
**Class Format**
The classes include discussions, student presentations, lectures and research demonstrations. In the lectures, I expand on material that is not in the readings. I expect you to read the relevant readings (see below) prior to each class and to participate in the discussion.

**Course grades**
Seminar participation: 20 points (grade reflects frequency and quality of contributions)
Assignments: 40 points
Final Exam: 40 points (an essay exam with broad questions that will require you to think and integrate different sections of the course)

**Optional Notes on the Readings**
For each set of assigned readings you can write up to 5 pages of notes that you bring to class with you on the day we are discussing the readings. The notes should cover the major arguments in each reading and your own comments on the readings. The notes must be your own. You will give me a copy of your notes at the beginning of the class. I will return the notes to you at the beginning of the final exam and you can use them to help you answer the questions. I will not accept notes after the beginning of class; whether or not you submit notes is entirely up to you. I assume that all the work that you submit will be your own work and will not tolerate plagiarism. As you probably know the Undergraduate Calendar defines plagiarism as “the act of presenting the ideas, words or other intellectual property of another as one’s own.” This means among other things that you will not submit someone else's work, copy someone else’s work, or cheat in any other way. It means positively that you will cite work properly. You should read Policy #71 in the Undergraduate Calendar for a full discussion of these matters.

**Overview**
We classify people according to their ethnicity, that is, their racial, national, religious, linguistic, or cultural origins. Ethnic similarities bring people together. We tend to associate with and value individuals who share our background characteristics. The flip side is that ethnic differences drive people apart. We often seem to disrespect and criticize members of other ethnic groups (outgroups). Worse, we sometimes cheat, maim, or kill members of outgroups. Of course, we harm members of our own groups too, but we seem to preserve a special savagery for members of outgroups. Examples are easy to come by. Suicide bombers kill thousands by blowing themselves up or flying airplanes into buildings. American soldiers abuse prisoners in Iraq. In 1994, soldiers and volunteers controlled by the Hutu government in the African nation of Rwanda killed over 850,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus while UN soldiers looked on or away (Dallaire, 2003). Between December 1937 and March 1938, Japanese soldiers killed more than 300,000 Chinese civilians and prisoners of war in the city of Nanking. About 80,000 women and girls were raped. Thousands of Chinese civilians were beheaded, burned, bayonetted, buried alive, or disemboweled. At about the same time, Germany was engaging in deliberate efforts at genocide, targeting Jews, gypsies, and gays in particular. In Canada, the non-aboriginal majority has attacked indigenous peoples and their cultures for centuries.
This course will have something to say about the origins of ethnic conflict, but more to say about how groups relate to each other, as well as how they remember and respond to injustices experienced or committed by members of their group decades or even centuries earlier (historical injustices). In calling attention to their past, groups often congratulate themselves for their achievements (e.g. Canada’s “Heritage Moments”). But one group’s triumphs are sometimes another group’s tragedies (arrival of Columbus to North America, completion of the transcontinental railway in Canada in 1885 etc.). Today, more and more groups are demanding apologies and reparations for past harms and they sometimes achieve their goals. Groups in Canada that have recently demanded reparations for historical wrongs include blacks in Nova Scotia, aboriginals, and people of Acadian, Chinese, and Italian heritage. We examine why “victim” groups (or some members of those groups) persist in demanding a response to past injustices and the reactions of members of the non victimized majority to such demands. Many legal scholars suggest that a collective response to such demands is necessary to heal the “wounds” caused by past injustices (Minnow, 2002). Legal scholars often assume that in the absence of a collective response the wounds from the injustice continue to “fester,” causing resentment and conflict. As evidence, scholars note that Japan’s unwillingness to apologize officially for war crimes it committed during WWII has prevented reconciliation with the harmed groups, whereas Germany’s provision of compensation to some victim groups has facilitated favorable relations with former enemies and harmed groups (Barkan, 2000). In this course, we discuss the psychological consequences of remembering and forgetting past harms for members of “victim groups” and members of “perpetrator groups.” We also examine why members of perpetrator groups favor or oppose offering apologies and reparations. As part of this discussion, we consider the impact of remembering and reparations on group identity, group cohesion, and intergroup relations. We will address these issues by drawing on research and theory from social psychology and other disciplines including, sociology, history, and law. In discussing the contributions of nonpsychologists, I have three interrelated goals: 1. To learn what these scholars have to say about ethnicity and historical injustice. 2. To examine their psychological assumptions; they couch some of their arguments in psychological terms. 3. To consider how social psychology might help clarify the issues they raise. Clearly some aspects of ethnic conflict and historical injustice are political, economic, or legal and psychology is secondary. But other aspects of ethnic conflict are profoundly psychological, centering on “issues of identity, symbols, legitimacy, memory, fairness, and justice” (Mays et al., 1998). Psychological factors often influence the intensity, tractability, and resolution of ethnic conflict.

Assignments

1. Due by 4 PM Wed Oct. 10 (10 points)

Select a research article on Social Identity that I do not present in class. Choose an article from the list I provide. Provide a citation for the study in APA style (authors, year, title, journal, volume, and page numbers). Be accurate. Note: if the article describes more than one study, choose the most interesting study and answer the questions below with respect to this one study. Indicate which study (e.g., Study 3) you are using. Answer the questions below using your own words; you can paraphrase what the authors say. Use headings so that I know what questions you are answering. Maximum length: two double-spaced typed pages.

1. What was the purpose of the study? Distinguish where you can between general purposes (e.g., why people think their own group is superior) and specific purposes (e.g., to study the impact of level of identification with the Canadian ingroup on evaluations of new immigrants). Write the general and specific purpose(s) as a question or set of questions: e.g., Is increasing ingroup identification associated with more negative evaluations of an outgroup?
2. Authors set their studies in the context of prior studies. They explain how their study adds new knowledge. How does answering the research questions add something new to what is already known?
3. Who were the research participants?
4. What are the independent variable(s)?
5. What are the major dependent variable(s)?
6. What are the major findings?
7. What cautions do the authors raise about interpreting the study or generalizing its results to other populations?
8. Do you have any additional reservations?
9. What is the most important or valuable thing you learned from reading the article?

2. Due by 4 PM Oct. 26. (10 points)

As above, but select a research on article on The Social Psychology of Justice.

3. Due by 4 PM on Nov. 9. (10 points)
As above, but select a research on article on **Reactions to Harm (I)**.

**4. Due by 4 PM on Nov. 23. (10 points)**
As above, but select a research on article on **Reactions to Harms (II or III)**

**Relevant Literature**

*Note: Articles with asterisks are required reading.*

**Sept. 21**

**Racism and Ethnocentrism in Canada**

*Backhouse, C. (2001). Required reading: Introduction & Chapters 2, 5, & 8. In reading these chapters, focus on the issues. Don’t worry about the personality and backgrounds of the characters. Come to class prepared to discuss the material in the chapters.

**Sept 28**

**Antecedents and Consequences of Social Identity I**


**Evaluations of Ingroups and Outgroups**


October 5

**Antecedents and Consequences of Social Identity II**


**Infrahumanization**


**Self & Social Identity**


October 12 (Date to be re-arranged)

**The Social Psychology of Justice**


**The Justice Motive**


System Justification and Legitimizing Ideologies


Self-Deception


October 19

**Remembering**


*Blatz, C.W. & Ross, M.. Historical memories (pp.1-5).*


**Oct 26**

**Reactions to Harm I: Responses to Prejudice and Discrimination**

*Backhouse, Chapter 7.


**November 2**

**Reactions to Harm II: Vengeance & Culture of Honor**


**Vengeance**


**Culture of Honour**


**November 9**

Reactions to Harm III: Hate & Forgiveness

**Hate**


**Forgiveness**

*TBA*


**Nov 16**

Reactions to Harm IV: Apologies, & Reparations


**November 23 & 30**

**Case Studies**

**Church Apologies.**

*Accatoli, L. (1998).* *When a Pope asks forgiveness: The Mea Culpa’s of John Paul II.* New York: Alba House. (Read Chapters 4, 5, 7, 10)


**Apologies for Slavery**


Additional readings on slavery from *When Sorry Isn’t Enough:*

*Clinton opposes apology (p.352).
*Paglia, C. Who is really to blame for the historical scar of black slavery? (p.353-354)
Slavery apologies: Waterloo Apology website [https://artsweb.uwaterloo.ca/~kschuman/political_apology/](https://artsweb.uwaterloo.ca/~kschuman/political_apology/)

**German and Japanese Reactions to War Atrocities.**

All readings (except for Blatz et al.) are from *When Sorry Isn’t Enough:*

**Germany**

*Hancock, I. (1999). Romani victims of the holocaust and Swiss complicity (pp. 68-74).

**Japan**

*Brooks, R.L. What form redress? (pp. 87-91)
*Parker, K. & Chew, J.F. The Jugun Ianfu System (pp. 95-100)
*Chang, I. The Nanking Massacre (pp. 104-108)
*Japan’s Official Responses to Nanking (109-110)
*Hicks, G. The comfort women redress movement (pp.113-124)
*Japan’s official responses to reparations. (126-131)

**Chinese Head tax and Internment of Japanese Canadians and Americans**

*Daniels, R. Redress achieved (p.189)
*Responses to apology and monetary redress (pp 203-205 & 222-227).