Supplementary Materials

This document contains supplementary materials for the paper "Does Holocaust Inversion Predict Justification of Anti-Jewish Aggression? Evidence from Two National Surveys in Norway". Below, the reasoning behind deviations from the preregistered model specification in Study 2 is explained. Next, the analyses examining the role of Holocaust inversion endorsement in predicting nonresponse to explicit prejudice items are described. Tables S1 to S17 present summary statistics, model results from the main analyses, sensitivity tests using preregistered models, and nonresponse models.

Preregistered models in Study 2

The analyses reported in the main tables of Study 2 deviate from the preregistration. First, the preregistration described the focal predictor item as an "antizionist belief". Here, the item is instead referred to as endorsement of Holocaust inversion, which more accurately reflects the content of the item. The preregistered hypotheses, however, concerned the association between endorsement of this item and justification of anti-Jewish aggression, which remains unchanged.

Moreover, the preregistered plan envisioned measuring the two outcomes (justification of aggression and refusal to answer) with separate binary variables and using binary logistic regression for estimation. Further, the plan specified measuring Holocaust inversion beliefs using a binary variable and controlling for antisemitic prejudice using an index variable pre-supplied by the survey authors. However, this approach was subsequently found to be suboptimal for two reasons that were not fully apparent at the time of preregistration.

First, dichotomizing the outcome and predictor variables led to exclusion of a large number of observations (for the population sample, about 700 observations or 42% of the total). Second, the pre-supplied antisemitic prejudice index was found to focus narrowly on endorsement of anti-Jewish stereotypes, while a more comprehensive combined index of antisemitic attitudes was in fact available. This combined index was computed by the survey authors to incorporate measures of (1) traditional prejudice (agreement with statements such as "Jews largely have themselves to blame for being

persecuted" and "Jews have always caused problems in the countries they live in"), (2) social distance (rejecting Jews as neighbors or friends), and (3) dislike of Jews (Moe, 2023). Consequently, the more comprehensive variable was deemed preferable. (Note that the first component of this blatant prejudice variable (agreement with prejudiced beliefs) was constructed by survey authors such that an "Impossible to answer" response contributes zero points, meaning that refusal to answer is treated as equivalent to disagreement with antisemitic statements. Since follow-up analyses found that Holocaust inversion endorsers were more likely to select "Impossible to answer" on these items (see Nonresponse models below), this scoring approach likely underestimates the true level of antisemitic prejudice among respondents.)

Based on this reasoning, it was decided to deviate from the preregistration and use a categorical outcome variable with three categories ("Aggression not justifiable", "Aggression justifiable", and "Refusal to answer"). This variable, which retains more information, could be analyzed using multinomial regression. This provided the added benefit of enabling analysis of the two outcomes within a single model. The focal predictor, endorsement of Holocaust inversion, was factorized to retain maximum information. Instead of the antisemitic prejudice index, the more comprehensive combined antisemitism index was used.

Models using the preregistered variable specifications are reported in Table S13. These preregistered models use substantially fewer observations and a more constrained measure of antisemitic prejudice. Results were generally consistent with the revised analyses, with Holocaust inversion endorsement significantly predicting justification of anti-Jewish aggression and refusal to take a stance against it. However, in the full model the coefficient for Holocaust inversion predicting refusal to answer became non-significant when the explicit prejudice variable was added. This might reflect reduced statistical power and the narrower scope of the explicit prejudice variable in this specification.

The central finding—that Holocaust inversion endorsement is associated with justification of anti-Jewish aggression, even after controlling for explicit antisemitic prejudice—is consistent across both the preregistered and revised specifications.

Nonresponse models

Follow-up analyses were conducted to examine whether endorsement of Holocaust inversion predicted nonresponse to six survey items measuring blatant antisemitic prejudice (e.g., "Jews largely have themselves to blame for being persecuted"). The outcome variable was defined as the total count of "Impossible to answer" responses across these items, with each such response contributing one point. A series of regression models designed for count data were estimated, including a negative binomial model, a zero-inflated negative binomial model, and a hurdle model (which simultaneously predicts the probability of a zero count and the probability of counts greater than zero). Model comparison using AIC indicated that a hurdle model incorporating nonresponse to anti-Muslim prejudice items as an additional control provided the best fit to the data. Tables S14 to S17 show results from the best-fitting models for the population samples as well as for the separate Muslim samples.

The results indicate that Holocaust inversion endorsement is correlated with refusal to answer blatant prejudice items. These findings have implications for interpreting the main analyses. Because the blatant antisemitism control codes nonresponse as low prejudice, and because Holocaust inversion endorsers were more likely to refuse answering these items, the control likely underestimates antisemitic prejudice among Holocaust inversion endorsers. This makes the blatant antisemitism control conservative, suggesting that the association between Holocaust inversion and justification of aggression observed after this control may be a lower-bound estimate.

Supplemental Tables S1-S17

Table S1

Summary Statistics (2017 population sample)

Variable	N	Percent
Considering how Israel treats the Palestinians, harassment and violence against Jews can be defended	1571	
… Does not reflect my views at all	602	38.3%
… Reflects my views somewhat poorly	368	23.4%
… Reflects my views somewhat well	158	10.1%
… Completely reflects my views	35	2.2%
… Impossible to answer	408	26%
Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II	1570	
… Does not reflect my views at all	157	10%
… Reflects my views somewhat poorly	311	19.8%
… Reflects my views somewhat well	411	26.2%
… Completely reflects my views	112	7.1%
… Impossible to answer	579	36.9%
Antisemitism index	1575	
… None	1342	85.2%
… Low	136	8.6%
… Moderate	61	3.9%
… High	36	2.3%
Sympathy in conflict	1573	
… pro-Israel	213	13.5%
… non-partisan	510	32.4%
… pro-Palestine	497	31.6%
… impossible to answer	353	22.4%
Education	1575	

Variable	N	Percent
… No higher education	1161	73.7%
… Higher education	414	26.3%
Gender	1575	
… Male	770	48.9%
… Female	805	51.1%

Table S2

Holocaust inversion and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2017 population sample)

	response	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
HCI: somewhat disagree	Justifying aggression	3.92**	4.48**	4.36**
		[1.59, 9.66]	[1.78, 11.29]	[1.73, 10.99]
	Refusal to answer	1.38	1.31	1.30
		[0.66, 2.88]	[0.61, 2.82]	[0.60, 2.81]
HCI: somewhat agree	Justifying aggression	7.14***	9.10***	8.27***
		[2.97, 17.17]	[3.53, 23.43]	[3.21, 21.32]
	Refusal to answer	3.87***	3.90***	3.83***
		[1.97, 7.61]	[1.84, 8.26]	[1.81, 8.10]
HCI: completely agree	Justifying aggression	18.50***	22.87***	15.58***
		[7.30, 46.88]	[8.28, 63.19]	[5.54, 43.84]
	Refusal to answer	3.13**	3.81**	3.41*
		[1.31, 7.45]	[1.47, 9.86]	[1.30, 8.94]
Pro-Palestine	Justifying aggression		0.91	0.89
			[0.50, 1.67]	[0.49, 1.64]
	Refusal to answer		0.66	0.65
			[0.36, 1.21]	[0.35, 1.20]
Higher education	Justifying aggression		0.32***	0.33***
			[0.20, 0.50]	[0.21, 0.52]
	Refusal to answer		0.30***	0.30***
			[0.21, 0.42]	[0.21, 0.42]
Female	Justifying aggression		0.45***	0.47***
			[0.31, 0.64]	[0.33, 0.68]
	Refusal to answer		1.08	1.10
			[0.82, 1.43]	[0.83, 1.45]
Antisemitism index: high	Justifying aggression			3.50***

	response	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
				[2.03, 6.04]
	Refusal to answer			1.63
				[0.82, 3.24]
Num.Obs.		1567	1565	1565
R2		0.122	0.175	0.182

Note. Odds ratios from multinomial regressions with 95% confidence intervals. HCI = Holocaust inversion endorsement, measured with the item "Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II" (ref. category = completely disagree). Model 1 includes no controls; Model 2 adjusts for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, and gender; Model 3 additionally controls for blatant antisemitic prejudice. Weighted data. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table S3

Holocaust inversion and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2017 population sample)

Holocaust endorsement	Predicted prob.	SE	conf.low	conf.high	Outcome	Model
1	0.04	0.43	0.02	0.08	Justifying.aggression	Model 1
2	0.13	0.17	0.10	0.17	Justifying.aggression	Model 1
3	0.18	0.13	0.15	0.23	Justifying.aggression	Model 1
4	0.38	0.20	0.29	0.47	Justifying.aggression	Model 1
1	0.07	0.32	0.04	0.12	Refusal.to.answer	Model 1
2	0.08	0.20	0.06	0.12	Refusal.to.answer	Model 1
3	0.19	0.13	0.15	0.23	Refusal.to.answer	Model 1
4	0.12	0.29	0.07	0.20	Refusal.to.answer	Model 1
1	0.03	0.46	0.01	0.06	Justifying.aggression	Model 2
2	0.10	0.19	0.07	0.14	Justifying.aggression	Model 2
3	0.16	0.15	0.13	0.21	Justifying.aggression	Model 2
4	0.33	0.23	0.24	0.43	Justifying.aggression	Model 2
1	0.07	0.35	0.04	0.13	Refusal.to.answer	Model 2
2	0.08	0.21	0.06	0.12	Refusal.to.answer	Model 2
3	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.24	Refusal.to.answer	Model 2
4	0.16	0.31	0.09	0.25	Refusal.to.answer	Model 2

Holocaust endorsement	Predicted prob.	SE	conf.low	conf.high	Outcome	Model
1	0.03	0.46	0.01	0.06	Justifying.aggression	Model 3
2	0.10	0.19	0.07	0.15	Justifying.aggression	Model 3
3	0.16	0.15	0.12	0.20	Justifying.aggression	Model 3
4	0.27	0.24	0.18	0.37	Justifying.aggression	Model 3
1	0.07	0.35	0.04	0.13	Refusal.to.answer	Model 3
2	0.09	0.21	0.06	0.12	Refusal.to.answer	Model 3
3	0.20	0.14	0.16	0.25	Refusal.to.answer	Model 3
4	0.16	0.32	0.09	0.26	Refusal.to.answer	Model 3

Note. Predicted probabilities with covariates held at their means or averaged across factor levels. Holocaust inversion endorsement ranges from 1 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree). Model 1 includes no controls; Model 2 adjusts for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, and gender; Model 3 additionally controls for blatant antisemitic prejudice.

Table S4

Israel-existence delegitimization and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2017 population sample)

	response	Estimates
IsDel: somewhat disagree	Justifying aggression	2.65**
		[1.29, 5.48]
	Refusal to answer	2.13*
		[1.01, 4.46]
IsDel: somewhat agree	Justifying aggression	5.58***
		[2.69, 11.57]
	Refusal to answer	4.47***
		[2.15, 9.28]
IsDel: completely agree	Justifying aggression	6.82***
		[2.84, 16.38]
	Refusal to answer	4.23**
		[1.64, 10.91]
Pro-Palestine	Justifying aggression	1.43
		[0.82, 2.47]
	Refusal to answer	0.84
		[0.48, 1.47]
Higher education	Justifying aggression	0.33***
		[0.21, 0.53]
	Refusal to answer	0.31***
		[0.22, 0.44]
Female	Justifying aggression	0.49***
		[0.34, 0.70]
	Refusal to answer	1.22
		[0.93, 1.60]
Antisemitism index: high	Justifying aggression	3.70***

	response	Estimates
		[2.10, 6.51]
	Refusal to answer	1.70
		[0.85, 3.39]
Num.Obs.		1568
R2		0.174

Note. Odds ratios from multinomial regressions with 95% confidence intervals. IsDel = Israel-existence delegitimization, measured with the item "As long as the State of Israel exists, there can be no peace" (ref. category = completely disagree). Controls included for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, gender, and blatant antisemitic prejudice. Weighted data. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table S5

Summary Statistics (2017 Muslim sample)

Variable	N	Percent/Mean	SD	Min	Max
Considering how Israel treats the Palestinians, harassment and violence against Jews can be defended	558				
… Does not reflect my views at all	162	29%			
… Reflects my views somewhat poorly	77	13.8%			
… Reflects my views somewhat well	69	12.4%			
… Completely reflects my views	43	7.7%			
… Impossible to answer	207	37.1%			
Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II	554				
… Does not reflect my views at all	38	6.9%			
… Reflects my views somewhat poorly	45	8.1%			
… Reflects my views somewhat well	133	24%			
… Completely reflects my views	151	27.3%			
… Impossible to answer	187	33.8%			
Antisemitic prejudice scale	586				
… None	394	67.2%			
… Low	155	26.5%			
… Moderate	26	4.4%			
… High	11	1.9%			
Sympathy in conflict	557				
… pro-Israel	18	3.2%			
… non-partisan	113	20.3%			
… pro-Palestine	330	59.2%			
… impossible to answer	96	17.2%			
Education	554				
… No higher education	377	68.1%			

Variable	N	Percent/Mean	SD	Min	Max
… Higher education	177	31.9%			
Gender	581				
… Male	322	55.4%			
… Female	259	44.6%			
Discrimination index	527	0.254	0.245	0	1
Religiosity	583	3.87	1.16	1	5

Table S6

Holocaust inversion and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2017 Muslim sample)

	response	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
HCI: somewhat disagree	Justifying aggression	1.36	2.26	2.98
		[0.41, 4.52]	[0.54, 9.46]	[0.69, 12.90]
	Refusal to answer	0.54	0.78	0.83
		[0.16, 1.81]	[0.19, 3.17]	[0.20, 3.43]
HCI: somewhat agree	Justifying aggression	1.82	2.58	3.31
		[0.66, 5.03]	[0.73, 9.12]	[0.90, 12.13]
	Refusal to answer	0.94	1.26	1.34
		[0.38, 2.31]	[0.41, 3.86]	[0.43, 4.18]
HCI: completely agree	Justifying aggression	2.92*	4.33*	4.80*
		[1.08, 7.89]	[1.26, 14.87]	[1.36, 16.88]
	Refusal to answer	0.62	0.76	0.77
		[0.24, 1.57]	[0.23, 2.46]	[0.24, 2.52]
Pro-Palestine	Justifying aggression		0.62	0.49
			[0.18, 2.15]	[0.14, 1.75]
	Refusal to answer		1.70	1.59
			[0.36, 8.02]	[0.33, 7.54]
Higher education	Justifying aggression		0.33***	0.33***
			[0.19, 0.59]	[0.18, 0.59]
	Refusal to answer		0.50*	0.49*
			[0.29, 0.86]	[0.28, 0.85]
Female	Justifying aggression		0.88	0.93
			[0.53, 1.48]	[0.55, 1.57]
	Refusal to answer		1.17	1.18
			[0.70, 1.96]	[0.70, 1.98]
Discrimination experience (z)	Justifying aggression		0.63***	0.64**

	response	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
			[0.48, 0.83]	[0.49, 0.84]
	Refusal to answer		0.78	0.78
			[0.59, 1.02]	[0.59, 1.02]
Religiosity (z)	Justifying aggression		1.41*	1.45*
			[1.05, 1.89]	[1.08, 1.96]
	Refusal to answer		1.07	1.07
			[0.82, 1.39]	[0.82, 1.40]
Antisemitism index: high	Justifying aggression			3.78**
				[1.50, 9.51]
	Refusal to answer			1.73
				[0.53, 5.67]
Num.Obs.		539	463	463
R2		0.155	0.219	0.227

Note. Odds ratios from multinomial regressions with 95% confidence intervals. HCI = Holocaust inversion endorsement, measured with the item "Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II" (ref. category = completely disagree). Model 1 includes no controls; Model 2 adjusts for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, gender, discrimination experience, and religiosity; Model 3 additionally controls for blatant antisemitic prejudice. Weighted data. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table S7

Summary Statistics (2022 population sample)

Variable	N	Percent
Considering how Israel treats the Palestinians, harassment and violence against Jews can be defended	1624	
… Does not reflect my views at all	665	40.9%
… Reflects my views somewhat poorly	384	23.6%
… Reflects my views somewhat well	135	8.3%
… Completely reflects my views	40	2.5%
… Impossible to answer	400	24.6%
Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II	1632	
… Does not reflect my views at all	214	13.1%
… Reflects my views somewhat poorly	341	20.9%
… Reflects my views somewhat well	427	26.2%
… Completely reflects my views	134	8.2%
… Impossible to answer	516	31.6%
Antisemitic attitudes index	1632	
… None	1422	87.1%
… Low	128	7.8%
… Moderate	52	3.2%
… High	30	1.8%
Sympathy in conflict	1640	
… pro-Israel	241	14.7%
… non-partisan	524	32%
… pro-Palestine	588	35.9%
… impossible to answer	287	17.5%
Education	1653	
… No higher education	1046	63.3%
… Higher education	607	36.7%

Variable	N	Percent
Gender	1653	
… Male	846	51.2%
… Female	807	48.8%

Table S8

Holocaust inversion and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2022 population sample)

	response	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
HCI: somewhat disagree	Justifying aggression	2.33	2.55	1.91
		[0.92, 5.89]	[0.97, 6.71]	[0.70, 5.26]
	Refusal to answer	2.64**	2.12*	2.28*
		[1.30, 5.38]	[1.01, 4.45]	[1.06, 4.90]
HCI: somewhat agree	Justifying aggression	9.64***	13.02***	9.00***
		[4.14, 22.42]	[5.03, 33.73]	[3.35, 24.17]
	Refusal to answer	4.90***	3.97***	4.06***
		[2.49, 9.65]	[1.89, 8.33]	[1.87, 8.82]
HCI: completely agree	Justifying aggression	19.25***	24.35***	14.99***
		[7.88, 47.03]	[8.92, 66.44]	[5.19, 43.30]
	Refusal to answer	5.36***	4.56***	4.63**
		[2.41, 11.93]	[1.92, 10.80]	[1.86, 11.54]
Pro-Palestine	Justifying aggression		0.67	0.65
			[0.34, 1.34]	[0.31, 1.37]
	Refusal to answer		1.02	0.90
			[0.57, 1.83]	[0.50, 1.62]
Higher education	Justifying aggression		0.40***	0.45***
			[0.27, 0.60]	[0.29, 0.70]
	Refusal to answer		0.37***	0.36***
			[0.28, 0.49]	[0.27, 0.48]
Female	Justifying aggression		0.63*	0.67
			[0.43, 0.91]	[0.44, 1.01]
	Refusal to answer		1.27	1.22
			[0.96, 1.67]	[0.92, 1.63]
Antisemitism index: high	Justifying aggression			3.59***

	response	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
				[2.16, 5.97]
	Refusal to answer			1.60
				[0.92, 2.78]
Num.Obs.		1609	1599	1512
R2		0.133	0.171	0.186

Note. Odds ratios from multinomial regressions with 95% confidence intervals. HCI = Holocaust inversion endorsement, measured with the item "Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II" (ref. category = completely disagree). Model 1 includes no controls; Model 2 adjusts for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, and gender; Model 3 additionally controls for blatant antisemitic prejudice. Weighted data. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table S9

Holocaust inversion and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2022 population sample)

Holocaust endorsement	Predicted prob.	SE	conf.low	conf.high	Outcome	Model
1	0.03	0.41	0.01	0.06	Justifying.aggression	Model 1
2	0.06	0.23	0.04	0.09	Justifying.aggression	Model 1
3	0.20	0.13	0.16	0.24	Justifying.aggression	Model 1
4	0.32	0.19	0.25	0.41	Justifying.aggression	Model 1
1	0.05	0.32	0.03	0.09	Refusal.to.answer	Model 1
2	0.12	0.17	0.09	0.16	Refusal.to.answer	Model 1
3	0.17	0.13	0.14	0.21	Refusal.to.answer	Model 1
4	0.15	0.24	0.10	0.23	Refusal.to.answer	Model 1
1	0.02	0.45	0.01	0.05	Justifying.aggression	Model 2
2	0.05	0.24	0.03	0.08	Justifying.aggression	Model 2
3	0.21	0.14	0.17	0.25	Justifying.aggression	Model 2
4	0.32	0.21	0.24	0.41	Justifying.aggression	Model 2
1	0.06	0.34	0.03	0.12	Refusal.to.answer	Model 2
2	0.12	0.18	0.09	0.17	Refusal.to.answer	Model 2
3	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.22	Refusal.to.answer	Model 2
4	0.16	0.25	0.11	0.25	Refusal.to.answer	Model 2

Holocaust endorsement	Predicted prob.	SE	conf.low	conf.high	Outcome	Model
1	0.02	0.46	0.01	0.06	Justifying.aggression	Model 3
2	0.04	0.28	0.03	0.07	Justifying.aggression	Model 3
3	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.21	Justifying.aggression	Model 3
4	0.24	0.25	0.16	0.33	Justifying.aggression	Model 3
1	0.06	0.35	0.03	0.11	Refusal.to.answer	Model 3
2	0.12	0.18	0.09	0.17	Refusal.to.answer	Model 3
3	0.17	0.15	0.14	0.22	Refusal.to.answer	Model 3
4	0.18	0.28	0.11	0.27	Refusal.to.answer	Model 3

Note. Predicted probabilities with covariates held at their means or averaged across factor levels. Holocaust inversion endorsement ranges from 1 (completely disagree) to 4 (completely agree). Model 1 includes no controls; Model 2 adjusts for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, and gender; Model 3 additionally controls for blatant antisemitic prejudice.

Table S10

Israel-existence delegitimization and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2022 population sample)

	response	Estimates
IsDel: somewhat disagree	Justifying aggression	1.68
		[0.78, 3.62]
	Refusal to answer	0.84
		[0.45, 1.57]
IsDel: somewhat agree	Justifying aggression	3.03**
		[1.43, 6.39]
	Refusal to answer	1.69
		[0.94, 3.02]
IsDel: completely agree	Justifying aggression	4.66***
		[2.00, 10.84]
	Refusal to answer	2.19*
		[1.05, 4.58]
Pro-Palestine	Justifying aggression	1.64
		[0.87, 3.10]
	Refusal to answer	1.28
		[0.74, 2.22]
Higher education	Justifying aggression	0.46***
		[0.30, 0.71]
	Refusal to answer	0.35***
		[0.27, 0.47]
Female	Justifying aggression	0.79
		[0.52, 1.19]
	Refusal to answer	1.35*
		[1.02, 1.78]
Antisemitism index: high	Justifying aggression	4.40***

	response	Estimates
		[2.66, 7.29]
	Refusal to answer	1.45
		[0.84, 2.50]
Num.Obs.		1509
R2		0.160

Note. Odds ratios from multinomial regressions with 95% confidence intervals. IsDel = Israel-existence delegitimization, measured with the item "As long as the State of Israel exists, there can be no peace" (ref. category = completely disagree). Controls included for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, gender, and blatant antisemitic prejudice. Weighted data. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table S11

Summary Statistics (2022 Muslim sample)

Variable	N	Percent/Mean	SD	Min	Max
Considering how Israel treats the Palestinians, harassment and violence against Jews can be defended	772				
… Does not reflect my views at all	311	40.3%			
… Reflects my views somewhat poorly	108	14%			
… Reflects my views somewhat well	74	9.6%			
… Completely reflects my views	71	9.2%			
… Impossible to answer	208	26.9%			
Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II	791				
… Does not reflect my views at all	35	4.4%			
… Reflects my views somewhat poorly	51	6.4%			
… Reflects my views somewhat well	184	23.3%			
… Completely reflects my views	332	42%			
… Impossible to answer	189	23.9%			
Antisemitic prejudice scale	772				
… None	526	68.1%			
… Low	196	25.4%			
… Moderate	36	4.7%			
… High	14	1.8%			
Sympathy in conflict	798				
… pro-Israel	25	3.1%			
… non-partisan	112	14%			
… pro-Palestine	557	69.8%			
… impossible to answer	104	13%			
Education	799				
… No higher education	657	82.2%			

Variable	N	Percent/Mean	SD	Min	Max
… Higher education	142	17.8%			
Gender	805				
… Male	441	54.8%			
… Female	364	45.2%			
Discrimination index	766	0.32	0.264	0	1
Religiosity	812	4.06	1.02	1	5

Table S12

Holocaust inversion and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2022 Muslim sample)

	response	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
HCI: somewhat disagree	Justifying aggression	0.72	1.02	0.36
		[0.23, 2.28]	[0.24, 4.31]	[0.06, 2.22]
	Refusal to answer	0.32	0.40	0.39
		[0.10, 1.04]	[0.09, 1.77]	[0.09, 1.71]
HCI: somewhat agree	Justifying aggression	0.80	1.63	1.17
		[0.31, 2.10]	[0.49, 5.38]	[0.35, 3.96]
	Refusal to answer	0.55	0.90	0.84
		[0.23, 1.32]	[0.30, 2.73]	[0.27, 2.57]
HCI: completely agree	Justifying aggression	1.18	2.49	1.45
		[0.47, 2.96]	[0.77, 8.02]	[0.44, 4.78]
	Refusal to answer	0.49	0.87	0.76
		[0.21, 1.12]	[0.29, 2.58]	[0.25, 2.31]
Pro-Palestine	Justifying aggression		0.33*	0.45
			[0.11, 1.00]	[0.14, 1.52]
	Refusal to answer		0.61	0.65
			[0.17, 2.23]	[0.17, 2.44]
Higher education	Justifying aggression		0.50*	0.60
			[0.28, 0.90]	[0.32, 1.13]
	Refusal to answer		0.75	0.73
			[0.45, 1.26]	[0.43, 1.25]
Female	Justifying aggression		0.59*	0.67
			[0.39, 0.91]	[0.41, 1.08]
	Refusal to answer		1.14	1.28
			[0.77, 1.68]	[0.85, 1.93]
Discrimination experience (z)	Justifying aggression		1.02	1.06

	response	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
			[0.83, 1.25]	[0.84, 1.32]
	Refusal to answer		0.99	0.97
			[0.81, 1.20]	[0.79, 1.19]
Religiosity (z)	Justifying aggression		0.75*	0.75*
			[0.59, 0.96]	[0.57, 0.98]
	Refusal to answer		1.16	1.11
			[0.91, 1.49]	[0.86, 1.44]
Antisemitism index: high	Justifying aggression			3.33***
				[2.03, 5.44]
	Refusal to answer			1.03
				[0.61, 1.74]
Num.Obs.		764	693	638
R2		0.095	0.124	0.147

Note. Odds ratios from multinomial regressions with 95% confidence intervals. HCI = Holocaust inversion endorsement, measured with the item "Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II" (ref. category = completely disagree). Model 1 includes no controls; Model 2 adjusts for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, gender, discrimination experience, and religiosity; Model 3 additionally controls for blatant antisemitic prejudice. Weighted data. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table S13

Holocaust inversion and justification of anti-Jewish aggression (2022 population sample, preregistered models)

	Justifying aggression (1)	Justifying aggression (2)	Justifying aggression (3)	Refusal to answer (1)	Refusal to answer (2)	Refusal to answer (3)
Holocaust inversion endorsement	6.56***	7.31***	3.81***	2.55***	1.91**	1.38
	[4.03, 10.70]	[3.77, 14.15]	[1.99, 7.31]	[1.73, 3.76]	[1.21, 3.03]	[0.81, 2.36]
Pro-Palestine		0.91	0.99		1.96	1.70
		[0.38, 2.17]	[0.43, 2.28]		[0.97, 3.98]	[0.80, 3.62]
Higher education		0.38***	0.45**		0.38***	0.50**
		[0.24, 0.60]	[0.27, 0.76]		[0.24, 0.58]	[0.31, 0.80]
Female		0.69	0.97		1.46	1.63*
		[0.45, 1.07]	[0.59, 1.59]		[0.96, 2.21]	[1.01, 2.63]
Antisemitic prejudice (z)			3.48***			2.10***
			[2.61, 4.63]			[1.59, 2.78]
Num.Obs.	950	948	926	940	939	904

Note. Odds ratios from logistic regressions with 95% confidence intervals. For both outcomes, Model 1 includes no controls; Model 2 adjusts for pro-Palestine sympathies, education, and gender; Model 3 additionally controls for blatant antisemitic prejudice. Weighted data. Standard errors are heteroskedasticity-robust. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table S14

Holocaust inversion and nonresponse to blatant antisemitic prejudice items (2017 population sample)

	"Impossible to answer" count (antisemitic prejudice items)		
Predictors	Incidence Rate Ratios	CI	p
HCI: somewhat disagree	1.13	0.91 – 1.41	0.255
HCI: somewhat agree	1.34	1.08 – 1.65	**0.008**
HCI: completely agree	1.11	0.85 – 1.46	0.437
pro-Palestine	1.06	0.88 – 1.28	0.516
Female	0.97	0.89 – 1.05	0.411
Higher education	0.84	0.76 – 0.92	**<0.001**
"Impossible to answer" count (anti-Muslim prejudice items)	1.09	1.07 – 1.10	**<0.001**
Observations	1568		
R^2 / R^2 adjusted	0.611 / 0.608		

Note. Incidence rate ratios from a hurdle model with 95% confidence intervals. HCI = Holocaust inversion endorsement, measured with the item “Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II” (ref. category = completely disagree). Data are weighted.

Table S15

Holocaust inversion and nonresponse to blatant antisemitic prejudice items (2017 Muslim sample)

	"Impossible to answer" count (antisemitic prejudice items)		
Predictors	Incidence Rate Ratios	CI	p
HCI: somewhat disagree	0.76	0.51 – 1.14	0.185
HCI: somewhat agree	0.81	0.60 – 1.09	0.156
HCI: completely agree	0.86	0.64 – 1.16	0.339
pro-Palestine	1.00	0.69 – 1.45	0.982
Female	1.07	0.95 – 1.21	0.238
Higher education	0.98	0.86 – 1.12	0.792
Observations	513		
R^2 / R^2 adjusted	0.587 / 0.579		

Note. Incidence rate ratios from a hurdle model with 95% confidence intervals. HCI = Holocaust inversion endorsement, measured with the item “Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II” (ref. category = completely disagree). Data are weighted.

Table S16

Holocaust inversion and nonresponse to blatant antisemitic prejudice items (2022 population sample)

	"Impossible to answer" count (antisemitic prejudice items)		
Predictors	Incidence Rate Ratios	CI	p
HCI: somewhat disagree	1.28	1.01 – 1.61	**0.038**
HCI: somewhat agree	1.39	1.11 – 1.76	**0.005**
HCI: completely agree	1.62	1.24 – 2.11	**<0.001**
pro-Palestine	1.03	0.86 – 1.23	0.772
Female	1.02	0.94 – 1.11	0.562
Higher education	0.81	0.75 – 0.89	**<0.001**
"Impossible to answer" count (anti-Muslim prejudice items)	1.08	1.06 – 1.09	**<0.001**
Observations	1622		
R^2 / R^2 adjusted	0.589 / 0.586		

Note. Incidence rate ratios from a hurdle model with 95% confidence intervals. HCI = Holocaust inversion endorsement, measured with the item “Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II” (ref. category = completely disagree). Data are weighted.

Table S17

Holocaust inversion and nonresponse to blatant antisemitic prejudice items (2022 Muslim sample)

	"Impossible to answer" count (antisemitic prejudice items)		
Predictors	Incidence Rate Ratios	CI	p
HCI: somewhat disagree	0.76	0.48 – 1.19	0.230
HCI: somewhat agree	0.85	0.58 – 1.24	0.389
HCI: completely agree	0.86	0.59 – 1.25	0.418
pro-Palestine	1.52	1.01 – 2.29	**0.043**
Female	1.08	0.98 – 1.20	0.138
Higher education	0.92	0.80 – 1.06	0.243
Observations	752		
R^2 / R^2 adjusted	0.507 / 0.501		

Note. Incidence rate ratios from a hurdle model with 95% confidence intervals. HCI = Holocaust inversion endorsement, measured with the item “Israel treats the Palestinians just as badly as the Jews were treated during World War II” (ref. category = completely disagree). Data are weighted.

References

Moe, V. (2023). *Attitudes towards Jews and Muslims in Norway 2022*. Center for Holocaust and Minority Studies.