

As a first measure of the importance of blame in understanding aversion and activity, we examine the Pearson correlation between these scores. The correlations were moderate to substantial, especially for blame and aversion: \( rs = .56 \) and \( .73 \) for U.S. survivors and Czech survivors, respectively. The correlations for blame with activity were lower, \( rs = .46 \), and \( .45 \), respectively.

It seems unreasonable to some to blame a descendant of Germans born after World War II, even if there is aversion, so this subset of individuals is of special importance in understanding aversion/discomfort. Blame scores were lower than aversion scores in all groups (Figure 2). In particular, there are four person exemplars who were born after World War II. Putting all participants together, the member of the German resistance had only 9 people who showed aversion/discomfort, and only 2 who assigned any blame. The grandson of a German World War II soldier had 56 averse, but only 13 blamed. The son of the German World War II soldier, generationally closer to the War, had 70 averse and 18 blamed. And the grandson of a Nazi SS officer in Auschwitz had 99 averse, but only 20 blamed. These numbers indicate that there is more than blame behind aversion. Of course, there is little if any direct link between blame and activity, but the correlations are moderately high.

Religiosity and identity. The U.S. survivors did not complete the identity scale. The correlation between religiosity and Jewish identity was \( r = .32 \) for the Czechs.

Correlations between religiosity with aversion and activity (Table 4) were for the U.S. survivors, of moderate magnitude (\( rs = .26 \) and \( .45 \), respectively). On the other hand, the Czech correlations were lower (\( rs = .14 \) and \( .06 \), respectively). Correlations between identity and aversion were low for the Czechs (\( rs = -.06 \) and \( .04 \), respectively). For religiosity, the low Czech correlations may result from the fact that they showed a low level of religiosity and small degree of variance compared with the U.S. survivors (Table 2).

German origin (or German familiarity). For most of the unfortunate Jews who spent time in work or death camps, their first contact with Germans was with the guards in the camp. However, for some, there was prior exposure to Germans under much more favorable conditions, which puts the camp guards in a different context. Jews of German origin are the prime example. Also, the Czech survivors, in general, had considerable familiarity with Germans, because Germany borders on Czechoslovakia, and German was the second language of the country. In addition, the Czechs had decades of postwar coexistence with Germans and Germany. In our prior study (Cherfas et al., 2006), we reported less aversion for the 5 American survivors who had German origin (\( M = .43, SD = .07 \)), as opposed to the 24 who did not (\( M = .57, SD = .28 \), \( t(27) = 2.05, p = .05 \)). The significantly lower aversion and activity in Czech as opposed to American survivors (Table 2; Figure 2) is also supportive of the importance of prior exposure to Germans and Germany.

Study 2

In this study, we explored similar issues as in Study 1, but with American Jewish students.
Because of the generational and cultural differences among American Jewish students, compared with U.S. or Czech Holocaust survivors, this sample enables us to begin to document how aversion to Germans, and its predictors, are transmitted to future generations. Furthermore, the opportunity to have a larger sample size would enable us to have more precision in identifying relations, and to ask questions using more sophisticated analytic techniques (e.g., regression analyses) than are possible with the small sample sizes of our survivors.

Participants

The data from 154 Jewish college students were collected in 2002, on paper-and-pencil surveys distributed to Jewish students in psychology classes or at the campus Hillel Jewish community center at the University of Pennsylvania. The Jewish college students were all at approximately the same educational level. They were 49.4% female, and had a mean age of 19.5 years (SD = 1.4).

Measures

Our measures were similar to the ones already discussed, administered via questionnaire rather than via interview. For the student group, the α = .88 on the identity scale.

Some measures were slightly adapted. For example, for the Blame variable, the student instructions read: “Each of the following items describes a hypothetical person possibly associated with World War II activities. His or her age is indicated as in the year 2000. For each person, indicate whether in your opinion that person has SOME blame for the Holocaust (write in a B), or has NO blame for the Holocaust (write in an N).”

Given the questionnaire format, it was also possible to include additional questions that would have made the Holocaust interview protocols too long. These additional questions were primarily two existing trait forgiveness scales. One was Berry’s 5 scenario Transgression Narrative Test of Forgiveness (TNTF; Berry, Worthington, Parrott, O’Connor, & Wade, 2001). The other was the 10-item forgiveness scale from the Values in Action (VIA) inventory of 24 virtues (Peterson & Seligman, 2004). We also added a measure of essentialism. We measured essentialism as having two components, in conjunction with Haslam et al.’s (2003) analysis: (a) a sense of genetic origin and indelibility, and (b) a sense of homogeneity of a group. The 3 items employed, for the two American samples (students and Holocaust survivors), all measured on the standard 5-point agree-disagree scale, were: “Once a child is raised as Nazi, this can never be erased; Once a German, always a German; All or almost all Germans are alike.”

Table 4
Pearson Correlations of Predictor Variables With Two Dependent Variables Plus Blame (Students/Czech Survivors/U.S. Survivors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Aversion</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Blame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Blame</td>
<td>.35/.73/56</td>
<td>.32/45/46</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td>.27/.14/26</td>
<td>.38/06/45</td>
<td>.27/19/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>.31/.06/</td>
<td>.35/04/</td>
<td>.23/.10/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Essentialism</td>
<td>.40/.37</td>
<td>.31/.44</td>
<td>.30/.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>German origin</td>
<td>.2/-26/</td>
<td>.2/-37/</td>
<td>.1/.06/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Forgiveness</td>
<td>.2/-20/</td>
<td>.2/-22/</td>
<td>.1/-15/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Any correlation that is above .25 is in bold. Any correlation that is significant (p < .05, two tailed) is underlined. Because of the large difference in group sample size (29 to 154 participants), lower correlations are much more likely to be significant in the student sample. As a guideline, for one-tailed tests, for the 153–154 students, a correlation of r = .14 is significant at p < .05, r = .19 at p < .01, and r = .25 at p < .001. For the 30 Czech participants, r = .31 is significant at p < .05, r = .43 at p < .01, and r = .55 at p < .001. For the 29 U.S. participants, r = .32 is significant at p < .05, r = .43 at p < .01, and r = .55 at p < .001. Blank entries indicate that the measure in question was not available for the group in question. Forgiveness means combined and equally weighted Berry and Values in Action (VIA) scores.
Results

Table 1 contains the percentages of participants reporting discomfort to and blame of Germans. Students had aversions to descendants (e.g., grandson of an Auschwitz SS officer, son or grandson of a German soldier who served in the German army in France) of individuals active in World War II that was between those of the Czech and U.S. survivors (25% to 46% discomfort for students, 0% to 13% for Czech survivors, 45% to 74% for U.S. survivors).

As shown in Figure 2 and Table 2, there are substantial differences in aversion across the three groups. Aversion was much higher in the U.S. survivors (mean of 60%), compared with students (44%) and Czech survivors (34%), with all differences significant by a one-way ANOVA. The largest between-groups difference is that the Czech survivors, much more than any other group, show minimal if any aversion to any Germans who were not Nazis.

Perhaps the most striking finding on aversion, reported originally for the U.S. survivors (Cherfas et al., 2006), is the very wide range of aversion. For the 154 students, 58 showed less than 10% aversion, and 6 showed more than 70% aversion. To assess the resemblance of the patterns of aversion across the three samples, we calculated a Pearson correlation across each pair of groups, with the entries being the percentage discomfort for each of the 11 items (excluding the two Nazi exemplars, the Kapo, and the control American pediatrician). The agreement is extremely high: the correlation was .92 for student versus Czech survivor, .86 for student versus U.S. survivor, and .84 for Czech survivor versus U.S. survivor. It is notable that just as the level of Czech discomfort is much lower than the two other groups, the similarity in the pattern of discomfort was much higher (r = .62) across the two American groups than between either American group or the Czechs (rs = .28 and .24). The Czech correlations were lower partly because there was much less variation in the Czechs, with all scoring zero for some items, but also because of the Czech discomfort at watching World War II movies. Aversion and activity were substantially correlated among the students (r = .54).

Predictors of aversion and activity. The results (% blame) are presented by group for each person in Table 1. Students (34%) showed about similar blame as Czech survivors (24%), and less than U.S. survivors (48%) (Table 2; all group pairs significantly different at p < .01 or better).

The most critical question is the extent to which individuals assign blame to the descendants of World War II Germans, descendants who were not alive during the War. Whereas only 3% of both students and Czech survivors assigned some blame to a “25-year-old German male whose grandfather was a German army soldier who served in France,” 31% (n = 9) of U.S. Holocaust survivors did.

To assess the resemblance of the patterns of blame across the three samples, we calculated a Pearson correlation, with the entries being the percentage blame for each of the 13 items. The agreement was very high: the correlation was r = .86 for student versus Czech survivor, r = .94 for student versus U.S. survivor.

Because the same 13 items are measured for aversion and blame, we can look at the relation between the pattern of aversion across targets and the pattern of blame. The correlation between aversion and blame pairs of scores for students was r = .90.

As a first measure of the importance of blame in understanding aversion and activity, we examine the Pearson correlation between these scores (Table 4). The correlations were moderate to substantial especially for blame and aversion. The correlations for blame with activity were lower, but of the same order.

Religiosity and identity. The correlation between religiosity and Jewish identity was r = .63 for the students. A one-way ANOVA com-
paring the three samples on religiosity was highly significant, $F(2, 210) = 15.121, p < .001$. Scheffé tests indicated a highly significant difference between the Czechs (less religious) and either the students or the U.S. survivors ($p < .001$; Table 2). For identity, there was not a significant difference between the Czech survivors and the students (Table 2). For the students, there were significant religiosity correlations with both aversion ($r = .27$) and activity ($r = .38$; Table 4). The identity measure correlated with aversion and activity with $r$s of .31 and .35 in the student sample, compared with the corresponding Czech correlations which were low ($r$s = -.06 and .04, respectively).

**Essentialism.** The 3-item essentialism score showed an alpha of only .14 for the U.S. survivors. The 3-item essentialism score showed an alpha of .51 for the U.S. students. The mean interitem correlation for the students was .29. Despite the low alphas, we continued to use the combined score because all 3 items are directly related to essentialism, and the mean interitem $r$ is respectable. Table 2 shows analyses with the combined scale, and because of the low alpha, Table 5 shows analyses with the individual items.

The mean essentialism score was substantially higher for the survivors ($M = 3.28$) than for the students ($M = 2.52$), $t(180) = 5.790, p < .001$, (Table 2). For both samples, there was a substantial link between essentialism and aversion (students: $r = .40, p < .001$; U.S. survivors: $r = .37, p < .05$) and essentialism and activity (students: $r = .35, p < .001$; U.S. survivors: $r = .44, p < .01$). For the students, all three essentialism questions correlate substantially with aversion (Table 5).

**Forgiveness.** For trait forgiveness, we only have scores for the student sample. The Berry forgiveness and VIA forgiveness scores correlated at $r = .38$, and we used the mean of the two (the same range of choices for both). We predict negative correlations (more forgiveness, less anti-German attitudes), and that is what we found, with correlations of $r = -.22, p < .01$ for aversion, $r = -.20, p < .05$ for activity, and $r = -.15, ns$, for blame. We expected that the correlations would have been highest for blame, given its direct relation to forgiveness, but this was not the case.

**Relations among the predictors.** We can only look at the predictive value of a set of predictors for the students, because this was the only group with a substantial $n$ (154). The candidate predictors (Table 2) are: blame, religiosity, Jewish identity, essentialism, and forgiveness. German origin is not a meaningful variable for the students (we calculated one based on country of origin of family, prior travel to Germany, and knowledge of the German language: $r = .01$ with aversion and $r = -.10$ with activity). Given the high correlation between identity and religiosity for the students ($r = .63$), we used only identity.

The results of a forward regression on aversion (adjusted $R^2 = .24$) is displayed in Table 6. Essentialism was the most significant predictor, with significant contributions from blame and identity as well. The parallel analysis on activity (adjusted $R^2 = .21$) reports three significant predictors, with identity and essentialism as the first two. Although

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Analyses With German Essentialism Scale and Individual Items</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GerEss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GerEss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnceGer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AllGer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OnceNaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Correlations are for the student sample/the U.S. survivor sample. These variables are not available in the Czech survivor sample. GerEss = essentialism score summed across the three items. OnceGer = is for the item “Once a German, always a German.” AllGer = “All or almost all Germans are alike.” OnceNaz = “Once a child is raised as a Nazi, this can never be erased.”

*p < .05. **p < .01.
blame was a significant (third) contributor to both aversion and activity, it is surprisingly below both identity and essentialism in strength as a predictor. Forgiveness did not make a significant contribution in either regression.

**Discussion**

The present study, based on two different samples of Jewish Holocaust survivors (U.S. and Czech)—both vanishing and invaluable groups—and a group of undergraduate Jewish college students, confirms and elaborates some of the suggestive findings that arose from our first article on 29 American Holocaust survivors (Cherfas et al., 2006). It also adds a new variable, essentialism, which is substantially related to aversion and activity. Our large undergraduate, Jewish sample, allows for a multivariate, regression analysis of the correlates of aversion and activity. We summarize the basic findings here.

There was a wide range of aversion and activity discomfort in all three samples, widest in the American survivors and lowest in the Czech survivors. This may be particularly surprising in the American Jewish sample, given that these young student Americans were not alive at the time of the Holocaust. Any aversion felt by them toward Germans must have been culturally inculcated, and in highly variable ways across participants.

Degree of blame was a substantial predictor of aversion and activity, but there is considerable evidence for discomfort in the absence of blame, with particular reference to Germans born after World War II. In addition, blame did not emerge as the principal predictor in either regression.

German origin or familiarity seems to moderate aversion and activity. In our original study on U.S. survivors, the 5 of 29 who were of German origin showed less aversion and activity discomfort, but with the small sample, this was not definitive. The Czech survivors showed much less aversion than the American survivors, almost certainly because of both proximity to Germany both pre- and post-World War II, and because of a major influence of German culture in Czech culture. All but one of the Czech survivors was fluent in German. The fact that the Czech survivors' aversion is lower than the undergraduate aversion, two generations removed from the Holocaust, suggests that the critical variable is not German origin, but familiarity with Germans. However, it is also possible that there is a strong anti-German component in American Jewish culture, which may be independent of familiarity with Germans. The link between German familiarity and aversion could be based on latent inhibition, outgroup homogeneity, and/or essentialism.

A new variable presented in this paper was essentialism, which was not reported at all in our previous article on U.S. survivors (Cherfas et al., 2006). Unfortunately, it was not measured in the Czech sample. This three-item score was a substantial predictor of aversion and activity in both U.S. survivors and undergraduates. In our regression, it was the best predictor of aversion and second best for activity. Essentialism conceptually can account for discomfort with German persons born after World War II, better than any of our other predictors. Essentialism, a concept salient in developmental and cognitive psychology (e.g., Gelman, 2003; Haslam et al., 2003; Medin & Ortony, 1989), has not been widely explored in relation to intergroup attitudes. We do not know whether the German essentialism we report reflects a general essentialist tendency in our participants, or is specif-
ically related just to Germans. Of course, it is also true that the Czechs had more exposure to Germany and Germans after the war, so some sort of habituation or extinction could have occurred. Furthermore, there may currently be a superordinate identity of “Europeanness,” related to the establishment of the European Union, which may reduce Czechs’ aversions to Germans.

While not explored in this article, it seems likely that Jews who think about Germans in an essentialist way still essentialize modern Germans. In this way of thinking, whatever German essence was present during the Holocaust still characterizes Germans today. We would hypothesize that Jews who essentialize Germans would perceive more of a threat from modern Germans, an important topic for future research.

The results from our original American sample suggested a link between a single item measure of religiosity and aversion. There was a correlation of $r = .26$ between religiosity and aversion, and $r = .45$ ($p < .01$) between religiosity and activity. This was confirmed in the Jewish undergraduates (comparable $r$s: .27 and .38, both significant with the larger sample). There was no effect of religiosity for the Czechs, but religiosity scores were much lower and showed low variance. Results on Jewish identity for the undergraduates confirm a significant link to aversion ($r = .31$) and activity ($r = .35$), but as with religiosity, there was no effect for the Czechs. Jewish identity was the best predictor of activity in the regression. There may be a variety of identity processes at work with these variables, including more cultural processes, and more specifically theological processes. Jewish cultural and religious identities are highly intertwined, but they are at least theoretically separable (cultural, as in Jewish culture promotes aversion to Germans, and theological as in Jewish theology has specific ideas about theology and repentance that might affect Jews’ willingness to interact with Germans; Cohen et al., 2006).

Insofar as religiosity relates to Jewish identity, the religiosity result is in accord with Wohl and Branscombe’s (2005) involvement of victimized group identity salience as a contributor to collective guilt. With regard to understanding the dynamics of identity and religiosity, Wohl and van Bavel (2011) showed that the effects on adaptation can be complex. Among Jews who were not descendants of Holocaust survivors, Jewish identification was correlated with lesser symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), but the reverse was true among descendants.

Trait forgiveness, for which we only have measures from undergraduates, was weakly but significantly related to the dependent variables, and oddly, it correlated less with blame than with aversion or activity. It did not appear as a significant predictor in the regressions on aversion or activity. Jewish dogma clearly states that certain offenses are unforgivable, which may serve to encourage both aversion and avoidance of reminders of the offense (Cohen et al., 2006; Dorff, 1998). Djupe and Sokhey (2003) found that Orthodox rabbis are more inclined to perceive anti-Semitism as a threat and speak about it more frequently to their congregations because of a need to maintain unity within their communities and barriers between their communities and the outside world. As to the role of forgiveness here, it should be emphasized that we measured a disposition to be forgiving in everyday life, but we unfortunately did not measure ideas about forgiveness for extreme offenses like genocide, or endorsement of the theological reasons within traditional Judaism which would make murder or genocide unforgivable. While forgiveness and aversion are clearly not the same variable, it seems likely that views of forgiveness for genocide would relate to German aversion for Jews, another topic for future research.

In the present study, we have confirmed the surprising finding from our first study, that people undergoing a severe trauma can emerge from it with very different attitudes. While much work has looked at variability in resilience in survivors and even their children (with the transmission of trauma), we suggest that other reactions and ways of thinking about the Holocaust can characterize the victimized groups (e.g., U.S. and Czech survivors), as well as descendants and people in the broader culture (evident here in Jewish undergraduates). The present paper confirmed this in two different samples (one with direct exposure to the Holocaust, our Czech survivors, and the other with only cultural exposure, our Jewish undergraduates), and offers some evidence on possible explanations. We believe that we have discovered two interesting, and not anticipated find-
ings in this study. One is that Czech survivors are less averse to Germans and German things than American Jewish undergraduates, two generations removed from the Holocaust. The powerful variable that seems to explain this is exposure to Germans and Germany prior to (and perhaps following) the Holocaust trauma. Our second new finding is the importance of German essentialism in predicting German person and activity discomfort. This makes sense in retrospect, but has not been previously invoked, to our knowledge, to account for ethnic aversions. It is the only variable we explored which can explain aversion to individuals who are not blamed at all for the Holocaust atrocities. We suggest that ethnic essentialism be explored further in the context of ethnic conflicts, using the organization of essentialist ideas proposed by Haslam et al. (2003).

Our study is just a beginning, but considering the precious value of the vanishing group of Holocaust survivors, it is important to record as much as we can about their responses to one of the great traumas in human history. Our four predictor variables (the fifth, the familiarity with Germans, though very important, was not directly relevant to the undergraduate sample, so is not part of the regression) account for only 24 or 21% of the variance in aversion or activity, respectively. There are clearly many other factors to measure and assess, and at least some of this can be done with accessible young adult Jews, or young members of other ethnic groups which have a history of trauma associated with another group.

Ethnic aversions are probably harbored by my many humans, and many of these presumably relate to an alleged group trauma from some point in the past. This would seem to be the case for contemporary Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland, or contemporary Hindus, Buddhists and Muslims in Sri Lanka. The unusual thing about the Holocaust (and some of the Japanese atrocities during World War II) is that contemporary Japanese and Germans are very different in politics and values from those who committed the atrocities. Aversion to the younger members of these societies is of special psychological interest. Further study is also needed on how ethnic aversions emerge in the cultural norms of postconflict societies, and, conversely, how they are mitigated by pre and postconflict positive interactions.

While much of this article looks toward the past, people’s thinking about the Holocaust has implications for the future. It is clear that ethnic aversions are long lasting, and that they probably serve to exacerbate further ethnic conflict. Cherfas et al. (2006) previously found that aversion to Germans among Jewish American Holocaust survivors is also related to aversion to contemporary Arabs and Muslims. Wohl and Branscombe (2008) showed that Jewish Canadians who were made to think about the Holocaust accepted less collective guilt for Jews’ treatment of Palestinians. Vollhardt (2013) demonstrated that Jews are most willing to acknowledge the victimization of other groups (like the genocide in Darfur) when the Holocaust was portrayed both as a crime against humanity and as a crime against the Jews specifically. Imhoff, Wohl, and Erb (2013) found that an emphasis on continuing negative consequences of historical crimes (like the Holocaust) evoked collective guilt and willingness to compensate, particularly when the perpetrators were seen as being morally responsible. In the end, to understand, we need to look both backward and forward.
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