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**Introduction**

The Jewish Holocaust - the premeditated and systematic murder of more than six million Jews by the Nazis during World War II (1939-1945) is a very wide field of knowledge and research. It has been discussed, investigated, taught and learned from many perspectives and points of view over many years but there is still much more to learn regarding this terrible event (Browning, 2004; Farabstein, 2002; Goldhagen, 1998; Zimerman, 2013). One of the most interesting but less investigated aspects of the Holocaust is the moral perspective. From the Jewish point of view, morality is considered in relation to four main dimensions: the Nazis who exterminated the Jews, the governments and individuals who assisted the Nazis, the free world and especially the countries who fought against the Nazi Germany, who undertook or did not undertake actions to save the Jews and finally the Jews’ own actions in order to cope with the Holocaust. This research discusses moral aspects of the behavior of Jews, who were forced to cope with dilemmas caused by the Holocaust. The high-school students who participated in the research were asked to express their moral attitudes not as a judgment on the moral decisions taken by Jews during and after the Holocaust but as if they themselves faced identical dilemmas. The rationale for consideration of both Holocaust era dilemmas (1939-1945) and Post-Holocaust era dilemmas (1945-2016) was that these are two parts of one story and we need to look at both parts in order to understand the entire story.

The research subject was chosen for two main reasons: the first is my personal interest in the Jewish Holocaust, as a Jew and a family relative of both Holocaust victims and survivors. This interest has emotional as well as intellectual aspects. It stems from a deep emotional-moral sense of personal obligation to do something about the Holocaust which was created in my childhood and more acutely in adolescence during many conversations with my grandfather about what happened, mainly to our family, in the Holocaust.

The second reason is that in recent years during my professional work as a teacher with adolescents and college students, I have found that the study and discussion of ethical, moral and value related questions in class, became very interesting and meaningful when related to Holocaust moral dilemmas.

The importance of this research subject derives firstly from the influence of the Holocaust on Jews and Israelis over the last decades. Throughout this time it continues to influence and occupy the Jewish people and the State of Israel in various ways - education, social, culture, political, national etc. (Guterman, Yablonka, & Shalev, 2008; Weiss, 2013; Weitz, 1997). A second importance derives from the continuing attempts mainly by the Ministry of Education in Israel to find new ways to teach the Holocaust to the young generations and to preserve its memory (Ministry of Education, 2015a). The universal importance of this research subject stems from the fact that the Jewish Holocaust is one of the darkest and perhaps one of the most despicable and horrifying chapters of World War II (Barley, 2007; Greif, Weitz & Macman, 1983). It is important for humanity to teach and learn about the Jewish Holocaust as a part of the terrible historical phenomena of genocides (Oron, 2006).

Over the years, various aspects of the Holocaust have been studied in many ways and from many points of view (Machman, 1998). However, the ways in which the Jews coped with the moral dilemmas they had to face during the Holocaust is not one of them. Public and academic discourse in Israel including school Holocaust learning usually tends to ignore or underestimate moral issues and specifically the Jews’ behavior in relation to moral dilemmas during and after the Holocaust (Aharonson, 1999; Weinrab, 1984).

Previous research studies on the Holocaust have not focused on the development of moral attitudes evolving through Holocaust learning and this subject has barely been explored (Mayseless & Solomon, 2005). The present research that investigates the consideration of moral dilemmas of the Holocaust as part of Holocaust learning and their effect on students’ moral attitudes is therefore an innovative attempt to bridge this gap of knowledge. **Why did we choose to focus on the moral dilemmas?** The answer is that moral dilemmas enable us to touch upon the very core of the Holocaust – the human emotions, thoughts and reactions of its victims and survivors. Furthermore, deep understanding of the moral dilemmas and decisions will help us widen our knowledge on human behavior in genocide events.

The decision to investigate the moral attitudes of high school students was based on the consideration that most of these young students learn the subject of Holocaust in Grades 11 and 12. Although these students are the third and fourth generation after the Holocaust they will carry on its memory in the future. The Holocaust Learning Program of the Ministry of Education includes chapters dealing with the causes of the rise of the Nazis in Germany, Nazi ideology, the Jewish Holocaust and World War II. This formal education program focuses on regular academic studies based mostly on textbooks, and is taught in history lessons during school studies (Ministry of Education, 2015). In addition, students are strongly encouraged to participate voluntarily in the organized youth heritage expeditions (journeys) to Holocaust extermination and memorial sites including ghettoes, extermination camps, memorials, synagogues and additional sites in Poland. The goal of the journey is to foster the students’ deep identification with the Holocaust and its victims (Lindenstrauss, 2012). The journey to Poland is the culmination of an educational and academic process, which lasts a full academic year and includes intensive preparation including academic studies, meetings with survivors/witnesses, visiting Holocaust museums and watching documentary and epic Holocaust films (Bitts, 2004; Bar Natan, 2004). Because all of the participants in this research took the Holocaust Learning Program and most of them (70%) also chose to participate in the journey to Poland the research investigated the outcomes of these two parallel axes of learning.

**The main research question** was how Israeli youth, who are members of the third and fourth generations after the Holocaust grasp the Holocaust from the Jewish moral perspective. Therefore, **the main aim** of this research is to explore the attitudes of Israeli youth towards the way Jews coped with the moral dilemmas of the Holocaust. The research participants were 102 Jewish-Israelis students aged 16-17 from three high-schools who volunteered to participate in the research. The study is a longitudinal survey investigating the participants’ learning process over a chronologic period of one year, from January 2015 until January 2016 and over a learning period of two academic years, from the middle of Grade11 until the middle of Grade 12. This is also an exploratory research since its deals with a new subject – the moral issues of the Holocaust, more specifically with the moral attitudes of the participants towards the Jews’ ways of coping with Holocaust moral dilemmas.

A mixed methods research was conducted in order to collect a wide range of data. A questionnaire investigating the participants’ moral attitudes towards Jewish moral dilemmas during and after the Holocaust was given to the participants at three points in time – January 2015 at the beginning of Holocaust learning, September 2015 in the middle of learning and January 2016 at the end of learning. The questionnaire related to 14 different Jewish moral dilemmas - seven from the Holocaust era (1939-1945) and seven from the post-Holocaust era (1945-2015). In addition, at the third point in time (January 2016) the participants filled out another questionnaire regarding perceived social and educational factors influencing their moral attitudes and perceived moral lessons they learned in their Holocaust studies. At this point 13 students also participated in an individual in-depth interview in order to deepen the researcher’s understanding of their thoughts and feelings following their learning.

# Chapter 1- Literature Review

## 1.1 The Holocaust as a critical historical event

### *1.1.1 The main events of the Jewish Holocaust*

*"In the Holocaust, worlds collapsed, the world of the individual, family and the community, and all the conventional rules were broken: the rules for daily living and society, rules of morality and thought" (Faberstein, 2002, p. 133).*

The Second World War (1939-1945) is considered as one of the beigest, important and influential historical events for humanity in the twentieth century. Possibly it is also the most terrible of all. During the war and especially between 1941-1945 another terrible despicable event occurred - the Holocaust suffered by the Jews and other people in Europe; the premeditated and systematic murder of more than six million Jews and other people from other races and nations by the Nazis under the leadership and vision of their leader, the Fuhrer, Adolph Hitler (Greif et al., 1983).

Nazi Germany initiated the war in order to fulfill its vision of world domination. Above all, the Nazi regime sought to conquer territories in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union to provide the German people with a "living space", but in fact Nazis armed forces invaded many countries all over Europe and North Africa. Their plans involved political, economic and military considerations. The primary goal was to establish a New "Third Reich" – a German empire that was to rule Europe and if possible the entire world. As the "dominant world empire" Nazis consider themselves as entitled to overtake territories and economic resources by force. The new world order that would be created through war would consequently include the racial subordination of “inferior” races, especially the Slavs - the people living in Eastern Europe - to serve the “superior race”, the German people. A no less important goal was to ensure the victory of the "superior German Aryan race" in the “war of the races”, achieving world domination and exterminating “injurious” and “inferior” races. These races were primarily the Jews and secondly, the Romani people, both of whom were victims of Nazi ideology and were slated to be exterminated. Although the Nazis’ actions took the lives of many people from many nations, Jews were considered the main threat and were therefore the main target (Machman, 1998)*.*

During the years 1941-1945, approximately 6,000,000 Jews and 300,000 Romani people were murdered by the Nazis solely for ideological reasons (Barley, 2007).

### *1.1.2 The historical-psychological context of the Holocaust for the Jewish people*

Since the destruction of Jerusalem and the deportation of most of the Jewish people from ancient Israel by the Roman Empire in 73AD, there have been two more events that are seen by scholars as exceptional historical events in the history of the Jewish people. These events or perhaps historical processes are the Jewish Holocaust and the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948 (Gutman, 1983).

Although the Holocaust ended with the surrender of Nazi Germany on 9th May 1945, it continues to influence and occupy the Jewish people and the State of Israel in various educational, social, and cultural dimensions until today (Weitz, 1997).

In a broad national-historical conceptualization, the predominant view of the Jewish people sees the Holocaust as an additional event along the sequence of continuous attempts by different empires, peoples and dictators to harm and destroy the Jewish people and now also the State of Israel. This orientation traces the persecution of the Jews from the times of the Assyrians and Babylonians, through the Persians and Greeks and the Romans, to the Spanish Inquisition, the "pogroms" that massacred Jews in Eastern Europe and of course the Holocaust perpetrated by German Nazis and their collaborators among the European nations. The modern-day aspirations of some states and terror organizations to destroy the State of Israel is seen by most Jews and Israelis as simply a current stage in this continuous process (Machman, 1996).

### *1.1.3 Survivors and Israeli society’s dual trauma following the Holocaust*

Many testimonies from the Holocaust, testify that the victims in their last moments expressed one or both of the following requests: revenge against the Nazis and that the world would remember them and what happened to them (Frankl, 1981).

Those who did survive felt that they needed to fulfill these wishes of their dead relatives but they also had a strong desire to rebuild their personal and family lives that had been destroyed. They felt the need to tell their personal, family and community story but this was a secondary need at that time; first they had to cope with the exhausting challenge of resuming their lives. Indeed, those who survived the Holocaust all went through terrible physical and mental suffering, in addition to their loss of most or even all of those who were dear to them. They survived but the events that they had undergone left their mark on them and continued to influence them for their entire lifetimes. Despite the fact that the war ended in 1945, they had to continually cope with the memories and scars that they carried in their souls and bodies. Most of the survivors were very young, between the ages of 15-25, since older and younger Jews were the first to be murdered by the Nazis (Aharonson, 1999).

With the end of the war, survivors had to invest immense efforts to overcome the trauma they had experienced and most of them indeed succeeded. The majority of the survivors immigrated to Israel, established new families and became active and creative citizens who became engaged in social activity and achievements no less than the other residents of the state; however, others suffered from severe Post-Traumatic Syndrome and did not manage to overcome this malady. Even those who functioned well remained with mental scars that imposed subjective suffering for the rest of their lives and of course influenced their families and their close surroundings (Neuman, 2010).

### *1.1.4 The inter-generational trauma of Holocaust*

*"Among the generations of Holocaust survivors, the children of the survivors, their grandchildren and great-grandchildren, there is an inter-generational transmission of trauma and memory. This trauma has most central significance for each generation and it influences a variety of areas and levels"* (Fuchs, 2009, p. 12).

Although the Holocaust ended on 8th May 1945 with the surrender of Nazi Germany, in the mind of Holocaust survivors it continued to influence them and their families each and every day. Strong feelings burned in the survivors, especially shame and pangs of conscience due to various events that they underwent and actions that they performed, and also a desire for revenge (Gampel, 2005).

For second, third and fourth generations the difficult events of the Holocaust, which were experienced to a different extent and at different strengths through the medium of their parents, never disappeared and are continually influential till today (Bar-On, 1994).

## 1.2 The concept of morality

### *1.2.1 Morality - terms and definitions*

“Morality” relates to human behaviors that are considered to be "good", distinguishing them from behaviors that are considered to be "bad" or “immoral”. This leads us to think about morality in terms of behaviors or judgments made in consideration of the principles or rules of appropriate conduct, and the distinction between right and wrong (Ring, 1999).

The main focus of this research is on moral dilemmas. What are moral dilemmas? A dilemma is a situation in which an individual is faced by two or more alternatives and has to choose between them in order to decide how to act in a given situation or to respond to a question. The dilemma creates a state of deliberation as the individual examines their own considerations, and it may be very difficult and even sometimes impossible to resolve. In a moral dilemma, deliberation stems from the character of a person’s conscience and their perception of what is the “correct” way to act. The dilemma is expressed by the fact that the individual finds it difficult to decide which alternative is the "moral" one (Weiner, 1995). Moral dilemmas focus on the deliberation between a "deontological"- the "right moral” choice - and the "a-moral" or “utilitarian" choice (Christensen & Gomila 2012).

**"Deontological morality"** is a morality based on state and sometimes religious laws together with the values of the particular culture and society. It is accepted as normal in a specific society or societies and characterizes moral decisions in standard daily situations (Waller, 2005; Beauchamp, 1991; Kamm, 1996).

**"Utilitarian morality"** is a morality that grasps moral action as one that should maximize the benefit for the person who carries out a curtain action. As such, this kind of moral behavior could contradict deontological morality (Bredeson, 2011; Gay, 2002).

**"Survival morality"**: It is a decision according to "utilitarian" morality that in extreme moral situations facing the danger of death can save life (Koenigs et al., 2007). It has an “instinctive” character and serves the basic human drive for survival. Survival morality very often characterized Jews’ behavior during the Holocaust. Holocaust survivors would usually not have survived if they had acted otherwise (Greif, 1999; Wiesenthal, 2012).

## 1.3 Jewish moral dilemmas during and after Jewish Holocaust

Undoubtedly the Holocaust was a terrible tragedy and national trauma for the Jewish people that will influence it for many generations to come. Although 70 years have passed since the end of World War II and The Holocaust, it is still, without doubt, a most important field of much interest for Jews and other people all around the world. Nevertheless, the main Jewish attention concerning this topic is usually focused on the issue of the mass murder of the Jews who were the victims of the Nazis. Public and academic discourse in Israel usually tends to ignore ethical issues and dilemmas relating to the Jews’ behavior, mostly during but also after the Holocaust (Weinrab, 1984). This is not surprising since dealing with issues such as these can be considered as picking at a very deep, still open wound.

Out of Holocaust historical literature we have chosen seven main dilemmas noted in from the Holocaust period 1939-1945 and another seven dilemmas from the period following the Holocaust, i.e. 1945-2016. We gave each dilemma a specific name and concise wording.

### *1.3.1 Jewish moral dilemmas during the Holocaust (1939 – 1945)*

***1. The "Judenratt" dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is the choice between Jewish leadership collaboration with the Nazis in the "Ghetto" (A closed, exclusively Jewish area) versus resistance. The outcome of resistance to Nazis orders for the leaders of the Jews was death. The Nazis demanded that the head of the "Judenratt" must prepare lists of Jews, who transport to extermination in death camps (Czerniakow, 1968; Nasmith, 1983; Gutman, 1979```; Katz, Ben Ami & Ilan, 2005).

***2. The "little smuggler" dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether toallow the child to smuggle food for the starving family into the "Ghetto" (a tiny enclosed Jewish region of the town) or to protecthim from the risk of death by stopping him from doing so, thus perhaps risking death by starvation for the entire family (Kaplan, 1961; Kermish, 1966, 1989; Heberer, 2011, Efrat & Baban, 2015).

***3. Giving children away dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether parents should trust particular gentiles and give their small children to them in order to save their lives, or not to trust them and avoid giving their children away (Blady Szwaiger, 2000; Bogner, 2000; Freiberg, 1988; Levine, 2002; Radlich, 1983; Evers-Emden, 2000).

***4. The crying baby dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether a parent or another person should kill the crying baby, whose incessant crying threatens to expose the group of Jews in the hiding place to the Nazis, who would kill them (Aharonson,1992; Neistatt, 1944; Kaplan, 1961; Levine, 2002; Nimsovitch, 1968).

***5. The thief's dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma for a Jewish prisoner in death camp is whether to steal food, a shoe, or hat etc. in order to survive or to die if he did not steal the object (Kermish, 1989; Lubotkin, 1979; Yerushalmi, 1995).

***6. The "Sonderkommando" dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma for the Jewish prisoner is whether to work in forced labor for the Nazis death machine in the death camps versus refusal to do so, which would lead to the prisoner’s death (Bar, 1978; Greif et al., 1983; Greif, 1998, 1999).

***7. The rebels’ dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether to participate in armed rebellion against the Nazis without the wide support of all the Jewish community or on the other hand to avoid it rebellion and continue to cooperate with the Nazis. Rebellion could mean sometimes a tiny chance of escaping from the "Ghetto" but the Nazis would probably murder the entire population instantly as a punishment (Baltman, 2002; Freiberg, 1988; Weinrab, 1984; Heskel, 2012; Holevski, 2001).

### *1.3.2 Jewish moral dilemmas after the Holocaust (1945 – 2016)*

***8. The revengers’ dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether it is morally right to kill Nazis who were involved in the murder of Jews in Europe during the Holocaust (Bar-Zohar, 1991; Carmi, 1961; Segev, 1991; Wiesenthal, 2012).

***9. The "Kapo" (foreman) dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether to take action for criminal prosecution against Jews who served under the Nazis in the concentration and death camps as those who directed special prisoners’ working units ("Commandos") or prisoner's residences ("Blocks"). Those people were often blamed by survivors for wicked unnecessarily abusive acts against the prisoners (Levine, 2015; Hausner, 1988; Weitz, 1997; Yablonka, 1996, 2000).

***10. They “went like lambs to the slaughter” dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is how to relate to what was seen by Israeli society in the first years after the Holocaust as the Jews’ "passive" reaction to the extermination (Kovner, 1981, 2002; Farber, 2007; Weitzberg, 1996).

***11. The restitution payments dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether it is morally justified for Holocaust survivors as individuals, and Israel as a state, to receive payments from Germany as restitution for Nazi crimes during Holocaust (Feldman, 1984; Ofer, 2007; Levracht, 1973; Sagi, 1986; Katz, 2009).

**12. *The Kasztner dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether to accuse Dr. Israel Kastner who was the head of The 'Jewish Rescue Committee' in Budapest for betrayal of his people. This was because in order to save Jews he made financial deals with Nazi officers (Weitz, 1995; Gutman, 1990; Hatis-Rolf, 1998; Weitz, 1995; Yablonka, 2000; Brand & Brand, 1960).

***13. The resistance dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is whether to emphasize Jewish armed resistance ("active resistance") against the Nazis on one hand or to emphasize unarmed resistance ("passive" resistance") on the other (Bauer, 1983; Laor, 2009; Machman, 1998; Tal, 2000).

***14. Holocaust comparison dilemma***

The essence of the dilemma is the deliberation between two options: 1. to learn about the Jewish Holocaust from a particular point of view which emphasizes the Jewish tragedy without mentioning other similar genocides during World War II or in other historical periods. 2. To learn about the Jewish Holocaust from a universal point of view; an approach which emphasizes the connection between genocides of other ethnic and national groups and the Jewish Holocaust (Moras, 1972; Neuberger, 1994; Oron, 1995, 2003, 2005, 2006).

## 1.4 Jewish Holocaust in Israeli education

*"There can be no doubt that the Holocaust shaped and still continues to shape our collective memory and has become part of our national identity and we therefore have an obligation to teach children about the Holocaust in the education system.**We should continuously deal with questions about the messages of the Holocaust"* (Kolett, 2014 pp-16).

There are several main educational-social-cultural stages, which children in Israel undergo with regard to the Holocaust: (a) from childhood until high school: during this period the main learning occurs on memorial days when general information is given in school. (b) In high school: Holocaust studies are part of the curriculum for the matriculation exams and there is an organized guided journey to Holocaust extermination sights in Poland for those choosing to travel. (c), during compulsory military service in the army soldiers are given lectures about the Holocaust. For army officers, there is also an organized guided journey to the Holocaust extermination sights in Poland (d), Holocaust studies are offered in universities and colleges for those who wish to study this subject. It is noted that there is also a very broad phenomenon of journeys for organized groups of adults to the sites of the Holocaust and its commemoration in Poland (Lev, 2007).

### *1.5 The journeys to Poland*

In the last 25 years, the journeys to Poland have become most important component of the Holocaust teaching program and the visits to the Holocaust sites in Poland have become a sort of “pilgrimage” for many of Israel’s youth who participate in these journeys. Teachers, parents and students feel that the journey to Poland is very important and invest serious efforts so that the students can participate in the journeys. The organized journeys began in 1983, the 40th anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising. They have increased over the years and hundreds of thousands of Israeli students from state high schools have travelled to Poland within the frame of journeys organized by the Ministry of Education (Worgen, 2008). The journeys to Poland are actually the direct or the logical continuation of the experiential learning that characterizes part of Holocaust studies in their broadest sense. The journeys to Poland are the peak of the experiential learning program that includes commemorative ceremonies, theater performances, documentary films, cinema films, trips to the memorial and commemoration centers in Israel, direct meetings with Holocaust survivors or viewing them through televised clips etc. The journey to Poland includes visits to historical sites – ghettoes, extermination camps, memorials, synagogues and additional sites (Lindenstrauss, 2012).

Over the years, there has been growing debate about the justification for the journeys to Poland focusing on several main issues: The high cost of the journeys,

Doubts regarding the educational value of the journey, “the business” revolving around the journeys, the students’ behavior on the journeys, the journey to Poland emphasizes a nationalist message at the expense of universal values (Maltz, 2016), the students’ behavior on the journeys rude (Rama, 2011), the journey causes emotional trauma inflicted on teenagers, the journey strengthens nationalism (Starkman & Dattel, 2016)

In contrast to this, those who defend the journeys claim that although there are some defects, there is still no good alternative that is better than the experience of the journey and the deep experiential learning that it affords (Shalem, 2008).

## 1.6 Gap in knowledge

When we want to define the gap in knowledge two main points can be mentioned:

1. A gap in knowledge in the field of Jewish Holocaust moral dilemmas from a retrospective point of view – what do Israeli high school students who are learning about the Holocaust think about the ways in which Jews coped with the moral dilemmas of the Holocaust?

2. A gap in knowledge regarding the effect of the present Holocaust learning program in high school, on the students’ perceptions of Holocaust moral dilemmas.

The next chapter describes the original and innovative research conducted on the moral dilemmas of the Holocaust that is the subject of this thesis.

# Chapter 2- Methodology

## 2.1 Introduction

**The main aim** of this research is to explore the attitudes of Israeli youth towards the way Jews coped with the moral dilemmas of the Holocaust. An **exploratory approach** was chosen because the research subject has not been yet investigated and clearly defined in previous research. The research is a **longitudinal survey** combining **mixed methods** data-gathering and analysis**,** which was conducted from January 2015 until January 2016 over a period of two academic years, from the middle of Grade11 until the middle of Grade 12. The following aims constitute the main axes of this research.

## 2.2 Research Studies and aims

***Study 1- Students’ moral attitudes at the beginning of learning***

* To identify the level of agreement or disagreement with the different moral behaviors of the Jews during and after the Holocaust among Israeli high school students who participated in a Holocaust Learning Program.

**Study 2-** ***The evolution of the students’ moral attitudes***

* To test whether the Holocaust Learning Program generated changes in the participant's moral attitudes.
* To test whether changes in the participant's moral attitudes during their Holocaust Learning Program is moderated by gender, having Holocaust victims as relatives and participation in the journey to Holocaust memorial sites in Poland.

***Study 3- Perceived influences and lessons learned***

* To identify whether and how social and educational factors are perceived by participants as influencing their moral attitudes.
* To identify the moral lessons that the students perceived they had learned from the Holocaust Learning Program.

***Study 4- The associations between moral attitudes and moral lessons***

* To examine whether moral attitudes are associated with perceived moral lessons from the Holocaust Learning Program.

**Study 5- The experiences of Holocaust learning**

* To understand the meanings constructed through stories by participants in relation to their experiences of Holocaust Learning Program.

## 2.3 Research population

The research participants were 102 Israeli high school students, boys and girls, from three public schools in northern Israel. They were aged 17-18, and studying in Grade 11 when the research begun in January 2015, All of them volunteered to participate in this research. Their political attitudes were not examined in this study because they had not yet reached voting age for Israeli parliamentary elections. With regard to the students’ religious-cultural status, they all defined themselves as Israeli Jews. Most of the participants had a personal-family connection to the Holocaust. This meant that they were the third or fourth generation after the Holocaust period and had a grandparent or great-grandparent or other close family relative who had experienced and survived the Holocaust in some way or another. Most of the participants also took part in the heritage journey to see Holocaust memorial sites in Poland.

## 2.4 Research tools

The research employed two kinds of research tools - Closed-ended questionnaires and in-depth interviews. The questionnaire was composed of three parts:

***(2) The Moral Attitudes Questionnaire***

The main research tool used in this study is a specially developed closed-ended questionnaire investigating the participant's moral attitudes towards Holocaust moral dilemmas. The questionnaire is based on the pioneering work of Kohlberg (1973) and many of his followers for example: Foot (1967), Graham et al. (2011). It presents seven main moral dilemmas that faced Jews during the Holocaust (1939-1945) and seven more main dilemmas that faced Jews after the Holocaust and up until the present time (1945-1915). These fourteen dilemmas were chosen because of the fact that they stand out after comprehensive review of the relevant literature regarding the Holocaust and post-Holocaust eras. Table 1 below shows the fourteen Holocaust and post-Holocaust moral dilemmas. Each dilemma is followed by two alternative solutions - deontological moral based solution as opposed to survival moral based solution. Participants are asked to choose one or both of the solutions. All of the dilemmas and all the solutions provided are historically authentic.

**Table 1: Holocaust and post-Holocaust moral dilemmas**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Holocaust era dilemmas (1939-1945)** | **Post-Holocaust era dilemmas (1945-1916)** |
| 1. The Judenratt dilemma | 1. Went like lambs to slaughter dilemma |
| 2. The Sonderkommando dilemma | 2. The Capo dilemma |
| 3. The Rebels dilemma | 3. The Kastner dilemma |
| 4. The thief's dilemma | 4. The Resistance dilemma |
| 5. The crying baby dilemma | 5. The Revengers dilemma |
| 6. The Little Smuggler dilemma | 6. The Restitution payments dilemma |
| 7. The Giving away children dilemma | 7.The Comparison of the Holocaust dilemma |

Participants were requested to indicate their personal attitude concerning the two suggested different solutions, A or B, for each dilemma on a 5-point Likert scale where 1 = strongly disagree, and 5= strongly agree. They could choose to relate to one solution (A or B), or to both solutions, A+B. Alternatively, they could mark the response “I have no opinion” or write a solution of their own. The full questionnaire appears in Appendix I.

***(3) The Perceived Influences and Lessons Learned Questionnaire***

It included two parts: **The first part** comprised a list of factors that might be perceived as affecting the development and shaping of the participants’ moral attitudes. These perceived influential factors are derived from major domains in the participant's life. Participants are asked to mark the extent of each factor’s influence on their moral attitudes on a 5-point Likert scale where 1= no influence and 5= strong influence. They can also add another factor / factors.

**In the second part** of the questionnaire there is a list of possible different moral lessons that were given to the participants and might be derived from their studies of the Holocaust. These lessons are part of Jewish-Israeli discourse over the Holocaust and can be found in literature, newspapers, television, movies and mainly in school learning. The lessons are presented as statements to which they were asked to express their agreement or disagreement on a scale of 1-5 point Likert scale where 1 = not at all agree and 5 = very much agree. They can alternatively write a lesson / lessons of their own.

***(4) The individual in-depth interviews***

Thirteen of the 102 student participants, who answered the questionnaires, also volunteered to participate in the in-depth interviews and were interviewed at Measurement Point 3 (January 2016). Interviewees were asked questions that touched upon their family connection to the Holocaust, the decision to participate or not to participate in the journey to Poland, their experiences regarding Holocaust learning, their views towards the moral dilemmas, the moral lessons they learned (from the Holocaust Learning Program including the journey) and their experience of participation in the study itself.

## 2. 5 Research procedure

The research took place over a period of two academic years 2015-2016.

**Table 2: Summary of research procedure**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Tools** |
| **Measurement Point 1**- Jan 2015, Grade 11, Beginning of Holocaust learning at school | A. Demographic Questionnaire  B. Moral Attitudes Questionnaire |
| **Measurement Point 2** - Sep 2015, Grade 12, Middle of learning and after returning from the journey to Poland | A. Moral Attitudes Questionnaire |
| **Measurement Point 3** - Jan 2016, Grade 12, Matriculations exams of Holocaust studies which remark the end of learning | A. Moral Attitudes Questionnaire  B. Perceived Influence and Lessons Learned Questionnaire  C. Individual In-depth Interview |

### 

## 2.6 Data-analysis

Data collected and organized in five studies according to the different aims. Quantitative data from the questionnaires were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics Version 23 64-bit edition software and included descriptive statistical analysis (percentage, means SD) and inferential statistical analysis (ANOVA tests and Bonferroni t-tests). Data collected from the in-depth interviews underwent qualitative thematic analysis.

For higher analysis in studies 2 and 3 the different individual dilemmas were assembled in categories according to mutual characteristics:

**Table 3: Categories of Holocaust Moral Dilemmas and solutions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dilemmas Categories** | **Moral deliberation**  **Between solutions** |
| **1.** "**Collaboration dilemmas"**: The 'Judenratt dilemma'' The 'Sonderkommando dilemma', 'Rebels dilemma' | "Deontological**"**  **versus**  "Survival" |
| **2. "Acute dilemmas":** The 'Crying Babydilemma' and 'The Thief’s dilemma' | "Deontological"  **versus**  "Survival**"** |
| **3. "Parental dilemmas":** The 'Little Smuggler dilemma'and the'Giving Children Away dilemma' | "Deontological**"**  **versus**  "Survival" |

**Table 4: Categories of Post-Holocaust Moral Dilemmas and solutions**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Dilemmas Categories** | **Moral deliberation**  **Between solutions** |
| **4.** **"The perception of Jewish behavior towards the Nazis":** The 'Like Lambs to the Slaughter dilemma', the ‘Capo dilemma', the 'Kastner dilemma' and the 'Resistance dilemma' | “Judgmental”  **versus**  “Acceptance” |
| **5**. **"Consideration of revenge and compromise**": The 'Revengers dilemma'and the 'Restitution Payments dilemma' | "Affective-Intuitive”  **versus**  “Rational-Utilitarian” |
| **6. "The perception of the Holocaust as a historical event",**  The 'Comparison of the Holocaust dilemma' | “Universal"  **versus**  “Jewish-Particular" |

## 

## Chapter 3 – Results

## 3.1 Study 1: Students moral attitudes at the beginning of Holocaust Learning Program

**The research aim** was to identify the level of agreement or disagreement with the different moral behaviors of the Jews during and after the Holocaust of Israeli high school students, who participated in Holocaust Learning Program.

***Method***

This study presents a statistical analysis of the responses to the Moral Attitudes Questionnaire. Research participantswere 102 Jewish Israeli high school students, 36 boys and 66 girls. Data analysis related to the responses for each one of the moral dilemmas were collected in Measurement Point 1- Jan 2015, Grade 11, at the beginning of Holocaust learning at school. Analysis was performed with the tool of descriptive statistics, presenting the distribution of the responses in percentages, the central tendency index – mean, and the deviant tendency index – SD.

***Results***

### *3.1.1 Students moral attitudes towards Holocaust-era dilemmas (1939-1945)*

***Table 5: Summary of results for the initial moral attitudes towards Holocaust-era dilemmas (1939-1945)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The dilemmas** | **Agreement with the survival Moral solution** | **Agreement with the deontological Moral solution** |
| 1. The ‘Judenratt dilemma’ | The survival solution **54%** | The deontological solution **31%** |
| 2. The ‘Sonderkommando dilemma’ | The survival solution **61%** | The deontological solution **56%** |
| 3. The Rebels dilemma | The survival solution **59%** | The deontological solution **68%** |
| 4. The ‘thief's dilemma’ | The survival solution **26%** | The deontological solution **63%** |
| 5. The ‘crying baby dilemma’ | The survival solution **38%** | The deontological solution **77%** |
| 6. The ‘Little Smuggler dilemma’ | The survival solution **66%** | The deontological solution **45%** |
| ,7. The ‘Giving away children dilemma | The survival solution **84%** | The deontological solution **30%** |

### *3.1.2 Students initial moral attitudes towards Post- Holocaust-era dilemmas (1945-2016)*

***Table 6: Summary of results for the initial moral attitudes towards Post-Holocaust-era dilemmas (1945-2016)***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **The dilemmas** | **Agreement with the survival Moral solution** | **Agreement with the deontological Moral solution** |
| 1.The ‘Like Lambs to the Slaughter dilemma’ | The judgmental solution **8%** | The acceptance solution **90%** |
| 2. The ‘Kapo’ dilemma’ | The judgmental solution **67%** | The acceptance solution **24%** |
| 3. The ‘Kastner dilemma’ | The judgmental solution **21%** | The acceptance solution **88%** |
| 4. The ‘Resistance dilemma’ | The judgmental solution **42%** | The acceptance solution **60%** |
| 5. The ‘revengers dilemma’ | The affective- intuitive solution **50%** | The rational-utilitarian solution **63%** |
| 6.The ‘restitution payments dilemma’ | The affective- intuitive solution **29%** | The rational-utilitarian solution **93%** |
| 7. ‘The comparison of the Holocaust dilemma’ | The Jewish particular solution **69%** | The universal solution **47%** |

### *3.1.3 Conclusions*

For Holocaust era dilemmas, the main conclusion is that at that point of time when the Holocaust Learning Program had just started, participants agree more with conventional deontological moral solutions in dilemmas they perceived to be more extreme.

For post-Holocaust era dilemmas, the main conclusion is that at that point of time when Holocaust learning program had just started, the participants usually tended to agree more with the more accepted attitude in the Israeli discourse today concerning Jewish resistance to the Nazis – it should not be judged retrospectively.

It is important to note that in all six categories there was always a high level of deliberation between the two contradicting options.

## 3.2 Study 2- The evolution of moral attitudes

**The research aim** was to test whether the Holocaust Learning Program generated changes in the participant's moral attitudes.

***Method***

This study presents a statistical analysis of the responses to the moral attitudes questionnaire which was filled in by 102 participants three times: first in January 2015 when they were in the middle of Grade 11, soon after the Holocaust Learning Program began, secondly in September 2015 after the journey to Poland and at the beginning of Grade 12, and thirdly in January 2016 in the middle of Grade 12 when the Holocaust Learning Program ended.

**In the first part**- ***"the evolution of Holocaust-era moral attitudes*"** and **the second part** – ***"the evolution of Post-Holocaust era moral attitudes*",** data analysis for the entire population of participants was performed by "Repeated Measures" deductive statistical analysis using ANOVA tests and Bonferroni t-tests. **In the third part** – ***"Moderators of change in moral attitudes"***deductive statistics were calculated for responses to the Moral Attitudes Questionnaire by "Profile Analysis". This is one of the types of tests that can be conducted to analyze the difference resulting from the "Repetitive Measures" analysis. The purpose of this analysis was to test whether different Moderators produce statistically significant differences in the participants’ profiles. ANOVA tests and Bonferroni t-tests were used for deductive statistical analysis.

**Results**

### *3.2.1 The evolution of Holocaust era moral attitudes*

For the further analysis of this part the seven Holocaust era dilemmas were sorted into three categories according to similar characteristics**:**

**Category 1** **– "The collaboration dilemmas":** including the 'Judenratt dilemma', the 'Sonderkommando dilemma' and the 'Rebels dilemma'. Moral deliberation exists between 'deontological' and 'survival' moral solutions. These are **"*Collaboration" dilemmas"*** because the question, whether to collaborate with the Nazis or not, is the core of the different dilemmas in this category.

**The results** indicate that agreement with the survival moral solution increased over the three different measuring points of the research in a manner that was not significant (F=1.69, p>0.05). On the other hand, agreement with solutions based on deontological morality decreased over the different measuring points in a significant manner (F=5.32, p<0.01).

**Category 2** – ***"The acute dilemmas":*** including the 'Crying baby dilemma' and the 'Thief’s dilemma'. Moral deliberation exists between 'deontological' and 'survival' moral solutions. These dilemmas are defined as ***"acute dilemmas***" because the individual needs to make a fast decision with no way back.

**The results** indicate that the extent of agreement with the survival moral solutions changed from "disagreement" at T1 (the beginning of the learning) to "uncertain" at T2 (in the middle of the learning) and "agreement" at T3 (the end of the learning). However, the increase was not significant (F=0.98, p>0.05). At the same time the level of agreement with solutions based on deontological morality decreased over the different measuring points of the research in a significant manner (F=4.64, p<0.05) but remained "agreement".

**Category 3** **– *"The parental dilemmas"****:* including the 'Little Smuggler dilemma' and the 'Giving children away dilemma'. Moral deliberation exists between 'deontological' and 'survival' moral solutions. The main common characteristic of this category is the direct influence of the individual – the parent’s decision on the fate of his child or children.

**The results** indicate that the level of agreement with the survival moral solution increased over the different measuring points of the research in an insignificant manner (F=0.47, p>0.05). However, the level of agreement with the deontological moral solutions decreased from “agreement” at T1 (the beginning of learning) to “disagreement” at T2 (middle of learning) and T3 (end of learning) in a significant manner (F=8.27, p<0.01).

**Overall** there was an insignificant increase in the level of participants’ agreement with survival moral solutions and a significant decrease in the level of their agreement with deontological moral solutions.

***3.2.2 The evolution of Post-Holocaust era moral attitudes***

For the further analysis of this part the seven Post-Holocaust era dilemmas were sorted into three categories according to similar characteristics**.**

**Category 4** – ***"The perception of Jewish behavior towards the Nazis":*** including the 'Like Lambs to the slaughter dilemma', the 'Kapo dilemma', the 'Kastner dilemma' and the 'Resistance dilemma'. The main common characteristic of this category is the attempt to understand and evaluate the way that Jews behaved towards the Nazis from different perspectives. Moral deliberation exists between “judgmental” versus “acceptance” moral attitudes.

**The results** indicate that the level of “disagreement” with the 'judgmental' moral solution increased over the different measurement points in a manner that was not significant (F=0.71, p>0.05, d'=0.14). At the same time the level of “agreement” with the 'acceptance' moral solutions decreased in a manner that was also not significant (F=1.72, p>0.05).

**Category 5 – *"Consideration of revenge and compromise":***including The 'Revengers dilemma' and the 'Restitution Payments dilemma'. The main common characteristic of this category is Jewish thinking and decisions concerning the way in which to treat the crimes of former Nazis in the post-Holocaust era. Moral deliberation exists between "affective-intuitive” versus “rational-utilitarian” moral solutions.

**The results** indicate that the participants’ level of “agreement” with the affective-intuitive moral solution decreased over the different measurement points of the research in a significant manner (F=5.13, p<0.01). At the same time, the level of “agreement” with the rational-utilitarian moral solution increased over the different measurement points of the research in a manner that was not significant (F=1.74, p>0.05).

**Category 6 – *"The Perception of the Holocaust as a historical event"*:** including the 'Comparison of the Holocaust dilemma'. The essence of the dilemma is whether or not to compare the Jewish Holocaust to other genocides in history. Moral deliberation exists between “universal” versus “Jewish-particular” moral solutions.

**The results** indicate that the level of agreement with the 'universal' moral solution decreased over the different measurement points of the research in a significant manner (F=6.41, p<0.01). At the same time the level of “agreement” with the Jewish-Particular moralsolution decreased over the different measurement points of the research in a manner that was not significant (F=0.01, p>0.05).

### *3.2.2 Moderators of change in moral attitudes*

**The research aim** was to test whether changes in the participant's moral attitudes during their Holocaust Learning Program, is moderated by gender, having Holocaust victims as relatives and participation in the journey to Holocaust memorial sites in Poland.

This part presents the only three significant results regarding the influence of moderators of change for the evolution of participants’ moral attitudes through the three research stages.

**I. A family relative who was a Holocaust victim or survivor as a moderator:**

**In Category 4** – ***"The perception of Jewish behavior towards the Nazis",*** a significant interaction effect (F=3.156, p<0.05) was found between the Holocaust Learning Program and the moderator 'having or not having a relative who was a holocaust victim or survivor’ in the evolution of “agreement” with the 'acceptance' moral solution. Agreement with the 'acceptance' moral solution among participants who have relatives who were Holocaust survivors or victims decreased significantly over time.

**II. Gender as a moderator:**

**In Category 5- *"Consideration of revenge and compromise"*,** a significant interaction effect (F=5.45, p<0.01) was found between the Holocaust Learning Program and gender in the evolution of agreement with the' affective-intuitive' moral solution. The level of agreement with the 'affective-intuitive' moral solution among the female group decreased significantly over time and changed from "agreement" to "disagreement".

**In Category 6 – *"The perception of the Holocaust as a historical event":*** a significant interaction effect (F=3.223, p-0.01) was found between the Holocaust Learning Program and gender in the evolution of agreement with the 'Jewish-particular' moral solution. The gap in the extent of agreement with the 'Jewish-particular' moral solution between boys and girls became significantly smaller over time.

### *3.2.3 Conclusions*

**Conclusions for the evolution of Holocaust era moral attitudes**

The learning process led the participants to increase their agreement with survival moral solutions and decrease their agreement with deontological moral solutions. Along this process, it was easier for the participants to decrease their agreement with deontological moral solutions than to increase their agreement with survival moral solutions.

**Conclusions for the evolution of Post- Holocaust era moral attitudes**

The learning process led the participants to:

1. Move towards greater acceptance of the “passive” way that Jewish people coped with the moral challenges of the Holocaust.
2. To adopt more 'rational-utilitarian' moral attitudes towards the question how to treat the crimes of former Nazis.
3. To change earlier support for the 'universal moral solution' to more support for the 'Jewish-particular moral solution‘.

**Conclusions for the effect of different moderators on the participants’ moral attitudes**

The learning process:

1. Reduced the initial tendency among relatives of Holocaust survivors or victims to accept the “passive” way that Jews behaved towards the Nazis.
2. Led the girls to increase their disagreement with killing of Nazis war criminals as act of revenge.
3. Led boys to agree more, and girls to agree less, with the 'Jewish-particular solution' that present the Holocaust as a unique "Jewish only" historical event.

* The journey to Poland did not have significand effect on the participant's moral attitudes.

## 3.3 Study 3 - Perceived influences and lessons learned

### *Introduction*

**Research aim 1** was to identify whether and how social and educational factors were perceived by participants as influencing their moral attitudes.

**Research aim 2** was toidentify the moral lessons that participants perceived they had learned from the Holocaust Learning Program.

***Method***

This study presents results and discussion concerning the responses of the participants to the Perceived Influence Factors and Lessons Learned Questionnaire. The questionnaire was filled in by 102 participants in January 2016, when the participants were in the middle of Grade 12, at the end of the Holocaust Learning Program. The Perceived Influence Factors and Lessons Learned Questionnaire that they completed consisted of two parts: Part A related to different influence factors perceived by participants as having an influence on their moral attitudes towards the Jews’ ways of coping with Holocaust and post-Holocaust dilemmas. Part B is related to moral lessons that they perceived they had learned during the Holocaust Learning Program. The different influences and lessons were first analyzed separately for each item and then sorted into categories according to similar characteristics, in order to create a higher level of analysis.

The perceived influences were derived from major domains in the participant's life. The perceived lessons were part drawn from Jewish-Israeli discourse over the Holocaust and can be found in literature, newspapers, television, movies and mainly in school learning

Data analysis first used descriptive statistics to describe the distribution (in percentages) of the factors perceived by the participants as influencing their moral attitudes and also the extent of their agreement with the different lessons, by individual items. Additionally, the central tendency index (mean) and deviant tendency index (SD) are given for the responses to each of the items in this questionnaire. Secondly, comparative deductive statistics were deduced using t-tests. This was done to find significant differences between possible moderators (participant’s gender, having Holocaust relatives and participation in the journey to Poland) and the way they moderated the categories of perceived influence factors which were assembled from the individual items. The same action was performed for the categories of lessons. Cohens` d size effect was calculated to measure the size effect of the significant differences.

***Results***

### *Table 7: Perceived influences over the moral attitudes:*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Factor** | **No influence**  **1** | **Slight influence**  **2** | **Medium influence**  **3** | **Strong influence**  **4** | **strongest influence**  **5** | **%** | **N** | Mean | **SD** |
| **1**. Learning for Matriculation in Holocaust Studies | 10.78% | 6.86% | 29.41% | 39.22% | 13.73% | 100 | 102 | 3.38 | 1.14 |
| **2**. Prior knowledge and experiences until Grade 11 | 3.92% | 16.67% | 37.25% | 30.39% | 11.76% | 100 | 102 | 3.29 | 1.01 |
| **3**. Nuclear Family | 11.76% | 16.67% | 27.45% | 28.43% | 15.69% | 100 | 102 | 3.20 | 1.24 |
| **4**. Participation in this research | 21.57% | 24.51% | 31.37% | 13.73% | 8.82% | 100 | 102 | 2.64 | 1.22 |
| **5**. Close friends | 24.51% | 23.53% | 34.31% | 11.76% | 5.88% | 100 | 102 | 2.51 | 1.16 |

The results indicate that the first influencefactor, most perceived by the participants to have an effect on their moral attitudes was learning for the matriculation in Holocaust studies***.***

***II. Analysis of perceived influences categories:***

The second step of data analysis wastosort the different perceived influence**s** into the following two categories:

**A. Socio-Cultural influences** including: the Nuclear Family, Close friends and Prior knowledge and experiences.

**B. Educational-Learning influences** including: Learning for the matriculation in Holocaust Studies**' and** Participation in this research

**Table 8: Results of perceived influences categories (2 = slight influence, 3 = medium influence, 4 = strong influence)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of perceived influences** | **N** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Paired Samples t-test (df)** |
| A. Educational-learning influences | 102 | **3.01** | .07 | 0.09 (101)  n.s. |
| B. Socio-cultural influences | 102 | **3.00** | .08 |

n.s. - non-significant p>0.005

\***Results indicate** that there were no significant differences between the two categories.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

***III. Analysis of Gender, the journey to Poland and family relation to Holocaust victims or survivors as moderators of perceived influences categories***

The third step of data analysis wastolook for significant differences between gender, participation in the journey to Poland and having or not having family relatives who were Holocaust victims or survivors, as moderators of perceived influences categories. Significant results were fund only for family relatives.

**Table 9: Results for measurement of perceived socio-cultural influences as a function of the moderators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Moderators** | **Section** | **N** | **Mean** | **SD** | **t-test value**  **(df)** |
| Whether the participant has Holocaust family relatives | Yes | 61 | 3.14 | .71 | t=2.18\*  (99) |
| No | 40 | 2.81 | .82 |

\*significant differences were found in these parameters p<0.05

The results indicate that there were significant differences between participants who had a relative who was a Holocaust victim or survivor and those who did not have such a relative in relation to their perceptions of the socio-cultural influence factors as affected their moral attitudes (t=-2.18, p<0.05).

**Table 10: Results for measurement of perceived educational-learning influences as a function of the moderators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Moderators** | **Section** | **N** | **Mean** | **SD** | **t-test value**  **(df)** |
| Whether the participant has Holocaust family relatives | Yes | 61 | 3.29 | .69 | t=-2.07\*  (99) |
| No | 40 | 2.58 | .73 |

\*significant differences were found in these parameters p<0.05

The results indicate that there were significant differences between participants who had a relative who was a Holocaust victim or survivor and those who did not have such a relative in relation to their perceptions of the educational-learning influence factors as affected their moral attitudes (t=-2.07, p<0.05).

### 

### *3.3.2 Perceived moral lessons derived from Holocaust learning*

This part presents different perceived moral lessons deriving from Holocaust learning. The first step of data analysis related to participants’ perceptions of particular moral lessons learned from the program.

***I. Analysis of moral lessons items***

**Table 11: Extent of agreement with the different perceived lessons**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **The Lesson** | **No agreement**  **1** | **Slight agreement**  **2** | **Medium agreement**  **3** | **Strong agreement**  **4** | **Strongest agreement**  **5** | **%** | **N** | Mean | **SD** |
| **1**. It`s important to learn about Holocaust moral dilemmas |  | 1.96% | 4.90% | 31.37% | 61.76% | 100 | 102 | **4.53** | .69 |
| **2**. The strong must avoid harming the weak | 1.96% | 3.92% | 11.76% | 47.06% | 35.29% | 100 | 102 | **4.10** | .90 |
| **3**. If we lose our morals we may become like the Nazis | 9.80% | 19.61% | 17.65% | 28.43% | 24.51% | 100 | 102 | **3.38** | 1.31 |
| **4**. Moral dilemmas are not relevant in war situations | 20.59% | 30.39% | 34.31% | 13.73% | .98% | 100 | 102 | **2.44** | 1.00 |
| **5**. Since the Nazis harmed us, we can harm others | 59.80% | 30.39% | 7.84% | 1.96% |  | 100 | 102 | **1.52** | .73 |

The results indicate that the highest level of agreement was with the lesson "it is important to learn about the moral dilemmas of the Holocaust".

***II. Analysis of lessons categories***

The second step of data analysis wastosort the different lessons into the two following categories:

**A. Humanist-Liberal moral lessons** including: "The strong must avoid harming the weak",

"If we lose our morals, we may become like the Nazis" and "It is important to learn about Holocaust moral dilemmas"

**B. Nationalist- Utilitarian moral lessons** including: "Moral dilemmas are not relevant in war situations" and"Since the Nazis harmed us, we can harm others".

**Table 12: Results for lessons categories**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Categories of Lessons** | **N** | **Mean** | **SD** | **Paired Samples t-test (df)** |
| A. Humanist-Liberal moral lessons | 102 | **4.00** | .06 | -18.36\*\* (101) |
| B. Nationalist-Utilitarian moral lessons | 102 | **1.98** | .07 |

\*\*significant differences p<0.01

The results indicate that the extent of agreement with theHumanist-Liberal moral lessons (Mean = 4.00), was significantly higher in comparison with the extent of agreement with the Nationalist-Utilitarian moral lessons (Mean=1.98); (t=-18.36, p<0.01).

***III. Analysis of Gender, the journey to Poland and family relation to Holocaust victims or survivors as moderators of perceived lessons categories***

The third step of data analysis wastolook for significant differences between gender, participation in the journey to Poland and having relatives who were Holocaust victims or survivors as moderators of perceived lessons categories. Significant results were fund only for perceived nationalist-utilitarian moral lessons as a function of the moderators.

**Table 13: Measurement of the difference between perceived nationalist-utilitarian moral lessons as a function of the moderators**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Moderators** | **Section** | **N** | **Mean** | **SD** | **t-test value**  **(df)** |
| Participant gender | Male | 36 | 2.25 | .78 | t=2.91\*\*  (100) |
| Female | 66 | 1.83 | .64 |

\*\*significant differences were found in these parameters p<0.01

Significant differences were found between males and females in relation to the extent of agreement with 'nationalist-utilitarian' lessons categories. Males expressed a significantly higher extent of agreement than the females (t=2.91, p<0.01).

### *3.3.3 Conclusions*

*Conclusions* *regarding the perceived influences:*

1. Learning was the most important factor of influencing the creation of moral attitudes.
2. There was no difference between Educational-learning and Socio-cultural influences on the creation of the moral attitudes.
3. Students who have Holocaust family relatives were more motivated to develop moral attitudes as an outcome of this influence.

*Conclusions regarding the perceived lessons:*

1. Learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas was the most important perceived lesson learned expressed by the participants.
2. Participants supported significantly more the Humanist-liberal lessons in comparison to the Nationalist-Utilitarian moral lessons.
3. Because of gender differences boys demonstrate more support for nationalist-utilitarian lessons than girls.

## 

## 3.4 Study 4 –Associations between moral attitudes and moral lessons

**The study aim** is to examine whether specific moral attitudes associated with specific lessons perceived to have been acquired from the Holocaust Learning Program. This is an innovating attempt to look for these kinds of correlations. The study is divided into two parts: the first part presents the correlations found between Holocaust era dilemmas categories and the lessons categories. The second part presents the correlations found between the Post-Holocaust era dilemmas categories and the lessons categories.

***Method***

The study was conducted at the end of the research after all the data were collected from the three Moral Attitudes Questionnaires and the Lessons Questionnaire completed by the 102 research participants. The statistical data analysis was performed with a correlation matrix using "Pearson" coefficients in order to examine possible linear connections (correlations) between the mean results for Holocaust and Post-Holocaust dilemmas categories and lessons categories. The two different moral solutions for each moral attitude category were correlated with the Humanist-liberal moral lessons category and with the Nationalist-utilitarian moral lessons category.

***Results***

### *3.4.1 Correlations between Holocaust moral attitudes and moral lessons*

**In category 1a**: "The collaboration dilemmas": a medium positive significant linear correlation was found between the results for the survival moral solution and the results for the Humanist-Liberal moral lessons (r=0.33, p<0.01). This means that if the extent of agreement with the survival moral solution is higher, then the extent of agreement with Humanist-Liberal moral lessons will be also higher.

**In category 2a**: "The acute dilemmas": a medium positive significant linear correlation was found between the results for the survival moral solution and results for the Humanist-Liberal moral lessons (R=0.35, p<0.01). This means that if the extent of agreement with the survival moral solution is higher, then the extent of agreement with Humanist-Liberal moral lessons will also be higher.

**In category 3a**: "The parental dilemmas": a medium positive significant linear correlation was found between the results for the survival moral solution and the results for the Humanist-Liberal moral lessons (R=0.28, p<0.01). This means that if the extent of agreement with the survival moral solution is higher, the extent of agreement with Humanist-Liberal moral lessons will also be higher.

No significant linear correlations were found between Holocaust moral dilemmas categories and Nationalist-utilitarian lessons, for either one of the moral solutions.

### *3.4.2 Correlations between Post-Holocaust moral attitudes and moral lessons*

**In category 4a**: "The perception of Jewish behavior towards the Nazis": a medium positive significant linear connection (correlation) was found between the results for the judgmental moral solution and the results for the nationalist-utilitarian moral lessons (r=0.22, p<0.05). This means that if the extent of agreement with the judgmental moral solution is higher, then the extent of agreement with nationalist-utilitarian moral lessons will also be higher.

**In category 4b:** "The perception of Jewish behavior towards the Nazis": a medium positive significant linear correlation was found between the results for the acceptance moral solution, and the results for the humanist-liberal moral lessons (R=0.35, p<0.01). This means that if the extent of agreement with the acceptance moral solution is higher, then the extent of agreement with humanist-liberal moral lessons will also be higher.

**In category 5a**: "Consideration of revenge and compromise": a medium positive significant linear correlation was found between the results for the affective-intuitive moral solution and the results for the nationalist-utilitarian moral lessons (R=0.32, p<0.01). This means that if the extent of agreement with the affective-intuitive moral is higher, then the extent of agreement with nationalist-utilitarian moral lessons will also be higher.

**In category 5b:**  "Consideration of revenge and compromise": a positive medium significant linear correlation was found between the results for the rational-utilitarian moral solution and the results for the humanist-liberal moral lessons (R=0.21, p<0.05). This means that if the extent of agreement with the rational-utilitarian moral solution is higher, then the extent of agreement with humanist-liberal moral lessons will also be higher.

**In category 6a**: "The Perception of the Holocaust as a historical event": a positive medium significant linear correlation was found between the results for the universal moral solution and the results for the humanist-liberal moral lessons (R=0.26, p<0.05). This means that if the extent of agreement with the universal moral attitude is higher, then the extent of agreement with humanist-liberal moral lessons will also be higher.

### *3.4.3 Conclusions*

1. When we look at the correlations between Holocaust era moral attitudes and the perceived moral lessons **the conclusion** is that when the extent of agreement with the survival moral solutions is high, then the extent of agreement with Humanist-Liberal is also high.
2. When we look at the correlations between Post-Holocaust era moral attitudes and the perceived moral lessons **the conclusion** is that: Insofar as the moral attitude is more critical than the lessons learned will be more extreme. Insofar as the moral attitude is more merciful then the lessons learned will be less radical. Insofar as the moral attitude is more open-minded and flexible, than the lessons learned give more consideration to other people’s needs and universal values.
3. Following those conclusions we can assumethat learning, understanding and evaluation of Holocaust moral dilemmas increases the probability that students will learn universal lessons such as the need for understanding, closeness and friendship with other people. This insight can strengthen support for the approach that universal lessons can be learned from the Holocaust.

## 

## 3.5 Study 5 –The experiences of Holocaust learning

**The aim** of this study was to understand the meanings constructed through the participants’ narratives regarding their personal experiences of Holocaust Learning Program.

***Method***

Thirteen participants (out of a total of 102 participants in the research) volunteered to take part in individual in-depth interviews conducted during the last phase of the study in January 2016. Four of the interviewees were boys: Boaz, Elad, Asaf and Ronen (all names given are fictive to protect interviewees’ confidentiality). Nine of the interviewees were girls - Yonat, Pazit, Noa, Lily, Rachel, Miriam, Sarah, Aia and Dina. Elad, Asaf and Sarah did not participate in the journey to Poland. Ronen, Boaz, Aia, Miriam and Lily do not have family relatives, who are Holocaust victims or survivors. The other interviewees did have such connection, usually a grandmother or grandfather, who was still alive, and they heard about their experiences in the Holocaust at different levels of scope and detail. They are actually members of the third or fourth generation in Holocaust survivors’ families. Interviewees were asked questions that touched upon their family connection to the Holocaust, the decision to participate or not to participate in the journey to Poland, their learning experiences regarding the journey, their views towards the moral dilemmas faced by Jews during and after the Holocaust, the moral lessons they learned and they were asked to describe their experience of participation in the study itself. The individual in-depth interviews were recorded, transcribed, coded and organized according to themes and sub-themes using thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke 2006).

Thematic analysis of the results revealed 4 main themes:

1. The personal connection with Holocaust.
2. The deliberation regarding the decision to join the journey to Poland.
3. The experiences gained from the journey to Poland.
4. Coping with Holocaust moral dilemmas through learning.

The fourth theme – 'coping with Holocaust moral dilemmas through learning' was divided into four sub-themes:

1. Learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas as a new experience.
2. The creation of moral attitudes through learning.
3. The evolution of moral attitudes through learning.
4. The importance of learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas.

### *3.5.1 Exploring the different experiences:*

***1. The personal connection with Holocaust***

Jewish people all around the world and mainly in Israel have memories of experiences from early childhood regarding the Holocaust through stories they heard, ceremonies in which they participated, films they watched etc.`. These experiences are stronger when they have family relatives, who were Holocaust victims or survivors. This direct encounter (or indirect through photographs etc.) with family members who witnessed the Holocaust creates strong emotions together with the arousal of a need for more information in order to satisfy curiosity.

*"I have Holocaust survivors in my family and I think that the encounter with them helped me to understand what they went through and all sorts of things that I would otherwise have been unable to grasp. I am very interested in the Holocaust, I have been thinking about this all year. On Holocaust Memorial Day' my feelings are very strong so I even sometimes need to close myself in my room and try to repress it" (*Yonat*).*

*Elad*spoke about the way that he tried to find information about the Holocaust in his family:

*"In our family, we talk a lot about the Holocaust and also about moral dilemmas. We especially talk about "Kastner" because my grandfather was on "Kastner’s train"* [a train that rescued Jews from Budapest organized by Israel Kastner in July 1944] *"My grandfather is a Holocaust survivor, what he told me about the Holocaust moved me and influenced me a lot"*(Elad).

***2. The deliberation regarding the decision to join the journey to Poland***

Israeli high school students undergo serious deliberation regarding their decision whether or not to take part in the journey to Poland (Bondi, 2014). Interviewees referred to their reasons in favor and against this decision.

Against: family’s opposition arguing that students are not yet mature enough:

*“My father thinks that at my age and in this framework it is not suitable; I don’t know if on a school trip it’s possible to achieve the significant experience that is anticipated” (Elad).*

In favor: family’s support for the journey on a personal base:

*"It is our family tradition; it’s the wish of family members who are survivors; all the grandchildren and all my brothers and sisters have flown there. It’s also very important for me to go there; I know it’s so important for my grandmother; it’s something that I want to experience myself; Grandfather explained it accurately – in which camp, in which block and in which bunk" (Aia).*

***3. The experiences of the journey to Poland***

Analysis of the results identified two main experiences *-* Cognitive experience and Emotional experience. In the interviews, participants reported both these types of experiences as they emerged during the journey to Poland.

*Miriam* explained her experience as a significant learning:

*"It was a challenging...during the journey everything came together for me...it seriously changed my thinking when I saw everything with my own eyes* (Miriam).

On the other hand, some the interviewees had a different experience of not so significant learning. An example of this feeling was expressed by *Noa*:

*"I did not really connect with the journey; it did not feel as though it was actually true and it was not possible to absorb things"*

After discussing the cognitive experiences, we move to the emotional experiences which emerged from the interviewees’ stories.Some of the interviewees reported sadness aroused by the sights and experiencesin Poland relating to both concrete and symbolic actions:

*“In the Lupochova forest near the execution ditches...it was really a very strong experience"* (Aia).

However, other interviewees expressed different emotional reaction, like the pleasure of the social experience:

*"I really enjoyed the journey … we had free time in the evenings and I really enjoyed being with my friends”* (Ronen)*.*

Some of the interviewees reported emotional satisfaction, and were pleased that they had gone on the journey:

*"I remember that when I returned home I firstly went to my grandfather and told him many things about the journey. I showed him my pictures; he was extremely glad"* (Yonat).

On the other hand, other interviewees reported that they felt bad because they did not feel sad or they did not have emotional difficulty in Poland in contrast to the earlier expectations that they had culled from their surroundings. They felt disappointed in themselves and dissatisfied with their personal emotional reaction to the sights in Poland. They thought that they should have felt a lot more sadness and emotional difficulty, that they should have cried but they didn’t feel the urge to do so. They also felt that they were abnormal and had the impression that their friends had the “correct” feelings.

*“I really expected that I will feel more powerful emotions and when it didn`t happen I was disappointed that I wasn't moved so much; it was really very interesting but it was not actually difficult; I saw some of my friends crying but I was emotionless so I was disappointed, I felt that When I was interested they felt pain. This feeling made me think all the time 'what kind of person are you'?"*(Pazit).

*Lily* shared the following thoughts:

*"I must be honest…* [She moved uncomfortably while talking], *when we visited 'Aushwitz-Birkenau' death camp our guide told us about the 'schlyse-commando' - the Jewish prisoners who worked in the latrines. Suddenly me and my friend looked at one another and we just burst into so much laughter… everybody stared at us like we were crazy and I felt so bad, not because of they, but because I felt relief while I should have felt bad"* (Lily).

***4. Coping with Holocaust moral dilemmas through learning***

Coping with Holocaust moral dilemmas through learning was a new experience for the participants in the research. The reason is that this issue is not included in Holocaust learning programs nor he has much place in Jewish-Israeli public discourse over the Holocaust. Therefore, it is important and relevant to study the different experiences and reactions of the participants to this new subject.

*4A. Learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas as a new experience:*

During the research and particularly during the interviews it became increasingly clear that the interviewees lacked much knowledge concerning the dilemmas presented to them in the moral attitude questionnaire.

*"I don’t really understand the dilemma about the comparison of the Holocaust, I know very little about other genocides; I know a little about the “Jewish expulsion from Spain”* [not actually genocide]: *I heard about the 'Armenian Holocaust’ but I really don’t know anything much about it"* (Dina).

*4B. The creation of moral attitudes through learning:*

Participation in the research gave the interviewees the opportunity to meet for the first time with the complex issue of Holocaust moral dilemmas. This encounter enabled them to define their moral attitudes towards the dilemmas as a new experience.

*"The research influenced me since it made me think about the dilemmas posed in the questionnaire although we had not learned about a large proportion of them; as a result of the questionnaires I thought about my attitudes"* (Ronen).

*Elad* and *Pazit* talked about the connection they found between Holocaust moral dilemmas and actual morality:

*"Many students in our school* [those who participated in the research] *are now aware of a lot of important things that they had not been aware of; before the research I hadn’t thought about moral questions at all... When I began to think about the moral dilemmas it really influenced me and made me think about those situations; the research opened up all sorts of new facets of knowledge and thinking so it had a strong influence* *on me and probably on many of my friends too*; *Moral thinking can help us in everyday situations and maybe later when we become soldiers"* (Elad).

*4C. The evolution of moral attitudes through learning:*

Interviewees expressed three main factors that caused them to change their attitudes through learning: maturation processes, learning processes and the repetition of filling out the questionnaires three times.

The first factor was the maturation process they underwent during the year in which the research was conducted. This process led them to be more aware of the complexity of the dilemmas and to be less naive. *Miriam* and *Noa* explained:

*"Now it is more difficult for me to decide … in all the dilemmas I wanted to write 'uncertain' … it is not because of the journey to Poland … I have matured and I value my life more and that of other people and this makes it more difficult for me to determine my attitudes"* (Miriam).

The second factor was the different learning processes that the students underwent as expressed by the interviewees:

*"After we spoke more about the "thief's dilemma" I understood that everyone stole from everyone else in order to survive… it’s a momentary decision, it’s not a moral consideration, you don’t think about someone - who he is and what he is - you just want to live"* (Asaf).

The third factor was the fact that they filled in the questionnaire three times. Repeating the same process three times engendered changes in attitudes as *Ronen* explained:

*"The fact that the research was in stages had an influence, because that gave us time to think; Time gave me deeper and greater understanding… because I had more time to think, I also deliberated more before making a decision"*.

It can be concluded that changes in attitudes stemmed from acquisition of knowledge during learning, maturation processes and due to the time that passed between the three points at which the students filled out the questionnaires.

*4D. The importance of learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas:*

The interviewees noted five main contributions that they derived from learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas. The first that they felt it deepened their knowledge on the Holocaust from a human viewpoint, so that they were able to understand the mental processes that the Jews experienced as expressed by the interviewees:

*"It is very important to learn about the dilemmas because as a society it was difficult to accept the Holocaust survivors in Israel and learning about the moral dilemmas really helped us to understand what happened there and why people acted as they did. This aspect is very important because it is the history of our people, of all of us"* (Boaz).

The second contribution was the beginning of the development of universal moral thinking as expressed by the interviewees:

*"In some way, it is clear that such situations or similar will reflect upon people in future life, perhaps in a smaller and weaker manner, but they will arrive. If we learn about those dilemmas, we will perhaps not repeat the mistakes of the past"* (Dina).

The third contribution was the understanding of the connection between moral behavior in extreme situations and moral behavior in daily life as expressed by the interviewees:

*"I think that the Holocaust was an exceptional event that forced people to face situations that they would never otherwise have encountered … when you think of their moral dilemmas it can teach you about human nature and what you would do when you are in a situation where you have to save yourself or die"* (Aia)*.*

The fourth contribution was the deepening of self-understanding and self-awareness in relation to moral issues as expressed by the interviewees:

*"Learning about the moral dilemmas helps us to understand things relating to morality and may help me in my moral decisions in the future; When you think about the Holocaust usually you think about the incinerators, the 'ghetto', the hunger and so on… you do not think about the person himself, and what he experienced, what the people faced and what they had to decide each day. When you encounter that, you begin to understand the mental difficulty that you might have with yourself if you ever need to cope with these kinds of situations"* (Yonat).

The fifth contribution was thestrengthening of Holocaust memory by learning about the moral dilemmas as expressed by the interviewees:

**"***I am afraid that with time the Holocaust will not be part of our awareness any more that it will be forgotten. It is very important that it should not happen! The superficial way that Holocaust is being taught now may cause a boredom and a lack of interest among young students like ourselves; I think that dealing with and learning about the moral dilemmas will make things more interesting and alive for young students and actually for everyone; in this way it will contribute to the memory of the Holocaust"* (Noa).

It can be concluded that the interviewees strongly valued learning about the moral dilemmas of the Holocaust from five different perspectives. Their estimation related both to their enrichment of knowledge about human and historical aspects of the Holocaust and also to the linkage that they identified between this knowledge and their moral behavior in their present and future life. Another most important contribution is that the students were able to better understand why it is important to remember the Holocaust.

### *3.5.2 Conclusions*

***The first conclusion*** that we present is thatall the characteristics of personal connections to the Holocaust which have been described are expression of the authentic psychological need to get to know and to understand the Holocaust. Dealing with Holocaust proved to be an inter-generational need that can help collectively recovering process from the trauma.

***The second conclusion*** is with regard to the ongoing debate on the journey to Poland. We conclude that early expectations "to feel bad" among the students before the journey led to strong feeling of disappointed because in reality their real emotions did not comply with these expectations. This might be prevented by beater understanding of the multi-faceted nature of psychological reactions to this kind of journey.

***The third conclusion*** is that learning about specific and realistic human experiences such as are depicted in the moral dilemmas of the Holocaust help participants to develop a wider moral perspective and understanding of human behavior. It encouraged the development of universal moral thinking and deepening self-understanding and awareness of moral issues. That will have potentially effect on their moral judgment and actions in present as well in the future.

***The fourth conclusion*** is that not only the participant's knowledge but also their emotional involvement with regard to the issue of Holocaust was strengthened by their exposure to Holocaust moral dilemmas. Therefore “Holocaust moral dilemmas” is an important subject that should be included in future Holocaust Learning Program curricula

**Chapter 4 - General Discussion and Conclusions**

This chapter presents further discussion and conclusions from the research relating to the studied issues of Holocaust moral dilemmas, the Holocaust Learning Program and lessons learned from these studies. It presents the contributions and the limitations of the research and indicates possible new directions for further investigation. The chapter concludes by presenting possible future directions of Holocaust learning.

## 4.1 Contributions of the present thesis

The following paragraphs summarize and review the main theoretical, methodological and empirical contributions of the present thesis to the extant corpus of knowledge in the relevant fields.

* In the literature review new innovating step of clarifying the domain of Jewish moral dilemmas during and after the Jewish Holocaust was presented. The concept "Survival Morality" was used here for the first time as an original concept to describe a most important element of Jewish moral behaviour during the Holocaust. Furthermore, we clarified some of the important processes which explain both the moral behaviour of the Jews in the Holocaust and the development of the Jewish-Israeli national recovery process after the Holocaust **(Chapter 1).**
* For the first time in the field of research on Holocaust moral dilemmas, complex statistical procedures which included an exploratory research design combined with longitudinal research procedures and specific research tools, was used to fulfil the research aims. In addition, a new research tool for investigated Holocaust Moral Attitudes was used. **(Chapter 2).**
* This study was the first to investigate moral attitudes towards Jewish Holocaust moral dilemmas among Jewish-Israeli high school students. Therefore, for the first time we have initial results regarding this most important but not yet investigated topic. We revealed the participants’ strong deliberation between supporting the deontological versus the survival moral solutions, at the initial stage at the beginning of the Holocaust Learning Program ***(Study 1)***.
* This study was the first to investigate the existing Holocaust Learning Programs in Israel as a factor forming moral attitudes among Jewish-Israeli high school students towards Jewish moral dilemmas during Holocaust and post-Holocaust eras. The three measurements during the learning process enabled us to examine the evolution of the participants’ attitudes over time. The final results regarding the impact of Holocaust Learning Program on the creation and development of the participants’ moral attitudes constitute a new and important contribution to knowledge. We now know that this learning process caused more support for the survival moral attitude towards Holocaust moral dilemmas at the end of the learning process. At the same time, there was also an increase in participants’ support for the 'acceptance moral solution' concerning Jewish resistance to the Nazis. A new contribution to the field of moral research is the conclusion that it is easier to reduce support for deontological solutions than to increase support for survival moral solutions ***(Study 2).***
* Moral lessons perceived by the participants as stemming from learning about the Holocaust were identified and discussed for the first time. Our results demonstrated that the Holocaust Learning Program and especially learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas strengthened the adoption of 'humanist-liberal' moral lessons learned by the participants ***(study 3).***
* New investigating of associations between moral attitudes and moral lessons stemming from Holocaust learning allowed us to find, for the first time, significant correlations between these two dimensions. This finding provides the foundation for the determination that there is a linear connection between moral attitudes and moral lessons in regard to Holocaust moral dilemmas ***(Study 4)***.
* The results from the interviews show that learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas can contribute to the participants’ understanding of the feelings, thoughts and actions of the Jews in the most terrible situations of the Holocaust. These results also taught us that learning about Jewish Holocaust moral dilemmas can contribute to the participants’ understanding of their own moral behavior. In addition, participants reported that as a result of their learning they improved their moral judgment in present situations. Now they think more about how they would potentially act in the same situations as those of the Jews during the Holocaust and even more important - how they can act in future similar situations, in which they will be either on the week or the strong side. This may be considered as education’s most important contribution to high school students – learning how to think more and deliberate more before taking action and obeying orders ***(Study 5)***.

## 4.2 Research limits

This was an exploratory researchwhich as far as we could ascertain was the first study on the subject of Jewish Holocaust moral dilemmas. Therefore, there were no other results from similar research studies that we could compare with our results. This limitation could be overcome by future research.

## 4.3 Future directions of investigation

The research reported here increased our knowledge regarding the moral attitudes of Jewish-Israeli youth towards Jewish moral dilemmas during and after the Holocaust. This is new knowledge gained from this innovative research. It is suggested that future studies should continue to investigate this subject in different ways. Several directions for such projects can be suggested:

1. Repeat this research with Jewish high schools' students outside Israel to look for possible similarities or differences.
2. Repeat this research but add more dilemmas. This will produce more data, results and conclusions.
3. Additionally, it could be very interesting and useful to perform similar research among German youth concerning German moral dilemmas during the Nazi era and the way that Germany is coping with the consequences of the Holocaust. It would be very interesting to compare the German research results with results of the Jewish and Israeli research and then to compare and integrate all findings. This research could be informing another step towards normalization of relations between Jews and Germans and emphasizing the importance of universal morality.
4. Given the fact that the subject of moral dilemmas is not part of both formal and experiential Holocaust learning programs in Israeli schools today, the exposure of the participants to this subject stemmed from three sources: their former personal knowledge, the Holocaust Learning Program and their participation in the research itself. We suggest that if the subject of moral dilemmas were to be taught thoroughly as part of Holocaust learning programs, it would be interesting and worthwhile to repeat this research with other students who learn about the moral dilemmas as an integral part of their Holocaust studies.

## 4.4 Future directions of Holocaust learning

### *4.4.1 " Holocaust Three-dimensional learning program"*

***Theoretical background:***

In Chapter 1 we discussed the intense debate that continues to be waged concerning new directions for the learning of the Holocaust (Cohen, 2010) and especially with regard to the necessity and effectiveness of the journeys to Holocaust sites in Poland (Bondi, 2014). The present Holocaust Learning Program – the compulsory learning program for the matriculation exams and students voluntary participation in the journey to Poland provide partial answers to fundamental questionsand especially to the question that seem to bother Jews above all – ***"why did we not strongly resist the Nazis"*** (In the paths of memory, Ministry of Education, 2015; Ministry of Education, General Manager’s Directive, 2014; Soen & Davidovich, 2011; Romi & Lev, 2007; Rama, 2011; Bondi, 2014). This reality encouraged us to suggest the following learning program.

***The program rational:***

Based on the results and conclusions of this research we propose an educational initiative, a new Holocaust learning programnamed ***"Holocaust Three-Dimensional Learning Program"****.* This program is based on the conception that we should learn about the Holocaust not only from the Jewish particular perspective but also from a more universal perspective. The program can also possibly be used in other places in the world to cope with the educational challenges involved in coping with catastrophic national events. Future use of the program should also need be investigated and evaluated through academic research.

***The program’s educational goals:***

1. To enable students to acquire comprehensive knowledge about the Jewish Holocaust and similar genocides. 2. To teach students to ask moral questions and to cast doubt on what appears to be certain 3. To develop the student`s independent and critical moral thinking. 4. To encourage students to adopt humanistic democratic values, draw informed conclusions and derive varied lessons out of their own independent thinking.

***The program’s foundations:***

The program has four main foundations: A. Combine different learning methods. B. Use of survivor's narratives. C. Making comparisons. B. Deducing different lessons. We shall now discus these four foundations.

*A. Combine different learning methods:*

Our results (Study 5) revealed that learning about horrific phenomena necessitates a certain kind of emotional distancing, because otherwise learners might be flooded emotionally and this would disrupt learning. On the other hand in order to really grasp and understand this highly complex issue of the Holocaust and particularly the Holocaust moral dilemmas, an emotional connection to the situations described is also needed. These elements can be achieved by combining different learning methods -'formal class learning' with ' experiential learning' in the field. A good combination between the journeys to Poland being the experiential learning together with formal class learning is performed today.

*B. Use of survivor's narratives:*  When we look at the way that the Holocaust has been taught over the years in Israel, we can observe two main learning disciplines involved – the first deals with the main historical events and facts, we shall call it "the frame story". The second deals with the 'narrative story' which concentrates on the survivors’ personal narratives, we shall call this "the inner story" (Shapira, 1997, Soen & Davidovich, 2011, Efrat and Baban, 2016). Based on our results (Study 5) we concluded that the 'inner story' can be best learned through exposure to the Holocaust moral dilemmas. The dilemmas clarify and illustrate what really happened, making the experiences more concrete – something that the students can really understand emotionally and with which they can empathize.

*C. Deducing different lessons:*

The Jewish people perceive the Holocaust as an additional event along the sequence of continuous attempts by different empires, peoples and dictators to harm and destroy the Jewish people and in the present time - the State of Israel. It is easy to understand how this perception of reality leads to the deduction of lessons such as: "we must be strong in order to survive" or "a strong Israel will prevent the next Holocaust", which are widely accepted in Israel (Machman, 1996). These are "national-utilitarian" lessons or in another definition –"Jewish-particular" lessons, which indicate that the Jewish people needs an independent state with a strong army to protect itself from another Holocaust. Another kind of lessons that can be also derived from Holocaust learning are the "Humanist-liberal" lessons which indicate that when we the Jewish people are strong they must preserve morality, and not harm, but instead protect those who are weak (Baron, 1994). The results of this research (Studies 3+4) indicate that learning about Holocaust moral dilemmas helped participants to develop not only moral thinking and attitudes but also different moral lessons, so that they expressed more support for the "Humanist-liberal" lessons after their learning. As a result, we believe that the adoption of Humanist-liberal moral lessons and their implementation in different policies can provide a psychological-educational barrier against the rise of negative ideologies of nationalism, militarism and racism.

*D. Making comparisons:*

Our results (Studies 1+2) indicated that many of the participants agreed that in order to understand, draw conclusions and learn lessons about Holocaust, it is better to compare it to similar phenomenon (other genocides). The way to implement this insight is when learning about Holocaust, to open up discussion, enhancing awareness of the different lessons and using comparison to distinguish them one from the other. This could be done by using the "Holocaust Three-Dimensional Learning Program" which includes the consideration of historical, phenomenological and psychological components. Figure 1 provides a visual description of the four above-mentioned foundations of this program:

**Figure 1–"Holocaust Three-Dimensional Learning Program" foundations**

***The structure of the "Holocaust Three-Dimensional Learning Program":***

*"*The program would include the following three parts which are defined as "dimensions":

*The first dimension is the* ***"Chronological Dimension"*** *–* Focusing on the historical time line of the Holocaust. This is an historical-chronological perspective; meaning that there is an attempt to go back and learn about the Holocaust from a longer time perspective which would include:

1. The roots of anti-Semitism, its development and implications in Europe during 19th and early 20th century (1800-1914).
2. World War I and its outcomes for Germany (1914-1923).
3. The rise of the Nazis to power in Germany, Nazi ideology and its implementation on the Jews in Germany (1923-1939).
4. World War II and its connection to the Holocaust (1939-1945).
5. Main events of the Holocaust throughout Europe and in North Africa (1939-1945).
6. Israel-Germany relations after the Holocaust (1945-2015).
7. The trials of Nazi war criminals in Germany and German understanding of the Holocaust (1949-2015).
8. The ways in which Israeli society has coped with the Holocaust and its implications (1940-2016).

*The second dimension is the* ***"Phenomenological Dimension"***– Focusing on genocide: This is a phenomenological expansion of Holocaust learning comparing the Holocaust to similar events in modern history. Other similar phenomena which should be included in this learning are:

* The Armenian Genocide in Turkey (1914-1923)
* The Genocide of the Romani people in Europe (1941-1945)
* The Tutsi Genocide in Ruanda-Africa (1994)

The learning program should also consider the acts of mass murders by certain governments against their own citizens. Examples are the "Great Hunger" in Soviet Ukraine (1932-1933), the "Euthanasia" program in Nazi Germany (1939-1941) and the Cambodian Genocide (1975-1979).

*The third dimension is the* ***"Psychological Dimension"***,Focusing on Moral Dilemmas. Here we go deeply into complex psychological processes to produce a sharper and more focused perception of Holocaust events. This should be accomplished by learning about moral dilemmas faced not only by the Jews, but also by other people and nations during World War II. This will include the Allies who fought against Nazi Germany governments and military command, the Nazi regime, the armed Nazi forces, German civilian population and non-Jewish population in the territories conquered by Nazi Germany at that time. The big advantage of learning about moral dilemmas is that this learning necessitates the use of a combination of emotional and analytical thinking. On the one hand the moral dilemmas expose the learners to the most painful weakness of the human soul, while on the other hand they must make an analytical cognitive evaluation and balanced judgment in order to form their own moral attitudes.

Figure 2 below summarizes the three dimensions:

**Dilemmas**

**Genocide**

**History**

**Figure 2 - "Holocaust Three-Dimensional Learning Program" structure**

***Practical implication of the program:***

Our results (Study 5) indicates that participants needed much time to adjust themselves to deal with Holocaust learning and especially Holocaust moral dilemmas. We concluded that this is because Holocaust is such a complicated issue to learn both cognitively and emotionally which needs time and sufficient maturity. Therefore, the duration of such a program should be two full academic years in Grades 11 and 12 when the students are socially, cognitively and psychologically mature enough. The extent of teaching hours should be 2-4 hours per week with an intensive one-day workshop, once a month. This program should include class learning along with experiential outdoor learning such as a journey to Holocaust sites in Poland or an alternative journey discussed below. Student's requirements for matriculation should include formal knowledge exams, personal research work on a selected topic and active participation in class debates and workshops. The teachers in the program should be the school’s history teachers and homeroom teachers, who should undergo special academic training.

### *4.4.2 An optional alternative for the "Journey to Poland"*

In Chapter 1 we noted the fact that not all high school students in Israel participate in the journey to Poland for many reasons - financial, educational, lack of motivation and others (Rama, 2011). In addition, our results (Study 5) demonstrated that some of the students came back from the journey with feelings of disappointment regarding their emotional reaction to the sites in Poland. As an option to solve these problems we suggest that Holocaust experiential learning does not necessitate the journey to Poland. This could be achieved in a journey in Israel using the many Holocaust learning centers which are spread over the country.

The journey to Holocaust memorial sites in Poland can be replaced by ***"The Journey to Holocaust memory in Israel".***  We suggest that this journey should take place towards the end of school studies in Grade 12 as the peak of two full academic years of Holocaust learning, when high school students’ maturity is at its highest. This kind of journey would not focus solely on the Holocaust. It would also include the story of the Jewish rehabilitation from the Holocaust and the ways in which Israeli society and Holocaust survivors cope with its memory and recover from the trauma. In this way, the story will be told until its end. Of course, this journey can become part of the "Three -Dimensional Holocaust Learning Program"***.*** To conclude this part, we emphasize the serious interest, importance and significance involved in going in person to see with one’s own eyes the extermination sites in Poland, where the horrors happened. In our opinion, this is really a unique, irreplaceable experience, an experience which can benefit every Jew. However, in order to learn and understand the Holocaust, it is not necessary to take this journey while at school. It can be done later in life as a mature and independent decision after more life experience.

***4.4.3 Summary***  In the preface to this thesis Professor Gideon Greif (p-9) wrote: "There is educational value in discussing questions of human behavioral practices in extreme situations, in order to examine ourselves, to think about these situations close-up, to try to reconstruct a particular historical reality and perhaps to come closer to the victims and to identify with them". Our results indicated that participants did expand their knowledge and understanding of Holocaust particular reality by learning about Jewish moral dilemmas. They also reinforced their emotional bond to Holocaust memory and felt closer to its victims. Furthermore, they declare that it is important to become more aware of moral considerations and behavior. No doubt there will always be a gap between moral attitudes and moral behavior especially in extreme situations and conditions. Nevertheless, based on our result and conclusions we can assume that learning of moral issues and educational "practice" in solving moral dilemmas may increase the probability that later in real life, former students will make better moral decisions. This may improve their moral thinking and enhance their interpersonal behavior in everyday life. In a wider perspective, it may even contribute to more humane and reasonable political behavior which might prevent future man-made catastrophes for humanity.
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