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Abstract

The purpose of this project is to develop a workbook and teacher’s manual that would help to teach anti-discrimination. The aim of the project is to have this practical tool used in the teaching of the new, locally developed Toronto District School Board grade 11 course *History of Genocide and Crimes against Humanity* (CHG38). The material can also be adapted for grade 9 and 10 courses in subjects such as English, Civics or History. The framework of the model used in developing the workbook uses an overlay of the five stages of discrimination model\(^1\), which is a Social Science course taught at the grade 12 level, and sanctioned by the Ontario Ministry of Education- HSB4M (*Challenge and Change: Introduction to Anthropology, Psychology and Sociology*). This model draws upon current academic research on genocide and peace education. The workbook was created based on an analysis of the current Ontario Ministry of Education’s secondary curriculum policy\(^2\) on discrimination and course profiles of current history courses. It is a practical resource with a clear program geared towards helping young people identify, stop, and reverse the stages of discrimination, and was developed using cognitive theory in instructional design.

---

\(^1\) Stereotypes, prejudice, discrimination, systemic discrimination and genocide.
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Introduction

This project started with a request for a small project in Trinidad and Tobago. A member of the local political community wished to start a school programme designed to combat the discrimination and violence she saw as rampant in the youth of Trinidad and Tobago. Once work commenced on a practical teaching tool for local schools, then came the realization that the tool would be useless without the theory to back up its assumptions. This initial work led to the creation of three documents: a document with theoretical material; a student workbook; and a teacher’s manual with an annotated version of the workbook, meant for use as a model for the teaching of anti-discrimination.

The workbook was created based on an analysis of the current Ontario Ministry of Education’s secondary curriculum policy\(^1\) on discrimination and course profiles of current history courses. It is a practical resource with a clear program geared towards helping young people identify, stop, and reverse the stages of discrimination, and was developed using cognitive theory in instructional design.

The construction of the workbook incorporated a number of parallel personal assumptions which I will discuss in detail below:

1) Without acceptance of all, there can never be peace.

\(^1\) Antiracism and Ethnocultural Equity in School Boards: Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation. Policy Program Memorandum no. 119. [1993]; Equity and Inclusive Education in Ontario Schools: Realizing the Promise of Diversity. [2009]; Equity and Inclusive Education in Ontario Schools: Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation. [2009].
2) Discrimination is discrimination whether by gender, socio-economic level, sexual preference, race, religion or mental/physical ability.

3) There is no country in the history of the world, past or modern, that has not reached the stage of genocide (including Canada).

4) Focus must be first on the idea of unlearning the discriminations that the students might hold, and then focus on the relearning of what it means to fully accept any one.

The aim of the project is to have this tool (the workbook and manual) used in the teaching of the new, locally developed Toronto District School Board grade 11 course History of Genocide and Crimes against Humanity (CHG38). The material can also be adapted for grade 9 and 10 courses in subjects such as English, Civics or History.

The framework of the model used in developing the workbook comprises of an overlay of the five stages of discrimination model\(^2\), which is taught at the grade 12 level, and sanctioned by the OME- HSB4M (Challenge and Change: Introduction to Anthropology, Psychology and Sociology). This model draws upon current academic research on genocide and peace education.

There are many frameworks commonly used in the context of genocide education. The course textbook for HSB4M: Transitions in Society: The Challenge of Change (Bain, Colyer, Des Rivieres and Dolan, 2002), uses the five stages of discrimination model developed in 1993 by the OME (which is the model used in this project).

\(^2\) Stereotypes, prejudice, discrimination, systemic discrimination and genocide.
Stanton’s eight stages of genocide (2004) are also used in CHG38. Another model, the seven stages on the path to mass violence and genocide by Linda Woolf and Michael Hulsizer (2005), uses psychosocial factors, and appears to combine the five and eight stage model. I will discuss the OME’s framework along with Stanton and Woolf & Hulsizer’s model in the genocide education literature overview to demonstrate that the OME five stages framework is best suited for the CHG38 and HSB4M courses.

The teacher’s manual is an extension of the workbook, and both are linked to the Ontario Curriculum expectations. Lesson plans are not included in the teacher’s manual. This purposeful exclusion echoes the workbook’s design emphasis on cognitive and constructivist theory. Just as the students need to create their own meaning, so do the teachers. However, answer keys for some questions are supplied. This workbook can be expanded and adapted for each individual teacher to be used as they see fit in the classroom.

Intended to be used by adolescent students, it was paramount that the workbook be supported by cognitive educational psychology, and cognitive instructional design. Justifying that this body of work is a tool to be used in the classroom includes a critical analysis of the curriculum policy from which the five stages framework was created, of the title and its effect on this research, and of discourse in genocide education.

The literature review explores current genocide education models and a thorough deconstruction of the validity of the title “Five Stages of Discrimination.” The final
chapters include a look at the adolescent psyche and its link to the success of cognitive instructional design.

Methodologically, the thesis reflects a bricolage\(^3\) analysis, and is largely a literature-based review of the OME curriculum, and the research of scholars in the realm of History, genocide studies, cognitive theory, and instructional design. The design of the workbook was such that I used a backward design\(^4\). I then worked my way through all of the components needed to reach my goal in creating a teaching tool that might help alleviate problems. Figure 1 is a visual representation of the process and even though it may seem that each component is separate, in reality none of them could have functioned alone in the creation of the project.

---

\(^3\) This is a French term for the work of a handyperson who uses numerous tools to complete a task. Also used by critical theorists Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln who use the term to describe multimethodological forms of research. The term is used here as a way to express the different forms of research and the multilayeredness of the work itself.

\(^4\) According to Ornstein and Hunkins, backward design is a model of curriculum development that begins with understanding the desired results, followed by a determination of how the curriculum will be evaluated and then the planning of instructional activities. In this context, I needed to know the goal, followed by a look at the curriculum, theory, and pedagogy. Only then could I create the activities for the workbook.
In order to produce a tool to be used specifically for adolescent students, I had to demonstrate that this work would be appropriate for the age group. I also had to ensure that the workbook I was creating was supported not only by cognitive educational psychology, but also cognitive instructional design.

The initial phases of this body of work included a critical analysis of the policy, Antiracism and Ethnocultural Equity in School Boards: Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation. Policy Program Memorandum (PPM) no. 119 [1993]. I started with the 1993 version of the equity policy as it was cited in the textbook Transitions in Society: The Challenge of Change as the reference for the framework. The framework is the strong basis of the workbook. It was clear that there
was not a direct connection from the textbook to the policy, and research was needed on the origins of the policies and where best to bridge this gap. The research began with an appraisal of historical and current OME policy research and documentation. Following this was a critical analysis of various frameworks in genocide education, which were applied in the development of the workbook. A thorough assessment of the literature lead to the development of acceptance education through a critical education research paradigm, illustrated through the student course work. Kemmins (1988) outlines that:

Critical Education Research exists in practice within the margins of culture and technology of educational policy and practice. The tension created by a demand for self-awareness, on one-hand, and threats of institutionalization, on the other, terms the dialectic on which critical research is based (Marriam & Simpson, 1995, p. 132).

Therefore the design of the project includes ample discussion of critical theoretical concepts for their importance to an educator’s self-awareness, while at the same time critiquing an institution of which teachers are a part.
The text in the image appears to be incomplete and difficult to interpret. It seems to be discussing policies related to multicultural education, human rights, and equity, among other topics. However, without further context or a clear outline of the content, it's challenging to provide a coherent representation of the text.
As Table 1 suggests, the PPM 119 (1993, 2009)\(^7\) is still very much a top-down initiative in its creation and its implementation. Policies that are theoretically focused on restructuring and value-orientation\(^8\) changes would be more successful, but really the PPM 119 (1993, 2009) are nothing more than slight alterations to course profiles and outlines. It must be understood that these policies under discussion are one of many that a teacher and school are trying to implement at the same time. In the project portion of the chart, one can see the direct links between policy and practice made through the workbook. The following sections of the chapter outline the top-down path of the ideals and policies that have a direct influence on the construction of the five-stage model used in the workbook.

**Federal Connection and the continuing effects of the multiculturalist ideal**

The need for the workbook came from an investigation into current policy, PPM 119 (1993), but in reality the policy and framework discussed at length in this report is a product of the 1971 multiculturalism ideal.

---

\(^7\) *Anti-racism and Ethnocultural Equity in School Boards: Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation. Policy Program Memorandum no. 119. [1993]; Equity and Inclusive Education in Ontario Schools: Realizing the Promise of Diversity. [2009]; Equity and Inclusive Education in Ontario Schools: Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation. [2009].*

\(^8\) While outlining five types of change, John McNeil defines restructuring change as, “Changes that lead to modification of the system itself, that is, of the school or school district...and value-orientation changes as shifts in the participants’ fundamental philosophies or curriculum orientations. Major power brokers of the school or participants in the curriculum must accept and strive for this level of change to occur. However, if teachers do not adjust their value domains, any changes enacted are most likely going to be short lived,” (Orenstein and Hunkins.(2009). p.255).
Based on current research, it is clear that the ideal of multiculturalism, equity and inclusion are not tangible or evident even 43 years after its creation. According to Allison Segeran and Benjamin Kutsyuruba (2012):

Despite attempts at a more equitable and inclusive models of multicultural education in Ontario, schools remain dominant sites for the perpetuation of race, gender, sex, and class-based inequalities ... Some groups of marginalized students based on race, class, gender, religion, sexual identity, and physical and mental ability continue to be at risk for lower levels of educational opportunity and achievement, and increased drop-out rates and crime participation (Segeran and Kutsyuruba, p. 2).

As seen in the results of the CRRF report, current initiatives are ‘collecting dust on policy makers’ desks.’ This is a scathing comment of how policy and practice are in no way connected, rendering both ineffective. The Ontario Ministry of Education has printed in their 2009 document *Equity and Inclusive Education in Ontario Schools: Realizing the Promise of Diversity* an excerpt that reflects an indication of the failure and need for its past and current policy:

Canadians embrace multiculturalism, human rights, and diversity as fundamental values.

However, there are ongoing incidents of discrimination in our society that require our continuing attention. In fact, the Supreme Court of Canada in 2005 acknowledged that racial prejudice against visible minorities is so notorious and indisputable that its existence needs to be treated as a social fact (R v. Spence, [2005] 3 S.C.R. 458, para. 5).

Homophobia has risen to the forefront of discussion. ...In recent years, there has been a documented increase in reported incidents of anti-Black racism, antisemitism, and Islamophobia in Canada.

Racism, religious intolerance, homophobia, and gender-based violence are still evident on our communities and—unfortunately—in our schools (Ontario Ministry of Education and Training, p. 9).
The solution to violence and hatred may lie in a program of prevention, which involves a change in attitude for the students, and the teachers. The problem inherently lies with a disconnection between what we are supposed to do, what the government says, and the tools for implementing aims of acceptance and peace. The federal goal in the beginning was the ideal of multiculturalism as a fix-all solution to the problems of discrimination. Although it seems to have failed due to its ambiguity, many provinces did and continue to draw their fundamental doctrine from this ideal. For example, the Ontario Ministry of Education stated in 1985 that, “The philosophy of multiculturalism...should permeate the school’s curriculum, policies, teaching methods and materials, courses of study, and assessment and testing procedures, as well as the attitudes and expectations of its staff and all of its community” (Cummins, 2001, p. 217). Unfortunately, this has not happened. As Segeren and Kutsyuruba (2012) state:

Needless to say, policy implementation is consequently anything but seamless, as the relationship between provincial or territorial ministries and school districts is as often characterized by tension as it is by harmony ... The complexity of the education policy terrain in Ontario has led to the development of few policies in the area of equity and inclusion, whereas developed policies have had only minor impacts on educational practices in Ontario schools ... Equity and anti-racism policies continue to suffer setbacks because the school system has not found a systemic way to enforce anti-racism and equity policies... Even more so, a noticeable retrenchment with respect to equity policies is taking place at the Ontario Ministry of Education, as issues related to equity have been subsumed under the banner of school safety, discipline, harassment, and bullying (Segeren and Kutsyuruba, p. 2).

Through the medium of secondary education, policies should lend themselves to the interconnectedness of different backgrounds and reflect a microcosm of the real world. The issue is in the policy’s dissemination and its application in the classroom.
Curriculum study is advanced when concepts can be well defined. Preliminary research for this paper ran into difficulty with definitions that should be easily defined as a provincial or national policy. It highlights an important problem between policy and practice. If a nation-wide, consistent definition of multiculturalism cannot be agreed upon, successful program implementation is doomed from the start. PM Pierre Elliot Trudeau announced a federal multiculturalism policy in 1971, but its respective Ministers of Education run education differently in each province.

What is missing is the connection to practice whereby the resources and professional development are facilitated to fully implement a policy of acceptance. This may be due to the fact that the concept and outcome of acceptance is immeasurable and although it is a curricular mandate, it is not in the forefront as the primary goal. In chapter fifteen of Sean Hier and B. Singh Bolaria’s Race and Racism in 21st Century Canada: Continuity, Complexity, and Change (2007), Sarita Srivastava in Troubles with “Anti-Racist Multiculturalism”: The challenges of Anti-Racist and Feminist Activism states that:

The multicultural approach had been pervasive and has shaped Canadian discourses on race and ethnicity. As such, it often forms the framework, either unspoken or explicit, for addressing racism in many organizations, institutions, and communities, even where anti-racism is the explicit goal (Hier and Bolaria, p. 291).

Srivastava points out that under the guise of multiculturalism, the goal is actually anti-racism. This is also the case in current equity policies where the goal is stated as

---

9 The definitions and underlying goals of Multiculturalism, Anti-racism and Equity will be further explored later in this paper.
equity, but is actually anti-discrimination and the production of economically productive citizens. The definition seems to be an area of great ambiguity seen here by Segeren and Kutsyuruba (2012):

Numerous scholars have insisted upon the inadequacy of Canada’s federal policy on multiculturalism in combating prejudice and discrimination in school, evidenced by a Eurocentric curriculum, the streaming of at risk students into applied settings, and increased dropout rates among racialized students... hence the shift from multiculturalism to equity. While liberal ideologies have influenced multiculturalism policy and programming, the theme of equity seems to have emerged as the ideological foundation of the policy and practice of multicultural education in Ontario. PPM No. 119 [2009] acknowledged the intersectionality of socially constructed forms of difference and the institutional barriers inherent in Ontario’s education system as a result. The documents collected from the Ministry of Education, including both versions of PPM No. 119 [1993, 2009], the strategy document (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2009e), and the guidelines document (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2009a) demonstrated that the Ministry of Education was attempting to move beyond a focus on multiculturalism to “a system-wide approach to identifying and removing discriminatory biases and systemic barriers to help ensure that all students feel welcomed and accepted in school life” (Segeren and Kutsyuruba, p. 24-25).

According to Charles Ungerleider in Joshee and Johnson (2007), “Over the last sixty-five years, Canada has chartered a course unique among nations in pursuit of a sometimes elusive and controversial vision of a multicultural society,” (p.viii). Multiculturalism seems to be as elusive and controversial as it was at its inception by the Federal government in 1971.

The ideal of multiculturalism revolved around the ideals of the ‘founding partners’ of this country without much regard or thought that a primary Aboriginal culture was already in existence in this country. Separating Aboriginal peoples from this framework also caused a fracture in the foundation of the policy from its inception.
For example, OME equity and inclusion policies (2009) are run separate and concurrent to current initiatives and policy implementations of First Nation, Metis and Inuit (FNMI) Education. The effects of this separation have been devastating. Current Ontario initiatives are trying to reverse the alienation and discrimination of FNMI students experience in school. FNMI education is under provincial and federal mandates or ‘Indian Acts’ whereby the government promised to take care of First Nation peoples, conversely statistics show “37.6% of Ontario FNMI aged 15 and older had less than a high school education compared to only 22% of non-FNMI. As well, Aboriginal youth in the province were three times less likely than their peers to earn a university degree,”¹⁰ (Lewington, 2013, p. 26).

Without the ability to sufficiently define the ultimate national mandate of Multiculturalism, it becomes clear why further policies in Ontario of anti-racism, inclusion, and equity become an unreachable goal. Ten years after the announcement of the Multiculturalism Ideal, Jim Cummins, quoting Troper (1979), outlines in his article From Multicultural to Anti-racist Education: An analysis of programmes and policies in Ontario that in multicultural education, the structural change or reform needed is not happening in our schools:

Since 1971, “Canadian educators have attempted to develop and implement ‘multicultural education’ policies in classrooms across the country...teacher-in-service activities have regularly focused on ‘multicultural education’...to many observers it appears that by the time ‘multicultural education’ policies filter down to the classroom, they amount to little more than recognition of holidays/festivals from a few cultures in addition to those observed by Anglo-

¹⁰ Current data for dropout rates are more than twice that of non-FNMI students (8.5%) at 22.6% between 2007 and 2010 (Lewington, p. 36).
Celtic Canadians, and the presence of some ‘visible minority’ referents in textbooks and other curriculum materials...has not given rise to dramatic changes in the interactions between educators and students...the hidden curriculum still conform largely to the ideology of ‘Anglo-conformity,’” (Cummins, p. 215).

The policies resulting from multiculturalism and multicultural education continue to be superficial actions that do not reflect a real change in provincial, board and teacher attitudes. Srivastava (2007) points out that:

Official multiculturalism barely acknowledges the historical inequities of race and ethnicity within Canada, and it does little to address systemic racism. Multiculturalism, and its liberal foundation, advocate education, cultural exchange, policy reform, and symbolic gestures as ways of addressing inequality. It avoids more profound challenges to racist practices and institutions.... [It] has taken a 3-D approach—one that celebrates dance, dress, and dining, but fails to take into account the multiple dimensions of racial and social inequality (p.291).

Through Cummins, we see the problems of the transference of policy to practice mentioned earlier. The fact that every school board and every teacher has a different understanding of the term multicultural (or of its successors anti-racism, equity and now school safety i.e. bullying)11 makes the implementation of true multiculturalism impossible. Context and historical meaning of terms such as visible minority, tokenism and the hidden curriculum are areas of further exploration through critical theory and teacher education.

The issue is not only one of practice, but mere understanding of the term multicultural education. And each province controls what and how the curriculum is taught. Well-

---

11 In further speaking of multicultural education, the premise is all of those policies that followed and are being implemented today in Ontario schools, unless otherwise indicated.
known scholar James Banks, in his 1989 article *Multicultural Education: Characteristics and Goals*, defines multicultural education as:

An idea, an educational reform movement, and a process whose major goal is to change the structure of educational institutions so that male and female students, exceptional students, and students who are members of diverse racial [SIC], ethnic, and cultural groups will have an equal chance to achieve academically in school (Banks, p.1).

Multicultural or anti-racism education is predominantly used as an issue or unit in a curriculum, and can change from one year to the next.

**Anti-racism policies as the new multiculturalism**

Historically, the OME equity policy was originally intended for the inclusion of four targets: race, gender, language and socio-economics. In the 1990s, however, there was a shift towards a policy of anti-racism. This shift made it even more difficult to define multiculturalism and multicultural education. Anti-racism policies have since been the focus and have been, in many ways, replacing multiculturalism to the exclusion of a large portion of our population. The anti-racism ideal has further diluted the policies of ethnocultural equity and inclusion (OME 1993, 2009); and are now referred to as school safety.

The goals of multicultural education and anti-racism are very different and exclusionary. Segeren and Kutsyuruba (2012) point out that even if the premise in the title is anti-racism, the goals have little to do with it. The Ontario Ministry of Education (2008) has outlined the three core priorities for public education in Ontario: high levels of student achievement, reduced gaps in student achievement, and increased public
confidence in the publicly funded education system. These three core priorities are echoed throughout the Ontario ministry’s equity strategy and are an example of the clustering of equity education policies with initiatives to improve academic excellence. They are not initiatives unto themselves. The Ontario Ministry of Education further states that the goals of the equity policy were of an anti-discrimination nature, but more importantly that these factors might have an impact on student achievement. The ultimate goal of having students be productive citizens is an economic one not a humanitarian one, although it is introduced that way. In a press release dated April 6, 2009, titled “Helping More Students Succeed,” the McGuinty government announced the launch of Ontario’s equity and inclusive education strategy. According to the press release, “By promoting inclusive education, the strategy will help schools better address barriers related to sexism, racism, homophobia and other forms of discrimination, which may have an impact on student achievement,” (Ontario Ministry of Education, 2009, April 6), (Segeren and Kutsyuruba, p.17-18).

The interconnection of schools as a vehicle for mass policy implementation and control makes it imperative that the goals of each are clear for the betterment of all. In 1993, the Ontario Ministry of Education released PPM No. 119: Antiracism and Ethnocultural Equity in School Boards: Guidelines for Development and Implementation. Chan (2007) and Dei (2003) argued that, although the policy was only marginally successful, it did highlight issues of inequity in Ontario’s education system and can therefore be conceptualized as one of the conditions that led to the unfreezing of the status quo,
contributing to the development of PPM No. 119 [2009] nearly fifteen years later.

While the release of PPM No. 119 [1993] marked the point at which equity issues in education first appeared on the ministry’s radar, the safe schools initiative at the Ministry of Education contributed to the ideological embedment of equity and inclusion at the Ministry of Education. According to the analysis, the ideas of equity and inclusion as expressed in the safe schools initiative were remarkably consistent with the ideological foundations of equity and inclusion as documented in PPM No. 119 [2009], (Segeren and Kutsyuruba). As a result, practitioners are faced with the conundrum of implementing an elusive, ever-changing program that has federal, provincial and district connections, and no clear focus.

Conversely, Yoon Pak (2007) presents the idea that we are already multicultural:

Hans Georg Gadamer (1993) once wrote that we are already related. Extending that thought, I question how our perceptions of the world and each other might be different if we presupposed that our current relations were built upon a well-established multicultural past. In other words, what if we came from the position that we are already multicultural? (Pak. p. 42)

This idea allows for acceptance of all on an equal field. The equality for all discourse would argue that we could not make a country multicultural if in essence it already is. Maybe we need to understand that multicultural education is not one of trying to include others through units or festivals; rather everyone is acknowledged as equal with no underlying federal motives of assimilation or superiority.
**Provincial Curricular Connection**

As illustrated in Table 1 (p.7), provinces are mandated to incorporate federal initiatives, control course requirements and approve textbooks. As per Ontario government equity strategy initiatives, curricular documents for each course must now contain a section dealing with anti-discrimination education and provide examples to help teachers:

Revised curriculum documents now contain a section on antidiscrimination education and examples that help teachers better connect with the reality of students’ lives. Schools must also be safe, respectful places for students and staff. Our Safe School strategy will help ensure that issues such as gender-based violence, homophobia, sexual harassment, and inappropriate sexual behaviour are discussed and addressed in our schools and classrooms. (OME. 2009. p. 15)

The revised curriculum has a direct link to the safe schools strategy even though it is quoted in the equity policy (2009). The new focus on anti-discrimination education seems to have already happened as shown in the current Canadian and World Studies curriculum documents published by the Ontario Ministry of Education. There are clear gaps between what is published in the policies, what appears in the documents, and what is practiced. An excerpt of the Canadian and World Studies Antidiscrimination Education (2005) curriculum states:

Students are expected to demonstrate an understanding of the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of citizenship, as well as willingness to show respect, tolerance, and understanding towards the environment. They are also expected to understand that protecting human rights and taking a stand against racism and other expressions of hatred and discrimination are basic
requirements of responsible citizenship. ... The critical thinking and research skills acquired in Canadian and world studies courses will strengthen students’ ability to recognize bias and stereotypes in contemporary as well as historical portrayals, viewpoints, representations and images (Canadian and World Studies. 2005. p.25).

School boards or districts do have allowances for material and creation of courses and school policy implementation, but they need the provincial ministry of education to agree to its use in order to grant students credit. The trickle down of course requirements does have some counter measures. Provincial policies and courses can and are created by school boards and teachers that feel there may be another way to meet the goals of equity and inclusion. Both the policy and CHG38 were initiatives of the TDSB (Toronto District School Board).

The original five-stage model is a product approved by the OME through the PPM199 (1993) and alluded to through provincial and federal documents. Nowhere in the document (PPM119 [1993]) is the model present in the form found in the Ontario certified textbook, calling in to question its validity. Although the CHG38 course is a district initiative, it has been cited provincially in numerous course schedules in the greater Toronto area such as Oakville, Burlington and Ottawa. Unfortunately, there are still no provincially created curriculum course profile documents to refer for general and specific expectations. The workbook developed in this project uses course profile documents created by TDSB, cross referenced with other Ontario grade 11 history courses, to provide teachers with material that would directly link to their teaching of the course and others of the same nature. The workbook has elements of Gregory
Stanton and Barbara Coloroso’s work in the framing of the discussion. The framework reflects historical thinking and puts content and cognitive design in place to prepare for teaching the grade 12 course HSB4M, from which the model is cited.

The primary goal in teaching acceptance is the prevention of future violence. Adolescents need to learn the history of genocides, and they need skills to prevent future violence. The workbook aims to be a useful tool to help change students’ mindset, and not only focus on academic skills. Through a framework supported by cognitive theory and cognitive instructional design theory, students can construct and make meaning of the discriminatory practices of others, and their own. This may help in the promotion of acceptance and peace.

\[12\] Please see course outline online in the appendix of the teacher’s manual or at [http://www.tdsb.on.ca/wwwdocuments/programs/Equity_in_Education/docs/TDSB%20Genocide%20Course%20Proposal.pdf](http://www.tdsb.on.ca/wwwdocuments/programs/Equity_in_Education/docs/TDSB%20Genocide%20Course%20Proposal.pdf)
Comparison of current discourse and literature

What follows in the next two sections is a theoretical discussion that critically deconstructs the title “five stages of discrimination,” and a full discussion and exploration of the connections and differences between current frameworks in literature. Furthermore, this discussion compares current scholarship in the teaching of genocide, and concludes with a critical deconstruction of the title. The literature review comprises of a review and comparison of the Ontario Ministry of Education (OME) model to that of Gregory Stanton (1996), which has been widely used in genocide studies literature. Also considered is the discourse on Linda Woolf and Michael Hulsizer’s (2005) seven-stage path to mass violence and genocide model.

Frameworks in genocide education

Two frameworks are commonly used in the adolescent classroom to teach acceptance: Stanton’s eight-stage model, and the OME five stages model. A third model by Woolf and Hulsizer (2005), although difficult to use in the classroom, reflects the complex yet “organized and orchestrated” (Woolf and Hulsizer, p. 106) path to genocide. For brevity, the differences between these three models are outlined in Figure 2. The major difference between models is the number of stages each incorporates. Other differences include the starting-point for each model (when does genocide begin), the meaning held within each stage and the ordering of stages. There is significant overlap between the seven and eight-stage models, comprising largely of examples of events outlined in the five-stage model. Figure 2 also shows an extreme contrast in their meaning of each stage.
Figure 2: Comparison of the five-stage, seven-stage and eight-stage models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>5 Stages of Discrimination - OME Model</th>
<th>7 Stages on the path to mass violence and genocide - Woolf and Hulsizer Model</th>
<th>8 Stages of Genocide - Stanton’s Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes - false or generalized beliefs about a group of people that result in categorizing members without regard for individual difference.</td>
<td>“The Norm” - normative for in-groups to maintain stereotypes and negative attitudes towards an out-group. “Informal” individual killings/abuse.</td>
<td>Classification - categories of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ are identified based on ethnicity, race, religion or nationality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Prejudice - a set of opinions, attitudes and feelings that unfairly cast a group and its members in a negative light without legitimate reasons.</td>
<td>Loss of privilege and opportunity - members of out-group may be denied access to certain services, excluded from organizations, or limitations in educational opportunities or jobs. Process of stigmatization occurs with an increase in stereotypes and derogatory images linked to negative attributes. May proceed to classifying and identifying.</td>
<td>Symbolization - names and symbols are given to classified categories. An example includes the yellow star for Jewish people during the holocaust. Symbolization does not typically result in genocide unless it is accompanied by dehumanization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Discrimination - inequitable treatment of people based on their race, gender, ethnicity, language, faith or sexual orientation.</td>
<td>Loss of basic civil rights - changes in laws. Dehumanization begins and is promoted by leaders and elite.</td>
<td>Dehumanization - one group denies humanity of the other group by equating them with animals, insects, or diseases. This eliminates the normal human revulsion against murder and makes killing someone of the other group easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Systemic Discrimination - the policies and practices in organization that result in the inequitable treatment of members of certain groups named above.</td>
<td>Forced Isolation - ghettoization, deportations, ethnic cleansing.* Moral disengagement. Increase in euphemistic language and ‘informal’ sanctioned killings.</td>
<td>Organization - governments, armies, or other groups of power unite and train militias to carry out the genocide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Genocide - the organized, systematic destruction of an identifiable group (ex. racial,</td>
<td>Deprivation of basic human rights - denied education, access to adequate food and shelter,</td>
<td>Polarization - extremists further drive the two groups apart by spreading</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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cultural, religious) by those in power. and relegated to subsistence living. Moral exclusion as victim becomes excluded entirely from the normal moral realm (easy to kill 'them' the enemy).

**Stage 6**

**Genocide**- killing and very existence is threatened. Formal sanctioned killing begins. *Key point of international intervention. Will or will not start if action is perceived as either accepted or punished by the international community.

**Preparation**- victims are identified and separated. Death lists are drawn up. Weapons are distributed.

**Stage 7**

**Denial**- deny that any killings have happened and blame the victim. Final insult and disrespect of victims.

**Extermination**- mass killing of identified victims begins. Killing is easy and extermination is quick.

**Stage 8**

**Denial**- perpetrators of the genocide try to cover up mass killings and intimidate witnesses. They deny that they committed any crimes, and try to blame what happened on the victims.

* Ethnic cleansing. Suggested definition: Expert advisory committee to security council includes: murder, extrajudicial executions, sexual assault, torture, confinement of civilians to ghetto areas, Deliberate initiation of attacks or threats of attacks...on civilians and civilian areas, Wanton destruction of property, Forcible removal, displacement and deportations, and Indirect result of the above (Richter and Stanton, p. 210).

As one can see, the eight-stage model fails to show a true comprehensive path to genocide as the model starts after a society is on its way to acts of annihilation.

Attending to these very early stages in the development towards genocide are a vital part of the comprehension of genocide and therefore also to the teaching of acceptance. The five stages of discrimination model and the seven-stage model, however, begin with the individual, where discriminatory thoughts begin. This best
illustrates the easy transfer of hate from individual thoughts to societal action. This step is lacking in the eight-stage model.

The models also differ considerably in ordering and in the meaning of the content in each stage. The first stage in Stanton’s eight-stage model outlines the idea that classification, where society classifies groups into us versus them, is the first step to genocide. This is not an instant occurrence but is rather an example seen in the first four stages of the OME’s five-stage model. Classification can occur in stereotyping people into certain groups, and coupling the group with common negative behaviour traits, and prejudging those stereotyped groups. For example, upon seeing a group of Afro-Canadian teenagers a Caucasian adult might ‘classify’ them by prejudging that they belong to a gang or up to ‘no good’. Further, classification of individuals is seen in both levels of discrimination, whether it is by the individual or the government. Most of us are familiar with analogies between the target groups and insects. This is a common step towards genocide and can be classified under the fourth stage of the OME model: systemic discrimination. The association of out-groups with vile insects and vermin can be seen as a prominent stage. According to Hamburg (2010),

The dominant group must come to see its potential victims as mortal threats (to make killing them an act of self-defence) or as subhuman, or both. Armenians, Jews, Bosnian Muslims, and Rwandan Tutsis were all portrayed as vermin: Julius Streicher, editor of the Nazi Weekly Der Sturmer, called Jews “a germ and a pest, not a human being,” (Hamburg, p. 31).

Bridget Conley-Zilkic and Samuel Totten comment in their 2009 article Easier said than done: The challenges of preventing and responding to genocide that, “Stereotyping;
and use of disparaging comments that malign, dehumanize...include referring to members of a group as animals or insects (e.g., baboons, snakes, cockroaches) or illnesses (e.g., virus, tumor, cancer) and scapegoating members of a specific group,” (Conley-Zilkic and Totten, p. 613). To make the target group seem subhuman, they must be delegitimatised in the eyes of the majority of the society. As Bryan and Vavrus (2005) state in their reflection of the use of language and propaganda,

> Delegitimisation was achieved through the depiction of Jews as ‘parasites,’ ‘maggots,’ ‘spiders’ and by depicting them either as an ‘inferior race,’ or in animal terms, thereby dehumanising them by denoting that they did not belong to the human race at all. They were also depicted as a threat to the social fabric of European society”. (Bryan and Vavrus, p. 191).

The eight-stage model is missing the idea that stereotyping and prejudice can be the precursors of acts of discrimination known as delegitimisation. These acts can be either performed by individuals or in the case of groups, systemic discrimination.

In Stanton’s eight-stage model, the second stage of symbolization is compiled of examples that can be found across different areas of the five-stage model. The eight-stage model isolates ‘symbolization’ - that is using names or code words and markings as identifiers - into one stage, whereas symbolization occurs throughout the process of discrimination can be seen in particular through prejudice, discrimination, systemic discrimination and even genocide itself. For example, the use of the code word ‘cockroaches’ during the Rwandan genocide, employed over the radio as an incitement to begin the killings, was seen in each of the OME’s five-stages model.
The third stage of Stanton’s eight-stage model is dehumanization, which is seen in stages one through three in the OME’s five-stage model. These stages reflect on many of the common thoughts and feelings experienced by perpetrators towards a group of individuals. In order to later commit violence, the group needs to be seen as less than an accepted human. Confining dehumanization to one stage rather than seeing its reflection in many different stages minimizes its importance in the progression from stereotypes to genocide.

The eight-stage model also explores organization in its fourth stage. To say that organization is a separate stage is to deny that it must happen formally or informally along the continuum of the process. Organization must happen at each stage, for nothing of the magnitude of genocide can be a random occurrence, as we will later see from Barbara Coloroso (2007).

In the polarization stage, the key actions discussed in the eight-stage model are the spreading of propaganda, limiting contact, and creating laws to ostracize the out-group from the in-group. But propaganda is an example seen in all stages of discrimination. Limiting contact and creating laws are examples of systemic discrimination whereby ostracizing can be achieved physically or emotionally, neither of which necessarily involves the government. To combine them under the one heading does not reflect the complexity of the issue and the power of each separate tactic being used.
The separation of different issues and recombining them is ultimately needed in trying to produce a framework for others to follow and understand. It is in this separation and combining that the eight-stage and the five-stage models most differ. In the subsequent stage within the eight-stage model, identification and the segregation of groups with the preparation to distribute weapons are combined. In fact identifying, creating death lists and separating individuals can be seen in many different levels, are primarily in the systemic discrimination and genocide stage of the five-stage model. How a society comes to group themselves differently from those being targeted has its roots in stereotypes and prejudice. The eight-stage model does not deny this, but the organization of stages assumes the reader understands that stereotypes and prejudice preceded the stage of classification. This may not be understood as easily in a grade 11 classroom without further research.

The only area in which both the eight-stage and five-stage models parallel each other is in the genocide and extermination stages. The intent and actions are the same: annihilation and destruction of the out-group.

The stage of denial is perhaps the most displaced. The eight-stage model places denial as the last stage of genocide, but it can be strongly argued that denial is used before, during and after genocide. Denial can be seen in the individual during the stereotype, prejudice and discrimination stages. It can also be seen in the systemic discrimination stage through the rewriting of textbooks, political speeches, religious indoctrination, and in the media. The type of denial referred to in the eight-stage model is when
genocide has occurred. At this stage it is used in order to wash away the reality of the
violence and ownership of the actions, when it becomes a clear effort to evade
punishment by outside forces. Denial of the occurrence of violence is evidence of
denial occurring at many stages, and until denial at these stages is acknowledged,
wrongs will not have been righted and hurt feelings will fester. To relegate denial to
only the final stage is yet again to limit its occurrence in other stages towards genocide.

Overall, the intentions of the eight-stage model are to single out for discussion several
key processes of genocide as it is in its immediate preparation. In such a separation,
the constant and invidious nature of these processes may not be fully recognised by
the students for whom the five-stage OME model would be of most use. Thus, the
eight-stage and Woolf and Hulsizer’s seven-stage approaches may fall short in
addressing and teaching acceptance in the secondary school curriculum.

There are prime differences on the motive and utility of each model. The eight stages
of genocide model refer only to what happens during genocide. Understanding the
process is useful in a history course as it allows students to analyze the events after the
fact. Using Stanton’s eight-stage model, genocide can be understood as a series of
processes that have occurred, but this model cannot move towards further peace and
acceptance because it does not fully address why genocide occurs, and cannot equip
students with the means to recognize and prevent the possibility of occurrences in
their own societies. The OME’s five stage model and Woolf and Hulsizer’s seven-stage
model of discrimination however, allow for the analysis of how genocide may come
about and are useful in many different subject areas, like English, history, human
geography, anthropology, psychology and sociology, law or any of the other humanity
or social science courses, allowing the incorporation of more opportunities to help
foster acceptance in adolescents.

Genocide is a multi-layered issue requiring complex understanding of the event. Woolf
and Hulsizer combine the seven stages of violence within a six-levelled frame
summarized by myself as:

- Social Psychological Factors (SPF) – includes social cognition, social influence,
  and social relations. Examples of the following may be included: deindividualization,
  displaced aggression, and obedience to authority, prejudice and propaganda.
- Parallel psychological processes- culture of violence and ideology of
  supremacy, stigmatization, dehumanization, moral disengagement, moral
  exclusion, impunity and perpetuation of violence.
- Historical and situational factors- group cultural history, destabilizing crisis,
  authoritarian leaders using SPF manipulation techniques, genocide.
- Levels of violence- hate crimes and institutional bias, loss of opportunity and
  privilege, loss of civil rights, isolation, loss of human rights, loss of existence,
  denial.
- Role of bystanders.
- Levels of prevention- primary, secondary, intervention and post-genocide
  intervention.

Most of the stages described on the seven-stage Woolf and Hulsizer’s path to mass
violence and genocide are limited to the section on levels of violence. However, when
looking at the six levels together, it is more easily understood how other factors help to
push individuals and groups towards genocidal acts. In essence, where the eight-stage
model focuses on actions in genocide, the seven-stage model (Figure 3) is only a portion of multiple factors leading up to and during genocide.

Woolf and Hulsizer reinforce the five-stage OME framework, seen in the vertical and horizontal levels of this seven-stage model. They provide a level of connection between the CHG38 course (Genocide and Crimes against Humanity) and HSB4M (Challenge and Change: an introduction to anthropology, psychology and sociology) as it echoes the previous learning in the anthropological, psychological and sociological paradigms. The information given by Woolf and Hulsizer in the seven-stage model is more useful at first for the instructor, whereas the OME’s five-stage model would be simpler for recall and application in a cross-curricular context for the student. The workbook facilitates itself to the OME model and incorporates research by Woolf and Hulsizer (2005), and also incorporates Barbara Coloroso (2007) who aides in connecting moral choices, the role of bystanders, and intervention strategies needed to combat the progression of the stages of discrimination. Below is the visual representation of the different levels that are outlined by Woolf and Hulsizer. What is noticeable in the visual that they designed is the interconnectedness both horizontally and vertically of the different levels as acts of violence and genocide move through a society. For visual learners, this type of graph is much more conducive to their learning styles and can be seen in the workbook as part of the culminating activity.
Figure 3: Woolf and Hulsizer's *Psychosocial roots of genocide: risk, prevention, and intervention*  

1. **Primary Prevention**  
2. **Secondary Prevention**  
3. **Intervention**  
4. **Post-Genocide Intervention**  
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**Levels of Violence:**  
1. Hate Crimes & Institutionalized Bias  
2. Loss of Opportunity & Privilege  
3. Loss of Civil Rights  
4. Isolation  
5. Loss of Human Rights  
6. Loss of Existence  
7. Denial  

**Group Cultural History**  

**Destabilizing Crisis**  

**Authoritarian Leaders & SPF Manipulation**  

**Genocide**  

**Parallel Processes:**  
1. Culture of Violence & Ideology of Supremacy  
2. Stigmatization  
3. Dehumanization  
4. Moral Disengagement  
5. Moral Exclusion  
6. Impunity  
7. Perpetuation of Violence  

**Social Psychological Factors (SPF)**  
(e.g., Deindividuation, Displaced Aggression, Illusory Correlations, Obedience to Authority, Prejudice, Propaganda)  

**Path to mass violence and genocide**  
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14 **Source:** Woolf and Hulsizer. (2005). Psychosocial roots of genocide: risk, prevention, and intervention. *Journal of Genocide Research*, 7 (1). March. p. 115. Figure 1
Critical deconstruction of the title “Five Stages of Discrimination”

A close look at the wording used in anti-discrimination work is a good exercise that helps deepen the discussion in comparisons between strategies. Wording can significantly change the goals and outcomes of different initiatives. It is therefore important to critically deconstruct the title “five stages of discrimination,” to remove ambiguity and clarify its full meaning. Each word in the title will be analyzed to demonstrate the purposefulness with which each word was chosen.

Robert Miles quotes Macdonell (1986) in his 1989 book Racism, as saying, the meaning of every word is as important as their combination. “No author and no reader changes the meaning of words. The struggle of discourses changes their meanings, and so the combination in which we put words together matters, and the order of propositions matters: through these, whatever our intentions, words take on meaning,” (Miles, p.1).

Critical theorists understand hidden ideologies, and how the words we are using have been shaped by time. As with anything, bias becomes the basis of the knowledge that was deemed appropriate to acculturate. Teachers possess a certain amount of dialectic authority over the words used in the classroom. Teachers are, and are mandated to be, the makers of knowledge and those who transfer the ownership of that knowledge to the next generation. Unfortunately, current positivist and biased curriculum policies

---

15 Dialectic authority means involving studies that account for the importance of opposites and contradictions within all forms of knowledge and the relationship between these opposites. Knowledge is produced in a larger process and can never be understood outside of its historical development and its relationship to other information (Kincheloe, 2008, p. 42).
run years behind accepted present terminology or knowledge content\textsuperscript{16}. The power and choice of words can be tools of acceptance, or of hate.

**The title: Five Stages of Discrimination**

This section deconstructs the multiple definitions behind the words used in the title to illustrate the full extent of their meanings. It is my belief that the five stages of discrimination model is the best model for secondary students in the teaching of acceptance and genocide. The deconstruction is of the words *five, stages, genocide* and *discrimination*, followed by a discussion on the choice between the word discrimination and the word genocide for the title.

The **five** stages of discrimination:

Cognitive learning theory and memory indicates that people remember things more easily if they are expressed simply and if they are in the range of five to nine items. There are many examples. This is reflective of psychologist Gordon W. Allport's five-stage model\textsuperscript{17} "the ladder of prejudice" (1954) and is used often in genocide education as it is cited as one of the resources for CHG38 (History of Genocide and Crimes against Humanity). The PPM 119 [1993] OME five-stage model cited in the grade twelve textbook, *Transitions in Society*, is also easy to remember with its small number of five. Both Stanton (1996) and Woolf (2005)\textsuperscript{18} use larger numbers (eight and seven respectively), but the five items framework is a more manageable number for our

\textsuperscript{16} Refer to Table 1 (p.7) on curriculum and policy
\textsuperscript{17} In Allport's book, *The Nature of Prejudice* published in 1954, the five rungs of the ladder of prejudice are: Spoken abuse or Antilocution; Avoidance; Acts of discrimination; Physical attacks on people or property; Genocide/extermination
\textsuperscript{18} Refer to preceding pages 21-22 or in the workbook for a full review of the other models.
memory, and lends itself well to cognitive theory and cognitive instructional design theory in that it is more manageable for the purpose of recall in secondary students. Cognitive strategy connections illustrate that the use of the number five in the title of the model is an excellent tool for recall. For example, mnemonics and simple kinaesthetic/physical cues of using five fingers to recall five things help solidify and transfer the information from short- to long-term memory.

The five stages of discrimination:

According to dictionary.com, there are up to 27 different definitions of the word stage. Five of these definitions are pertinent to this thesis:

1. A single step or degree in a process; a particular phase, period, position, etc., in a process, development, or series.

Discrimination and genocide do not happen without warning. As seen earlier with Woolf and Hulsizer (2005), there are many influences and occurrences that happen in order to foster an attitude of hate, allowing some people to contribute in genocide.

A stage being a single step in a process by no means allows for the movement to occur only in one direction. In this context the important word is process. It means the phase, period, or position can change. It is not stagnant, nor is it complete. Therefore, this definition of the term stage infers that there is a process and there is movement towards (or away from) genocide. Coloroso (2007) states:

---

19 Retrieved in 2012. All of the definitions came from this source.
The progression from taunting to hacking a child to death is not a great leap but actually a short walk... The tragedy of genocide has many rehearsals that weaken moral inhibitions against violence, publicity that spreads bigotry and intolerance, a backdrop that establishes climate, ominous sounds that signal the beginning and the end, scripts that heighten the tension and fuel the contempt, six scenes that seal the victims' fate, a slew of character actors, and an international audience that either fails to hinder or actually helps to energize the performance of acts of extraordinary evil by ordinary people (Coloroso, p. xxi-xxii).

There are many players in the development of discrimination and genocide and as this hatred moves in stages from the individual’s thoughts (stereotyping and prejudice) to actions in a society as a whole. This definition reflects the realization that every culture and every group of people have a period or history of actions such as genocide. In speaking of forced resettlement and genocidal behavior as a precipitating factor, Hamburg (2010) states:

The expulsion of an undesired population from a given territory carries with it forceful, injurious, often brutal treatment and extreme humiliation. It typically involves religious or ethnic discrimination, political or ideological animosities, or a combination of these. Such behavior has occurred throughout human history from antiquity to the present but greatly intensifies in the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Recent events in the former Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Darfur are a repetition of processes that nearly all other parts of the world have undergone in efforts to achieve ethnically distinct territories, group superiority, or control of highly valued resources. Children and adolescents are typically caught up in such horrors, and survivors are often left with permanent disabilities or psychological scars (Hamburg, p. 19).

Typology and definition are explored later in this report, and at length in the workbook. It is not the case that there is only one kind of genocide and that every community has in some way been a part of such violence. Hamburg and Hamburg (2004) do believe however that we possess innate desires to protect our own interests over others we deem less significant. In their book they try to make the reader realize that all societies in some way have been affected by genocide and that we must always be vigilant of the processes and the escalation of violence. They do follow a biological anthropology paradigm as well as a biological psychology one.
The discrimination and small acts of violence towards others happen every day, everywhere. As acceptance of stereotypes and prejudice against certain groups become accepted by the society, they become the norm. If these thoughts are not negated, they are transmitted to others through social institutions where they are transmitted en mass.

The hope is to stop the stages of discrimination in its inception so that later, the same institution will not be used as a vehicle for systemic discrimination. With this definition of stage, the hope is to stop the progression of the development of discrimination so it may not continue.

2. The scene of any action.

Part of this definition reflects some of the terminology used in producing a drama. For example, there is a stage on which the play is conducted and there are scenes that are acted as part of a plot, performed by actors for the enjoyment of the audience.

According to Sternberg (2003), love and hate are easily mapped in connection to an analogy of a story with the same literary devices. He says, “Hate has story-like properties, with a beginning (often introduced by propaganda), a middle (characterized by action), and, sometimes, an ending (often induced by eliminating the object from one’s life or, less often, reconciliation), and has one or more plots, subplots, and themes,” (Sternberg, p.413).

There comes a point in the stages of discrimination model where the perpetrators move from thoughts to action (transference). In the model, the first two stages
(stereotypes and prejudice) are still in the thought stages of development, whereas once a person has performed a discriminatory action, the thoughts have moved into actions. These actions move from individual- to group-actions once they are sanctioned or go unpunished by the society. For Sternberg (2003), “It is important to keep in mind that whereas hate is an emotion, genocide, like terrorism and massacres is an action,” (Sternberg, p. 299).

3. **Entomology.** a) Any one of the major time periods in the development of an insect, as the embryonic, larval, pupal, and imaginal stages. b) Also called **stadium.** Any one of the periods of larval growth between molts.

The concept of this definition is twofold, towards those affected and those who perpetrate the violence. Both the development of the child and the development of the perpetrator can be seen as ‘growth between molts.’ Children can be taught to love and hate. Once a child is on a course towards genocide, s/he will continue to change and grow between stages. In this definition, the larval and pupal stages can easily be linked to the stages of prejudice and discrimination. The imaginal stage is the final stage before full transformation of the insect, where what was once one type of organism has turned into quite another. Children are socialized by the adults and society around them and continue to change with each stage of development. If there is no one to stop hatred, growth happens. It has time to grow if there is no intervention for change.

4. **Economics, Sociology.** A major phase of the economic or sociological life of human beings or society.
This definition implies movement towards change. Social inequalities or conditions of life whether they are spurred by economics or by beliefs can be a starting point, or a result of much hatred. These conditions can cause hurt and then retaliation by those affected. Bryan and Vavrus (2005) state:

Social conditions often act as catalysts activating the psychological processes and motivation that cause people to exclude ‘Others’ from their moral universe. Many of the explanations of extreme manifestations of intolerance locate their origin in historical or ‘difficult conditions of life’ (Staub, 1990, p.55). These conditions include economic deprivation, rapid social and technological changes, political or criminal violence, and war (ibid). Within such contexts, people often feel physically and psychologically threatened, and are more likely to harm others and use economic or physical self-defense as a justification (Bryan and Vavrus, p.186).

Economic power has long been used to oppress. The slave trade ran on the underlying belief of superiority of one group over another, and use of one group viewed as a free commodity in order for the dominant group to increase its own profit and economic power.

5. To plan, organize, or carry out (an activity), especially for dramatic or public effect: Workers staged a one-day strike.

The underlying idea is that there was a plan to carry out violence and involves preparation, whether it is a loose plan of inflicting pain on an individual, or a detailed systemic plan of annihilation. “Genocide is not an unimaginable horror, on the contrary, every genocide throughout human history has been thoroughly imagined, meticulously planned, and brutally executed,” (Coloroso, p.xx-xxi). There is nothing
random about this type of violence. There are warning signs and as Sternberg (2003) states:

The formenting of the cognitive component of hate is often well planned and may involve setting of long-term goals. Massacres of Hutus in Rwanda, of Jews in Germany, of Armenians in Turkey, and of other groups were carefully planned over long periods of time. They were in no sense "spontaneous," as they often have been feigned to be (Sternberg, p.309).

As Sternberg pointed out, this type of violence and discrimination has story-like properties that cannot be ignored. Hamburg (2010) reiterates this idea, “I conclude, firmly supported by recent research, that there is ample warning time to act, since danger is typically clear – years in advance of the carnage,” (Hamburg, p.7). He later states in speaking of the time it takes to plan and organize such an activity that, “The time required to build the machinery of genocide can be used for prevention. The deadly warning signs are especially manifested in the expression of virulent, persistent, and flagrant prejudice” (Hamburg, p.10). He reiterates that one solution is to, “Mold a constituency for prevention through comprehensive public education on the necessity and feasibility of preventing mass violence,” (Hamburg, p.7). This workbook is a carefully planned resource that I hope will help counter future planned actions of violence.

The five stages of discrimination

Discrimination and genocide are words with different connotations that draw different reactions when connected to a framework used in the classroom. Genocide is a commanding word that stands alone and gets attention. Whereas discrimination
brings into the discussion the end result or final product of discrimination (genocide), it also enlightens the reader on the origins of these atrocities.

Using the title ‘stages of genocide’ implies the end result and that by the time the stages have run their course we are too late to stop it. The focus then is on the what, rather than on the how and why genocide happens.

According to the Dictionary.com (2012), genocide means the intentional murder of a people, race or kind for the purpose of total annihilation. What the word does not allow is the interpretation and the practice of different kinds of genocide and how a society arrives at this level of violence. An integral part of the issue in using the term in a model or public discourse is that genocide has several definitions. Raphael Lemkin introduced the term to scholars after the Second World War. Samuel Totten (2009) in his book Century of Genocide: Critical Essays and Eyewitness Accounts, states:

Raphael Lemkin combined the Greek genos (race, tribe) and cide (killing). He went on to define genocide as:

The coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be the disintegration of the political and social institutions of culture, language, national feelings, religion, economic existence, of national groups and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their

---

21 Dictionary.com was used to define this word as the OME model does not include a definition of genocide, even though it is part of its model.

22 Lemkin is a reference in almost every piece of literature in genocide studies. Totten outlines a base definition to show that the existence of one single meaning of the word genocide is not acceptable.
individual capacity, but as members of the national group, (Lemkin, 1944, Totten, p.3-4).

The United Nations’ Convention on Genocide, called *The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, later resulted in an ambiguous definition that lacks cohesion. Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn (1990) point out that the UN definition is the only internationally recognized definition. Therefore the lack of rigor in the definition of genocide is responsible for a great deal of the confusion for scholarly work in the field. The convention was adopted by Resolution 260 (III) A of the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948 and states, in part:

**Article 1**
The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law, which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

**Article 2**
In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:
(a) Killing members of the group;
(b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
(c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
(d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
(e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

(Peace Pledge Union, 2012)

It is the definition most used as a measure against actions deemed genocidal and requiring of action. But, as stated by Hamburg (2010), without a clear definition of genocide, there can be no clear moment in which we are forced to act. The problem
with the UN definition, according to Bauer (1984), quoted here by Chalk and Jonassohn (1990), is that there are actually two crimes:

"The first...should be called genocide and should refer to:

The planned destruction, since the mid-nineteenth century, of a racial, national, or ethnic group as such, by the following means; (a) selective mass murder of elites or parts of the population; (b) elimination of national (racial, ethnic) culture and religious life with the intent of “denationalization”; (c) enslavement, with the same intent; (d) destruction of national (racial, ethnic) economic life, with the same intent; (e) biological decimation through the kidnapping of children, or the prevention of normal family life, with the same intent.

The second crime Bauer calls holocaust, meaning “The planned physical annihilation, for ideological or pseudo-religious reasons, of all the members of a national, ethnic, or racial group,” (Chalk and Jonassohn, p.20).

The fact that there can be no consensus over the definition makes it difficult to use in a model, and its use in a framework makes the concept unclear. “To this end, various alternative terms have been proposed: atrocity crimes (Scheffer, 2007), ethnic cleansing, or simply ‘large-scale loss of life’, (ICISS, 2001). Others have suggested ‘crimes against humanity’ is a more relevant and helpful term than genocide (Schabas, 2006),” (Conley-Zilkic & Totten, p.610).

Whereas genocide exhibits finality and death, the term discrimination brings the end result or final product of discrimination (genocide) into the discussion, and also

---

23 Chalk and Jonassohn’s book, The History and Sociology of Genocide, was published in 1990 and written before the genocides in Bosnia and Rwanda. Note that there is discourse around the use of the word genocide, holocaust and Holocaust. In Chalk’s book there is a discussion of the difference between genocide and holocaust where the targets of systemic discrimination of the Polish in WWII was deemed genocide, but the annihilation of the Jews by Nazi’s was deemed a holocaust (note the use of the lower case h). Adam Jones states that the use of capitalization H versus h denotes the different between the Holocaust (of the Jews during WWII) and holocaust as the term used for other mass killings/genocide.
enlightens the reader on the origins of these atrocities. The definition of discrimination demonstrates a more appropriate and complex term used for describing the path to genocide. The OME in their current 2009 equity and inclusion policy documents define discrimination as:

Unfair or prejudicial treatment of individuals or groups on the basis of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, or disability, as set out in the Ontario Human Rights Code, or on the basis of other, similar factors. Discrimination, whether intentional or not, has the effect of limiting the opportunities, benefits, or advantages of certain individuals or groups because of personal characteristics such as ethnicity or religion. Unlike prejudice or stereotypes, discrimination is an effect or result, not an attitude. Discrimination sometimes results from prejudice or stereotypes. However, it also comes from the failure, intentional or not, to avoid practices that disadvantage certain groups more than others. Discrimination may be evident in organizational and institutional structures, policies, procedures, and programs,” (OME, p. 88. Emphasis added).

Another important aspect of the definition is where discrimination is described as,

“The failure, intentional or not, to avoid practices that disadvantage certain groups more than others. Discrimination may be evident in organizational and institutional structures, policies, procedures, and programs,” (OME, 2009, p. 88). The five stages of discrimination model illustrates the importance of individual as well as group behaviour.

The five-stage framework also illustrates the effect or result of attitudes that become action by using the word discrimination rather than genocide as its base definition.

The stages of genocide focus primarily on the actions directly preceding and during the

---

24 As stated earlier, even though genocide is included as the fifth stage in the OME framework, nowhere in the document does it include a definition of the word. The policy document has been analysed in a previous section of the report.
violence. In the OME’s five-stage framework, discrimination is central to two important pillars in the model as there is a differentiation between discrimination and systemic discrimination as separate entities in the genocide process. This is important when outlining the importance of intervention in the early stages of discrimination. It is often the conceptual ideas that may inhibit our goal. As Moshman (2001) states,

Even if we could agree on a definition of genocide and could be utterly objective in applying it, actual human rights catastrophes, as we have seen, nearly always spill across any set of conceptual categories (Jonassohn and Bjornson, 1998). Genocidal elements can be detected in many or most cases of mass killing, cultural extermination, ethnic cleansing political disappearances, religious inquisition, group enslavement, and other atrocities. Even if genocide is indeed the ultimate crime, we cannot categorically distinguish acts that meet this threshold of evil from those that do not. Rather, we might use the lens of genocide to bring into focus the most evil and horrifying aspects of a wide variety of crimes against groups (Moshman, p. 443).

It is the conceptual idea of the atrocities of genocide that overpower the underlying ideas of the stages of discrimination preceding it that make the word discrimination the correct choice over the word genocide. Despite the controversy of the definitions of the words incorporated in the title, the understanding of these definitions must be clear when discussing the terms with students. Knowing the differences and the connotations of both will help to facilitate questions and discussions especially with the intellect of adolescents.
Adolescents as the target audience

Adolescents, specifically those in Grade 11 taking the CHG38 History course, are the workbook’s target audience. They are developmentally ready, and most receptive for the sophistication of the information presented in the workbook, in addition to having an intellectual level sufficient to comprehend benefits and consequences. They are our immediate future leaders, and the group that can bring about the most rapid change in society around issues of acceptance, and against discrimination. Adolescents are at a critical time in the process of creating their own identity and self-worth. A program at this level would have the most lasting effects for pro-social behaviour modification models. As previously mentioned by Hamburg and Hamburg (2004), the solution to violence and hatred is a program of prevention that involves attitudinal changes for the students, and the teachers. Following is an exploration of the facets of adolescent receptivity with links to the need for this type of work in education.

Basic adolescent development shows that teenage cognitive advances encompass increases in knowledge and in the ability to think abstractly, and in the ability to reason more effectively. They comprehend the benefits and consequences of hatred, and its eradication. Jean Piaget (1971) describes cognitive development in teens as the stage of life in which thoughts become more abstract while at the same time becoming less egocentric. This allows the individual to think and reason in a wider perspective. The thoughts, ideas and concepts developed at this period of life increasingly influence the future, playing a major role in character and personality formation. Angela O’Donnell, Reeve Johnmarshall and Jeffery Smith (2007) outline in their book Educational
*Psychology: Reflection in Action* that in this formal operational stage, adolescents are ready to think about thinking because developmentally they should have mastered lower level mental operations. They use mental operations to consider unseen hypotheses and solve abstract problems. The major cognitive development at this stage is the capacity to apply systematic, deductive and differential reasoning (O’Donnell et al., 2007).

Levi Vygotsky describes this theory of maturation in adolescents as a gradual acquisition of skills, knowledge and expertise. This can only happen over time, with many experienced mentors providing social guidance and cooperative dialogue. Biological changes in brain structure and connectivity interact with increased experience, knowledge, and changing social demands to produce rapid cognitive growth (O’Donnell et al. 2007). The cognitive changes in adolescence directly reflect the need for the workbook and the teaching of peace to be introduced in this age strata.

Table 2, created by myself, outlines some of the cognitive changes in adolescence. Bold areas are of particular importance to this research and will be referenced often as a framework for discussion in this report. Underlined portions indicate further online definitions of the term.
Improvements in cognitive ability

By the time individuals have reached age 15 or so, basic thinking abilities are comparable to adults. These improvements occur in five areas during adolescence:

1. **Attention.** Improvements are seen in selective attention, the process by which one focuses on one stimulus while tuning out another. Divided attention, the ability to pay attention to two or more stimuli at the same time, also improves.
2. **Memory.** Improvements are seen in both working memory and long-term memory.
3. **Processing speed.** Adolescents think more quickly than children. Processing speed improves sharply between age five and middle adolescence; it then begins to level off at age 15 and does not appear to change between late adolescence and adulthood.
4. **Organization.** Adolescents are more aware of their own thought processes and can use mnemonic devices and other strategies to think more efficiently.
5. **Metacognition.** A cognitive ability that involves thinking about thinking itself. It often involves monitoring one's own cognitive activity during the thinking process.

Hypothetical and abstract thinking

Adolescents' thinking is less bound to concrete events than that of children: they can contemplate possibilities outside the realm of what currently exists.

1. One manifestation of the adolescent's increased facility with thinking about possibilities is the improvement of skill in deductive reasoning, which leads to the development of hypothetical thinking. This provides the ability to plan ahead, see future consequences of an action and provide alternative explanations of events. It also makes adolescents more skilled debaters, as they can reason against a friend's or parent's assumptions. Adolescents also develop a more sophisticated understanding of probability.
2. The appearance of more systematic, abstract thinking is another notable aspect of cognitive development during adolescence. This also permits the application of advanced reasoning and logical processes to social and ideological matters such as interpersonal relationships, politics, philosophy, religion, morality, friendship, faith, democracy, fairness, and honesty.
3. A gain in cognitive ability that involves thinking about thinking itself, or metacognition. Adolescents' improvements in knowledge of their own thinking patterns lead to better self-control and more effective studying. Adolescents are much better able than children to understand that people do not have complete control over their mental activity.

Related to metacognition and abstract thought, perspective-taking involves a more sophisticated theory of mind. Adolescents reach a stage of social perspective-taking in which they can understand how the thoughts or actions of one person can influence those of another person, even if they personally are not involved.

Relativistic thinking

Compared to children, adolescents are more likely to question others' assertions, and less likely to accept facts as absolute truths. Through experience outside the family circle, they learn that rules they were taught as absolute are in fact relativistic. They begin to differentiate between rules instituted out of common sense—not touching a hot stove—and those that are based on culturally-relative standards (codes of etiquette, not dating until a certain age), a delineation that younger children do not make. This can lead to a period of questioning authority in all domains.

Wisdom

Wisdom, or the capacity for insight and judgment that is developed through experience, increases between the ages of fourteen and twenty-five, then levels off. Thus, it is during the adolescence-adulthood transition that individuals acquire the type of wisdom that is associated with age.

Risk-taking
Much research has been done on adolescent risk-taking, particularly on whether and why adolescents are more likely to take risks than adults. Behavioral decision-making theory says that adolescents and adults both weigh the potential rewards and consequences of an action.

During adolescence, there is an extremely high emphasis on approval of peers as a reward due to adolescents’ increased self-consciousness. There may be evolutionary benefits to an increased propensity for risk-taking in adolescence—without risk-taking, teenagers would not have the motivation or confidence necessary to make the change in society from childhood to adulthood.

Table 2: Cognitive developmental improvements in adolescents

Mental clarity, precision, explicitness and generality is a necessity when dealing with the subject matter and framework of the five stages of discrimination model and the schema from which students need to draw from for making higher-level connections. The skills asked of adolescents in the workbook are at a level that requires the ability to gather process and organize a large amount of information. For example, one of the workbook assignments is to formally debate whether or not a certain occurrence in history was actually genocide. The ideas, data, and concepts are not absolutely concrete. As long as the instructions are clear, the amount of information the students will need to accumulate and process is vast, but at this age they are ready for such a cognitive and learning challenge.

The changes in cognitive ability in the brain during adolescence allows for increase in hypothetical, systemic and abstract thinking, and advanced reasoning. The ability to apply advanced reasoning with logical processes towards social and ideological matters will help students understand the easily identifiable stages on the route to genocide, and to think of the ‘multilayeredness’ of topics such as religious practical engagement,

---

politics, fairness, morality and interpersonal relationships. The student, “is ready at the secondary school level for a new type of verbal expository teaching that uses concrete-empirical experience primarily for illustrative purposes, i.e., to clarify or dramatize truly abstract meanings rather than to generate intuitive meanings,” (Ausubel and Ausubel, 1966, p. 410). Metacognition also allows students to reflect on their own learning and the process of learning at a level conducive to the reception of the information given to them. For example, most adolescents would understand that the teaching of hatred and control of what one learns is not always under an individual’s control. They might also be more cognisant of how they think and why they think a certain way in order to reverse or unlearn some of the prejudices they might already possess.

Adolescents develop an increase in relativistic thinking, where they are more likely to question the assertions of others and the idea of the absolute truth. Teaching that truths are relative should be a continuous model for teenage students. Who has committed an atrocity against human kind is relative to the perspective of the witnesses; who is in charge of making the decisions on our future is relative to the problem trying to be solved. This questioning of authority is a skill we want adolescents to have in order for them to combat the ideologies that may be detrimental to them and society in general.

**Challenges faced by adolescents**
Adolescence is a challenging time of life riddled with potential for risk-taking with sex, drugs and violent behaviour. According to psychiatrists and researchers, Beatrix Hamburg and David Hamburg in their 2004 book, *Learning to Live Together: preventing hatred and violence in child and adolescent development*, the problems adolescents face are:

- Occurring across all sectors of the youth population: no part of society is exempt from its casualties - witness the Columbine tragedy and other school massacres occurring in affluent communities. Among the more disquieting signs of the emergence in younger adolescents of very high-risk behaviors that were once associated with older groups: early smoking, early alcohol use, early sex, early alienation from school, even early involvement with deadly weapons (Hamburg and Hamburg, p. 87).

Conversely, adolescents are also most likely to embrace the knowledge needed to stop cycles of hatred. Woolf and Hulsizer (2005) say that educators are the primary mechanism of prevention when it comes to mass violence and genocide. Hamburg and Hamburg (2004) emphasize the importance of education for peace and our role in the lives of adolescents:

- In the long run, the vitality of any society and its prospects for the future depend on the quality of its people - on their knowledge and skill, health and vigor, and the decency of their human relations. Preventing children from having damaged lives would therefore have powerfully beneficial social and economic impacts, including a more effective workforce, higher productivity, lower health costs, lower prison costs, and so much relief of human distress. Youth violence is the tip of the iceberg. Tragic as it is, it should give us a powerful stimulus to enhance the life chances of all children, including those who suffer personal misery and lost opportunities in quiet pain and sometimes violent eruptions that can do irrevocable damage, (Hamburg and Hamburg, p.98).
The workbook aims to help reach superordinate goals of peace. As quoted by Braddock and McPartland, “For many youth 10-15 years old, early adolescence offers opportunities to choose a path toward a productive and fulfilling life. For many others, it represents their last best chance to avoid a diminished future, (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development (1989),” (Braddock and McPartland, p.1). Educators need to ensure they are the last best chance students have for a positive future by passing on the skill sets and drive to may make this world a more accepting and peaceful place.

Cognitive theory and instructional design

26 From Hamburg and Hamburg (2004) “Superordinate goals have the potentially powerful effect of unifying disparate groups in search of some common aspiration that can only be obtained by their cooperation,” (p.102).
The final section of the report builds on the theory and language that were needed to construct the workbook. This first portion delves into the connection between cognitive educational theory and instructional design.

The basic premise of cognitive educational psychology is to engage the learner so that they may become active problem solvers. Anita Woolfolk et al in *Educational Psychology,* outline that both Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky believe that adolescent learners are active rather than passive learners. Piaget outlines in his research the idea that adaptation is an inborn process people possesses in order to adjust to their environment (i.e., culture). People are forced to adapt in order to cope with challenges, solve problems and attain a higher level of thinking. To Piaget, there are three kinds of adaptation: assimilation (bring new info into existing schemas); accommodation (change a schema to understand new info); and disequilibrium (new information creates a cognitive conflict with the existing ways of thinking and the individual needs more information. This adaptation becomes a motivational process that leads to the previous two types), (Woolfolk, 2009). Vygotsky, on the other hand, focused on guided participation where learning happens through activities alongside a skilled partner who supplies support. First used by Jerome Bruner in 1976, in educational terms, it is called ‘scaffolding’ when dealing one on one with a student. In a group it is called ‘instructional conversation.’ Much like scaffolding used by tradespersons to support them in their work, it is a term used to guide and support the student. Teachers, peers and culture can all be guides in the learning process (Woolfolk, 2009).
The workbook follows many of the basic processes applied in instructional design using the Cognitive Theory Model (Rose. 2011; O’Donnell et al. 2007) along with constructivist theories of learning. In constructionist theory, emphasis is on the “active role of the learner in building, understanding and making sense of information that is introduced to them. Social interactions are of utmost importance to knowledge construction,” (Woolfolk, p.342).

David Moshman (1982) outlines three types of constructivism: (1) Exogenous (born outside) - constructs knowledge by learning to represent current structures in the environment, (2) Endogenous (born inside) – constructs new knowledge structures from existing ones (reflective of Piaget), and (3) Dialectical (interconnected, inter-referential) - continual interaction between an individual and the environment (reflective of Vygotsky). The five stages of discrimination model and the workbook follow many of the same principals of Vygotsky’s guided participation with both scaffolding and instructional conversation and Moshman’s three types of constructivism. According to Woolfolk, constructivist approaches also recommend five conditions for learning:

1. Embed learning in complex, realistic, and relevant learning environments.
2. Provide for social negotiation and shared responsibility as a part of learning.
4. Nurture self-awareness and an understanding that knowledge is constructed.
5. Encourage ownership in learning. (Woolfolk, p. 342)

The workbook takes all of these conditions into account by supplying many opportunities for students to construct their own knowledge through multiple
perspectives and social negotiation. It is also reflective of Rand Spiro and colleagues (1991) quoted here by Anita Woolfolk et al. when they say, “Revisit the same material, at different times, in rearranged contexts, for different purposes, and from different conceptual perspectives is essential for attaining goals of advanced knowledge acquisition,” (Woolfolk, p. 349). This revisiting is reflective of the Piaget’s theories of adaptation; and of Jerome Bruner’s (1966) spiral curriculum\(^\text{27}\) and scaffolding.

**Links between cognitive learning theory, constructivism, and cognitive instructional design**

This section continues to illustrate the link between cognitive learning theory, constructivism, and cognitive instructional design (CID). The following table is an overview of CID, based on the work of Ellen Rose (2011)\(^\text{28}\):

---

Table 3: Overview of Cognitive Instructional Design Goals

---

\(^{27}\) Spiral curriculum is used in much the same way as scaffolding. A teacher may return to previous skill sets during a curriculum yet, increase the difficulty at the same time. As in a spiral staircase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Cognitive Information Processing model</th>
<th>Moving information from sensory input to short term memory and then to long-term memory.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. Strategies to assist in movement of information from short to long term memory</td>
<td>1) Rehearsal activities — repetition, practice, studying, underlining, and note taking — that help process information into long-term memory by keeping it active. 2) Encoding techniques - used to memorize material that isn’t inherently meaningful but needs to be committed to memory. For example, the use of first letter mnemonics. 3) Elaboration activities - paraphrasing, summarizing, or describing how new information relates to existing knowledge. 4) Organization activities - involve grouping or ordering items to be learned, outlining a passage, or creating a hierarchical list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Important principles for the design of instructional materials that emerge from cognitive psychology</td>
<td>1) Since information is processed and remembered in chunks, designers should capitalize on this knowledge by grouping related items and otherwise creating message structures that will assist learners in chunking information. 2) Introduce new material with advance organizers; short passages (50-100 words) that help learners understand how new content relates to what they already know (i.e., existing schemata). Ex: at the beginning of a lesson on long division, discuss the similarities and differences between division and multiplication. 3) State the theme of each paragraph and section at the beginning in order to focus the reader’s attention on the main points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4) Organize information within paragraphs and sections in order to reflect and highlight its relative importance (i.e., don't bury major points within a mass of detail).

5) Use transitional expressions or signposts (therefore, for example, first, as a result) to make the structure of the text clear and to signal the relationships between concepts.

6) Use the structure of the information on the page to alert learners to the relative importance of concepts and their relationship to each other; outlining, bulleted lists, and proper use of white space to emphasize points.

7) Whenever possible, foster metacognitive skills by making the text design explicit and by prompting learners to interact with the information (e.g., by highlighting, organizing, summarizing, or illustrating it themselves).
To understand CID, one must first understand the cognitive information processing model, and how memory works in order to construct learning materials that will have the most long lasting effects and allow for easy retrieval. The goal is to stimulate the neurons and aide in creating a path for the information in the classroom. Once the path is created, constant reinforcement will create bridges between different pockets (schema) of information, and the instructional materials should move items from short-term memory (STM) to long-term memory (LTM). Many educators are also relying heavily on multi-media to stimulate interest in a new subject. According to West et al. (1991),

There is a developmental progression in metacognitive sophistication. Even young children use strategies of learning. As development progresses, students learn more about their own cognitive strategies and begin to monitor those strategies. Later, an ability to reflect on the strategies while learning develops. Even later, students become able to plan their learning, check progress toward goals, monitor the effectiveness of any strategy used and try another if necessary (West et al, p.18).

Atkinson & Shiffron (1968) created a model (Figure 4) to understand memory and is important in understanding CID. As a visual learner, I felt the need to use and site Figure 4 for the ease of understanding. In particular, maintenance, rehearsal, elaborative rehearsal and encoding are deeply reflected in the type of instructional design:
From Figure 4, we see elaborative rehearsal moves information from STM to LTM by elaborating information and connecting it to things learners already know. For example, the chunking of five to nine items and then repeating them a number of times allows for the information to transfer to LTM.

Daniel Willingham (2006) in his article, *Students remember...what they think about*, describes three types of knowledge in connection to the Atkinson and Shiffrin model. In discussing rote knowledge, which is devoid of all meaning, he outlines his thoughts on shallow and deep knowledge. Shallow knowledge is, “The students’ knowledge has meaning (unlike rote knowledge), in that the students understand each isolated part,

but their knowledge lacks the deeper meaning that comes from understanding the relationship among the parts,” (Marlowe and Canestrari, p.69). With shallow knowledge as only a step toward deeper understanding, deep knowledge is:

Harder to obtain than shallow knowledge, because knowledge of their interrelationships is prerequisite to it. We want our students to know the different levels of hierarchy; it’s not enough to have memorized each level in isolation of the others. That connected knowledge will inevitably be the last thing that the student acquires, (Marlowe and Canestrari, p.73-74).

Adolescents must be supplied with time to think, reflect and construct links to information schema to have the information moved to LTM. The more adolescent students think about something and know how their learning takes place, the more meaning they derive from the lessons taught in the classroom.

Long-term memory, as seen in Figure 4, postulates the purpose of relatively permanent storage of memories and information with a capacity that is relatively unlimited. Within LTM there exist two different kinds of memory: episodic and semantic. To O’Donnell (2007), episodic memory is used to store memories of events and includes sensory information. This type of memory often includes emotional content and is embedded in a specific context. Semantic memory concerns verbal information or declarative knowledge and can be sub-divided into declarative and procedural memory. Declarative memory is knowledge about what. Procedural memory is how to do something. Gayle Gregory and Carolyn Chapman (2007) in their book, *Differentiated Instructional Strategies*, define declarative memory, “…as more conscious, and procedural memory as more unconscious,” (Gregory & Chapman, p.98).
For example, doing up a button, or using a pencil are skills embedded in our procedural memory. Semantic memory is organized in a complex network where facts are isolated and connected to other ideas. This is what we may see a great deal in holocaust education. Students may know isolated information about the Holocaust but they do not have a deep understanding of the complexity of the recurrence of genocide as a domain. A domain in memory involves a dense network of interconnected ideas about the theme, called a propositional network, is "a set of interconnected pieces of information that contains knowledge for the long term," (O’Donnell, p. 250). West et al (1991) say, “schemata are like packets or bundles in which the mind stores knowledge: they are patterns, structures, scaffolds,” (West et al. p. 7).

O’Donnell (2007) states there are three kinds of knowledge. Already discussed are declarative (what) and procedural (how). O’Donnell also outlines conditional knowledge that is a combination of the ‘what and ‘how’ of knowledge retention which involves knowing the necessary information and how to apply it in the right situation. This last type of knowledge is the focus in the workbook, echoing Willingham’s shallow versus deeper knowledge ideas. Under the idea of constructivism, students should understand how their knowledge is constructed in order that they may then take ownership in their own learning (Woolfolk, 2009). When information is encoded well, information is most effectively remembered and retrieved.

Four common strategies needed in transferring from STM to LTM include:

1) Rehearsal activities — such as repetition, practice, studying, underlining, and note taking — help process information into long-term memory by keeping it active.
The duration of STM is 30 seconds without rehearsal, but with rehearsal, this transfer increases duration in the memory. Gregory and Chapman (2007) state that, “Practice may occur in a multitude of ways using a variety of multiple intelligences and as many modalities as possible to involve opportunities for visual, auditory, and tactile/kinaesthetic learners to develop understanding,” (Gregory and Chapman, p. 98).

2) Encoding techniques that people use to memorize material that is not inherently meaningful but needs to be committed to memory.

Mnemonics is a common strategy used for encoding. O’Donnell (2007) states they are strategies for remembering non-meaningful information by making it meaningful. West et al (1991) describe mnemonics as, “Artificial aids to memory” (West et al. p. 22). According to O’Donnell, there are different kinds of mnemonics and these include:

1. Acronyms – ex. R.O.Y
2. Keyword
3. Pictorial mnemonics
4. Method of loci- uses special imagery to assist memory
5. Pegword mnemonics- associate word with previously memorized list (O’Donnell. p.255)

In Figure 5 below, is an example of a pictorial mnemonic that is used in the workbook, combining words and the visual image of the arrow to put forward the idea of the five stages.

Figure 5: Pictorial image of the five stages of discrimination.
3) Elaboration activities such as paraphrasing, summarizing, or describing how new information relates to existing knowledge.

Elaboration activities allow students to put ideas into their own words. This helps with recall, increases meaning, and makes connections to other schema. Examples of elaboration activities can be seen in Table 4.

Table 4: Elaboration activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elaboration Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Restating and paraphrasing</td>
<td>Students put concepts, ideas and propositions in their own words, thereby relating the new material to their prior knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reviewing and summarizing</td>
<td>Students “pass” through material to reflect on its meaning and to think about what they recall. Students create an overview of the idea of the material</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Organization activities involve grouping or ordering items, outlining a passage, or creating a hierarchical list.

The grouping or organizing of information can be facilitated using knowledge structures known to the student. Knowledge structures include chains (Fig. 6), brainstorming webs (Fig. 7) or trees (Fig. 8):

---

Imagery and visual learning strategies such as the arrow/five stages visual works well because it follows the ideas of dual-coding theory (Paivio, 1986) which state that when images and words are linked, the result is stronger learning (O’Donnell, 2007).

There are several important principles (grouping related items, advance organizers, and interacting with information) for the design of instructional materials that emerge from cognitive psychology. First, information is processed and remembered in chunks. Designers should capitalize on this knowledge by grouping related items and creating message structures to assist learners in chunking information (Rose, 2011). Chunking or grouping of information enables, “The rational ordering, classifying, or arranging of complex arrays. They aid persons in intellectual management of large amounts of data or complex processes or events,” (West et al. p.20). Knowledge structures or graphic organizers link the visual and the written, and help to categorize the information. Categorization helps to:

1. Reduce complexity
2. Identify objects
3. Devote less effort to learning
4. Decide what actions are appropriate
5. Order and relate classes of objects and events (O’Donnell, p. 255)

There are many types of graphic organizers such as concept or mind mapping, Venn diagrams, comparison matrix, word webs, and T-charts. Which graphic organizer an instructional designer/teacher applies depends wholly on the content and use of the information. For example, West et al (1991) speak of two types of frames: type I and types II, each with a different purpose as seen here in Table 5:

For brevity’s sake, not every section outlined in the CID chart is reflected in this section.
Table 5: Type I Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type I</th>
<th>A matrix or grid. Names of concepts, categories or relationships are headings for columns and rows of the grid. Students, teachers or instructional designers supply information in the slots.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type II</td>
<td>Similar to Type I, but the type of frame is governed by a general principle that allows students to use logic to fill in information into slots. Students can infer information from slot to slot and from general principle to slot.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 is an example of a Type I frame, which is used often in this thesis, allowing for the production and illustration of information in a way that shows the relationship between ideas. Figure 9, an excerpt from the workbook, demonstrates a Type II frame, which allows the students to fill in their own information, while at the same time providing guidance through cues (the arrows) and giving an overview of the general concept.

---

Figure 9. Type II frame using the fourth stage of discrimination (workbook sample)

4th Stage of Discrimination: Systemic Discrimination II
From the last class we defined the term systemic discrimination and looked at Hitler's stages of discrimination towards the Jewish p:

For the following stereotypes, provide examples of the next three stages. The first one has been completed for you as an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Prejudice</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Systemic Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All homosexuals are pedophiles</td>
<td>That couple must be looking at the kids in the park as their next prey.</td>
<td>I’m leaving the park with my son, RIGHT NOW before they touch him! I’m going to warn the other parents in the park so they can keep their kids safe!</td>
<td>The government makes a law that homosexuals are not allowed to marry or adopt children as they are ‘bad’ role-models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All teen moms are promiscuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Processing structures and functions help with metacognition, reasoning, argumentation, problem solving and transfer. Benefits of argumentation (taking a position, give reasons and present counter arguments) include: understanding content, increasing interest and motivation, improve problem-solving skills, and increased argumentation skills, as the students need to ask why questions to have deeper thinking when organizing the information (O’Donnell. 2007).

Second, introduce new material with advance organizers; short passages (50-100 words) that help learners understand how the new content relates to what they already know (i.e., existing schemata) (Rose, 2011). West et al (1991) describe advance organizers as:
Presented prior to new material, the advance organizer is a brief abstract passage or prose. It is a bridge, a transition statement, which is not only a summary of prior learning prerequisite to new material but is also a brief outline of new material. The advance organizer is unique among the strategies in that generally students cannot be expected to create advance organizers. This is the task of the designer or teacher. (West et al. p. 21).

Figure 10 is an example of this type of advanced organizer. Here, students are reminded what they have learned, and the information is bridged with new ideas of transference. Students are familiar with visual representations, but need some script in order to link the idea of transference in the five stages of discrimination model. Cues for recall and openers are used in the workbook following key ideas on information recall of cognitive and constructivist theory. These allow students to create their own meanings.

Figure 10: Advance organizer (workbook sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>So far we have learned the first two stages of the discrimination model.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotype → Prejudice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For a person to go from one stage to another there must be transference. To go from stage two to stage three, an individual must move information from their thoughts/mind to actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thought</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transference</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third, whenever possible, foster metacognitive skills by making the text design explicit and by prompting learners to interact with the information (e.g., by highlighting, organizing, summarizing, or illustrating it themselves) (Rose, 2011). As stated by Jonassen (1985) in Rose (2011), graphic organizers can be final form or participatory. The workbook focuses on the latter as a way of moving information for STM to LTM, as
well as, targets their growth in abstract and relativistic thinking.

The anticipated curriculum connections in the workbook include the fact that students in Ontario have had grade 10 History at this stage in their school careers and may then participate in a grade 12 History or social science course. This course workbook is for grade 11, but the five stage discrimination model is not introduced until grade 12. The material and the way it is organized using CID will help students see the overlap or connectivity of their course subjects and life itself.
Conclusion

Education is, in my opinion, the best venue within which to guide the change that is needed to produce more accepting individuals in our society. The Ontario Ministry of Education (OME) also felt that way or they would not have tried to implement policies in their school boards to alleviate the issue. The current heteronormative curriculum perpetuates the status quo of discrimination under the guise of multiculturalism or anti-racism policies rather than helping to resolve the problem. The goal of critical pedagogy is to illuminate the status quo and make the hidden curriculum visible in order to implement change towards peace. The government mandated a policy of equity and inclusion, but did not make the goals clear to the classroom teacher.

Teachers play a very important part in the construction of future societies, and can help shape the type of society we may all want, where discrimination and violence leave way for peace and acceptance. By focusing on a methodical framework which teaches students to unlearn prejudices and illustrate the consequences of not doing so, we can get there.

This report outlined the current equity policy being implemented in Ontario, and also critically looked at the five stages of discrimination framework and the power of its title. Further, the workbook was may prove to be a good link to the CHG38 course (History of genocide and human atrocities). Its construction and focus are made for adolescents, who would benefit the most in its use. Gerry Rosenfeld (1971) in his

---

Heteronormative is defined as the prevalence of a white straight male oriented society. When speaking of curriculum, it is most often linked to the belief that our curriculum and course materials reflect a bias towards the Caucasian male while silencing the knowledge of others in an attempt to be held superior.
ethnography “Shut those thick lips”: A Study of slum school failure outlines the importance of refocusing our attention to what is important in our teaching practices:

We pride ourselves on the fact that we can make machines that think like human beings and overlook the fact that we have made millions of human beings who think like machines.

So that social change may be sound, so that human change will be sound, we need to teach the young how to think critically, creatively, originally, imaginatively and daringly.

Indispensable as it is, the ability to think soundly is not enough. Man [sic] is not alone a thinking creature; he is also a feeling creature. Just as he has to be taught to think, so, too, he has to be taught how to feel (Rosenfeld. p. 97).

Therefore if prevention were the goal of peace education, the eight stages of genocide outlined by Stanton would not allow for adequate analysis or supply enough skill sets to resolve the issue for adolescents. Rosenfeld’s key point is that our teaching cannot only be about content, which is regurgitated like a machine, but it must also be for the fostering of caring individuals. In her 2008 article “Redefining Genocide Education,” Ellen J. Kennedy outlines a three-pronged system that would work very well in combination with the five stages of discrimination model:

...[The assumption is], to a large extent, that learning about genocide will prevent its recurrence...[we] have clearly ‘known’ about genocides in Armenia, Europe, Cambodia, Rwanda, and Bosnia, [yet] this knowledge did not prevent the genocide in Darfur. ...The Darfur conflict is in its fifth year and all the courses, films, programs, books, plays, art exhibits, movies, social activism, and millions of web sites about genocide education have not brought the conflict to an end.

Something is wrong. There is a disjunctive between what we assume genocide education is doing - and what is actually happening. What form should genocide education take if our goal is to make a difference, somehow, in the world? ...We
must teach about, teach against, and teach to prevent genocide\textsuperscript{34} (Kennedy, p.1-2).

The prevention of genocides must follow the three levels of implementation outlined by Kennedy if we wish to have any kind of success in peace/genocide education.

Stanton’s eight-stage model only teaches about genocide, whereas the seven-stage Woolf and Hulsizer model and the OME’s five stages of discrimination model incorporate all three of Kennedy’s recommendations in order to try and prevent further pain and suffering through discrimination. Woolf and Hulsizer (2005), state that (in reference to the four types of prevention\textsuperscript{35}) educators are major pinnacles of acceptance in the primary level of prevention. Within this first mode of prevention (education), Woolf outlines four prongs of inoculation\textsuperscript{36} against genocide. The first is to address historic animosities and patterns of disparity. The second and third refer directly to the impact that peace education (and its educators) can have in preventing genocide: promotion of positive relationships between groups; and the teaching of knowledge, conflict resolutions skills, appreciation of diversity and acceptance of all. The fourth is the increase of democratic governments and acceptance of pluralistic societies.

The third level in primary prevention is the crux of the workbook, and using the five stages model also allows for a wider scope in prevention. Combining the model with adolescent cognitive educational theory and instructional design allows students to

\textsuperscript{34} My bolding for emphasis
\textsuperscript{35} Refer to Figure 3. The four types of prevention include Primary, Secondary, Intervention and Post-Genocide Intervention
\textsuperscript{36} Woolf and Hulsizer use the word inoculation here as an analogy of fighting against the disease of the recruitment of hatred.
recognize their own involvement in these issues through reflection and constructive solution based questions in the workbook.

It is a teacher’s responsibility to direct students towards peace. Current levels of hatred and discrimination can be alleviated through the teaching of pro-social behaviour and full acceptance. As Rosenfeld states in his anthropological ethnography on schooling:

In school as well the persons whose job it was to teach him (SIC) have failed the child who has not learned. This is, in addition, a societal failure. The pervasive influence of teachers on our social structure must clearly be understood...it is the classroom teachers who exert the most significant influence upon the short- and long-term social shape of our communities” (Rosenfeld p. 98).
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Forward

What is the workbook about?

This workbook was constructed to reflect and teach the five stages of discrimination. It is only one way of looking at the problem, but one which will deconstruct the issue and reconstruct your thoughts on the process and progression of discriminatory thoughts to large scale human atrocities.

You are taking this history course because you have a desire to learn and stop genocide and crimes against humanity. This workbook will help you to understand the complex issue while at the same time getting you to realize your own bias and experiences.

Why is it important to examine discrimination?

While the study of genocides from a historical viewpoint has its own importance, we must know the basis for which all the atrocities and crimes against humanity are forged. It is only by examining the stages of discrimination that we can truly understand and reverse this process. You will be asked to examine and deconstruct the stages in order to construct your own meaning around the idea of acceptance and peace.

What is ‘Peace education’? How does it connect to discrimination?

Your teachers are here to guide you through not only the material, but your own reflections and experiences. Teachers, who believe in the idea of acceptance, strive for peace in order to combat the result of discrimination: genocide. For without acceptance and understanding, there can never be peace. They are the only solutions and education is our medium.

What are the intended objectives in completing this Workbook?

The objectives are simple on the surface: learn the 5 stages of discrimination and their effects on you and the world; and unlearn your own prejudices and discriminatory thoughts/bias. The material you will learn in this course will be difficult at times, but we are all confident that you will take the information forward and be the change you desire in the world.
Considerations and disclaimers when using this workbook:

a. The exercises in the workbook are designed to enable students to confront their own roles in various acts of discrimination. Often, these exercises provoke strong feelings and reactions, and both students and teachers need to be prepared to address these strong reactions. Students need to know that these reactions are very common and understandable. Students need to know that they can ask their teachers for help and guidance in dealing with these reactions. Teachers need to be prepared to help students understand and learn from their reactions. Students also need to know that they are in a safe environment in order to confront and explore their reactions.

b. This workbook is a work in progress as fulfillment of my Masters, compiled from my own teaching experiences into the current framework as a potentially useful teaching tool. The thinking involved in putting together this workbook is still developing and will need much more critical reflection and engagement with critical pedagogies in order to move forward. The workbook and teachers’ manual has not yet been tested in a classroom setting.

c. The workbook and manual have not been formally endorsed by any appropriate bodies. In granting the degree of Masters of Education for this work, UNB is acknowledging the academic and intellectual work undertaken here in the development of the workbook and teachers’ manual. But UNB does not endorse the formal use the workbook in any educational setting.
Stages of Discrimination- Introduction

Sometimes, to understand a problem we need to start with the result and then go back to the beginning. We will start with a definition and then trace how the phenomenon happened. This is sometimes called the ‘archeology of knowledge’. ³⁷

Let’s start with the final stage of discrimination and then work through the different stages to see how we all could get to the point of genocide.

Definition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genos</th>
<th>Cide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People, race, kind</td>
<td>Act of killing, murder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, genos + cide = genocide: The intentional murder of a people, race or kind for the purpose of total annihilation. ³⁸

Can you define or guess the meaning of the following words:

Linguicide: ____________________________

Gendercide: __________________________

Senicide: ____________________________

Ecocide: ____________________________

Suicide: ____________________________

Eliticide: __________________________

Memoricide: _________________________

Can you think of different ways genocide happens?

---

³⁷ A term used by Michel Foucault that means the analysis of systematic body of knowledge and power. Jardine, Gail McNicol. (2005). *Foucault and Education*. NY. Peter Lang. p. 15
How do you think a country gets involved in genocide?

Can you think of any countries that have had genocide?

Can you think of any countries that have NOT had genocide?

Genocide is the last stage of discrimination. Brainstorm with a partner ‘clues’ or indicators that a genocide could happen.
Can you pick your top three indicators from the brainstorming activity above?

There is a model scholars have created that reflects how societies may transition to genocide. It is called the Stages of Discrimination:

Stereotype → Prejudice → Discrimination → Systemic Discrimination → Genocide

Look at the following excerpt and question from Adam Jones’ book entitled: *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction*.

On a sheet of paper, answer the following questions. Be ready to share your point of view!!

Which ‘cides’ do you think deserve to be considered genocide, and which do not? Explain your reasoning in each case.

---

BOX 1.3 THE OTHER "-CIDES" OF GENOCIDE

The literature on genocide and mass violence has given rise to a host of terms derived from Raphael Lemkin's original "genocide." A sampling follows.

**Classicide.** Term coined by Michael Mann to refer to "the intended mass killing of entire social classes." *Examples:* The destruction of the "kulaks" in Stalin's USSR (Chapter 5); Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge (Chapter 7). *Source:* Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).


**Ecocide.** The wilful destruction of the natural environment and ecosystems, through (a) pollution and other forms of environmental degradation and (b) military efforts to undermine a population's sustainability and means of subsistence. *Examples:* Deforestation in the Amazon and elsewhere; US use of Agent Orange and other defoliants in the Vietnam War (see p. 76); Saddam Hussein's campaign against the Marsh Arabs in Iraq (see Figure 1.3). *Source:* Jared Diamond, *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed* (Viking, 2004).


**Ethnocide.** Term originally coined by Raphael Lemkin as a synonym for genocide; subsequently employed (notably by the French ethnologist Robert Jaulin) to describe patterns of cultural genocide, i.e., the destruction of a group's cultural, linguistic, and existential underpinnings, without necessarily killing members of the group. *Examples:* The term has been used mostly with reference to indigenous peoples (Chapter 3, Box 5a.1), to emphasize that their "destruction" as a group involves more than simply the murder of group members. *Source:* Robert Jaulin, *La paix blanche: Introduction à l'ethnocide* ("White Peace: Introduction to Ethnocide") (Seuil, 1970).

The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) declares (Article 8): "Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subjected to forced
Figure 1.3 Two members of the Madan community in southern Iraq, known as the "Marsh Arabs," pole along a waterway in a traditional *mahroof* boat. The marshes and their population were viewed as subversive redouts by the Saddam Hussein dictatorship, which waged a campaign of "ecocide" against the Madan in the 1990s, draining the marshes and turning much of the delicate ecosystem into a desert. The recovery of the wetlands has been one of the few bright spots of the post-2003 period in Iraq, but only about 20,000 Madan remain of an original population of some half a million.

Source: Hassan Janali/US Army Corps of Engineers/Wikimedia Commons.

assimilation or destruction of their culture," and instructs states to "provide effective mechanisms for prevention of, and redress for . . . any action which has the aim or effect of depriving them of their integrity as distinct peoples, or of their cultural values or ethnic identities . . ."57

**Femicide/Feminicide.** The systematic murder of females for being female. 
*Examples:* Female infanticide; killings in Ciudad Juárez, Mexico, in the 1990s and 2000s; the École Polytechnique massacre in Montreal (1989). (See also Gendercide.)


**Fratricide.** Term coined by Michael Mann to describe the killing of factional enemies within political (notably communist) movements. 
*Examples:* Stalin’s USSR (Chapter 5); Mao’s China (Chapter 5); the Khmer Rouge (Chapter 7). Source: Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
Gendercid e. The selective destruction of the male or female component of a group, or of dissident sexual minorities (e.g., homosexuals, transvestites). Term originally coined by Mary Anne Warren in 1985. Examples: Female infanticide; gender-selective massacres of males (e.g., Srebrenica, Bosnia in 1995) (see Chapter 13). Source: Adam Jones, ed., Gendercid e and Genocide (Vanderbilt University Press, 2004).


Memoricide. The destruction “not only... of those deemed undesirable on the territory to be ‘purified,’ but... [of] any trace that might recall their erstwhile presence (schools, religious buildings and so on)” (Jacques Sémelin). Term coined by Croatian doctor and scholar Mirko D. Grmek during the siege of Sarajevo. Examples: Israel in Palestine; Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 1990s. Source: Edgardo Civallero, “‘When Memory Turns into Ashes’... Memoricide During the XX Century,” Information for Social Change, 25 (Summer 2007).


Politicide. Barbara Harff and Ted Gurr’s term for mass killing according to political affiliation, whether actual or imputed. Examples: Harff and Gurr consider “revolutionary one-party states” to be the most common perpetrators of genocide. The term may also be applied to the mass killings of alleged “communists” and “subversives” in, e.g., Latin America during the 1970s and 1980s. Source: Barbara Harff, “No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955,” American Political Science Review, 97: 1 (2003).

**Urbicide.** The obliteration of urban living-space as a means of destroying the viability of an urban environment, undermining the sustainability of its population and eroding the cosmopolitan values they espouse. The term was apparently coined by Marshall Berman in 1987 in reference to the blighted Bronx borough in New York; it was popularized by former Belgrade mayor Bogdan Bogdanovic and a circle of Bosnian architects to describe the Serb siege of Sarajevo (1992–95). Examples: Carthage (146 BCE); Stalingrad (1942); Sarajevo (1992–95); Gaza (2008–09). Source: Martin Coward, *Urbicide: The Politics of Urban Destruction* (Routledge, 2008).
1st Stage of Discrimination – Stereotypes

Last class we discovered that there are five (5) stages of discrimination. Here they are again:

Stereotype ➔ Prejudice ➔ Discrimination ➔ Systemic Discrimination ➔ Genocide

In your group, can you come up with a mnemonic⁴⁰ for the 5 stages so that you will be able to remember them more easily?

As you can see there are five easy steps to remember. During the course of working on these worksheets, you will be introduced to each one individually so that you have a full understanding of each. Let us begin with the first stage of discrimination: stereotypes

What is your definition of a stereotype?

Now look up the definition of stereotype in the dictionary and write it below:

Is your definition different from that of the dictionary? How? Why do you think they are different?

Do you feel your definition to be more accurate? Why?

Provide four (4) examples of stereotypes that you know. (For example: “All Asians are good at Math”)

⁴⁰ Mnemonic means that you make up a sentence using the first letter of each word as the first letter of your ‘catch phrase’ so that you can easily remember everything.
In the chart below, 'deconstruct' one of the stereotypes above. Why is it considered a well-known stereotype and what is the truth of this stereotype? For example, in taking the stereotype “All Asians are good at Math”, we can say this is a stereotype well-known to us based on the high Math test scores coming out of some Asian countries. The reality is that not ALL people of Asian decent are good at Math. Like all other people there is a balance of different strengths whether it is language, sports or History.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Proof</th>
<th>What is the truth?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to the five stages of discrimination at the beginning of the worksheet. Why do you think stereotypes come before prejudice?

In your group, come up with four “solutions” from the perspective of your age group to dispel the myth of a stereotype:

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 
Choose one of the solutions you came up with and sketch a poster that you could use in your school to show other classmates the dangers of stereotypes and your solution for it. You will be presenting this to the class.
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quote.

A German Jewish emigrant:
'It dawned on me that if I looked into my own heart I could find seeds of hatred there, too. I realised that they are there in every human being. Arrogant thoughts, feelings of irritation, coldness, anger, envy, even indifference - these are the roots of what happened in Nazi Germany.'

Are there any other emotions that can lead to hatred? What are they? What does 'hatred' mean? What is it like to feel it? What is it like to be on the receiving end? Does hatred ever feel right and good? If so, when? Does that mean it is right and good?41

41 www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html
2nd Stage of Discrimination – Prejudice

We previously learned that the first stage of discrimination is Stereotypes. If stereotypes people hold in their thoughts are not ‘corrected’, they lead to the second stage which is prejudice.

Stereotype → Prejudice

Can you define prejudice?

Can you think of some examples from your own life?

Now look in the dictionary and see if your definition is correct. Write the definition below:

What do you think the difference is between a stereotype and a prejudice?

Complete the following quiz:

Use this quiz to test your knowledge concerning the origins and prevalence of prejudice in our society, as well as the viability of various antidotes and solutions. Some of the answers may surprise you.

1. Punishing those who behave in prejudicial ways is:

A- the quickest solution to ending the problems of prejudiced behavior.
B - a response that is impossible since most prejudiced behavior is difficult to observe or prove.
C - unlikely to make a major difference since those who are the most prejudiced tend to have already received more punishment than most of us have received.
D - Both B and C.
2. If one thinks prejudicial thoughts, one should suppress them or avoid thinking them.

A - Yes, Thoughts are very close to actions and one should avoid thinking negative thoughts about other groups of people.
B - No. One should not suppress the thoughts, but should actively replace them with more positive images of the group members.
C - No. Prejudiced thoughts are normal and harmless; they are part of being in a group.
D - Yes. If we don't start on a personal level to reduce prejudiced thinking, then the problems simply grow.

3. Prejudices don't cost our society and therefore are really only a problem to those who are the victims of prejudicial behaviour.

A - To discuss the monetary cost of prejudiced behavior is impossible.
B - The cost of prejudiced behavior is a human cost and is not a national economic issue.
C - The cost of sexism and racism alone have been estimated at over one-half trillion dollars per year.
D - Both A and B are true.

4. Most people are not prejudicial.

A - Surveys show that well over 75 percent of people in the U.S. do not consider themselves to be racist.
B - Those who discriminate represent a very small proportion of the U.S. population.
C - Research has shown that those who identify themselves as low in prejudiced beliefs still discriminate.
D - Both A and C are true.

5. There are no inexpensive methods of managing prejudicial behaviour.

A - This is true because prejudiced behavior is so widespread, but we still need to try.
B - There are ways of managing prejudiced behavior that cost next to nothing.
C - While the training might be expensive the long term savings are worth the investment.

6. Those who risked their own lives to save Jewish people in Western Europe during the period that the Nazis were practicing genocide were more religious than those who did not try to save Jewish people.

A - True
B - False
7. Those who saved Jewish people from Hitler's genocide had more resources than those who did not.

A – True, they had larger attics or larger basements.
B - False, they had no more resources.

8. Those who are in positions of authority can do a great deal to manage prejudice within the ranks of an organization.

A - True
B - False

9. Being strongly prejudicial has little to do with a person's intellectual functioning or ability to make other types of judgments.

A - True
B - False

10. The motivation of a strongly prejudicial person who is committing an overtly prejudicial act is basically the same as that of a person with lower levels of prejudicial behaviour who is functioning out of a stereotyped perception.

A - True
B - False

11. When a person who does not hold prejudicial beliefs behaves in a prejudiced way he or she often feels a personal sense of discomfort.

A - True
B - False

12. Those who are most strongly prejudicial toward a target group generally know no more negative stereotypes about those they are prejudicial toward than those who are low in prejudicial behaviour toward the same group.

A - True
B - False

13. When the leading scientists of the world look at the issues that threaten our future they look at environmental concerns not prejudicial behaviour.
A - Scientists have little agreement about the things that threaten our future and there is nothing that even looks like a consensus.
B - There is clear consensus among the majority of leading scientists in the world about what threatens our future and it includes concerns about prejudiced behavior.
C - There is clear consensus among the majority of the leading scientists in the world about what threatens our future and it includes concerns about prejudiced behavior, specifically sexism.

14. Sexism, racism, ageism, xenophobia, homophobia and prejudices toward those with ‘disabilities’ all have basically the same dynamics.

A - They are all basically the same except for homophobia which functions very differently from the others.
B - Each is different and has its own set of dynamics.
C - They are all basically the same except for prejudices toward those with disabilities, which function very differently from the others.
D - They are all basically the same.

*answers can be found in the Appendix

* Adapted “Prejudices Quiz” by psychologist and human relations consultant Dr. Jim Cole. To learn more about Dr. Cole’s training programs and materials, visit his web-site at www.beyondprejudice.com or telephone (509) 925-5226. http://remember.org/guide/History/root_stereotypes.html
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quotes.

A Russian writer:

‘What mattered about Vitya was that he was my trusted friend, not that he was Jewish. My friend Khristik was Armenian, and Balbek was a Nagay, and Lida was Ukrainian, and Magda was German.

‘From what age do we develop this neanderthal dislike, irritation and hostility towards people of a different tribe or faith or origin? From childhood? From birth? I really want to know how it comes to be there in a person at all.

‘I can say that for us in the children’s home someone’s nationality was of no importance whatever. I can’t remember a single instance of anti-Semitism or racism among the children, unless it came down from the young thugs, older than us, who wintered in the orphanages and taught us the criminal’s ideology - which isn’t human nature but comes from a different hideous world of brutal oppression that was to swallow many of us.

‘Neither Nazism nor racism are present as original sin in children who are just beginning life; they are born internationalists. It’s only later, within the family, at school, in the street, from peer groups, that prejudice begins to break through, with its ability to subvert any primal truth. And here nothing helps, neither education, nor a profession, nor even belonging to an intellectual élite.’

How do we become prejudiced against people? Is the writer correct in saying it can’t be overcome once it’s taken hold? Can it be held in check by choosing not to let it dictate how one behaves?

A Croatian writer:

‘I met a Turk who was working in Germany. He complained, "When I’m in Germany, they see me as a Turk, but when I visit Turkey, they don’t think of me as one of them, they think of me as a foreigner, a German. I always feel I have to choose between the two, and I don’t like it. " ‘Well, how do you feel/ Who do you think you are?” I asked. ‘I am both,” he replied. It was only others who had a problem with his identity. But in a culture of nationalism, identity is made up of borders, territory and blood, and one is forced to choose.’

What do you think of as your nationality? Does it matter to you? Does other people’s nationality matter to you? Do you think someone can have 'identity' without bringing nationality into it?

[42 www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html]
Transference

So far we have learned the first two stages of the discrimination model.

Stereotype → Prejudice →

For a person to go from one stage to another there must be transference. To go from stage two to stage three, an individual must move information from their thoughts/mind to actions.

Therefore:

| Thought | Transference | Action |

Can you define transference?

________________________________________

Do you think the arrow is a good symbol to represent the concept of transference? Why? Why not?

________________________________________

Can you think of times when you have committed an act of discrimination (advertently or inadvertently)? Describe

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

Where do you think the discrimination you possessed at the time came from?

________________________________________

________________________________________

________________________________________

What can you do to stop a thought from changing into an action?

________________________________________
The action to stop transference is often called an "intervention"; something that stops a continued action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thought</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Can you think of any "interventions" that could have stopped you from committing an act of discrimination that you described above?

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________
3\textsuperscript{rd} Stage of Discrimination - Discrimination

In the last worksheet, we discussed the idea of transference. Moving from one stage to the next involves transference. With this next stage, Discrimination, a person moves from thoughts (that do not necessarily hurt people), to an action, where people may be hurt, mentally or physically.

Stereotype $\rightarrow$ Prejudice $\rightarrow$ Discrimination

Define Discrimination in your own words:

__________________________

__________________________

__________________________

Underline words in your definition that highlight the primary meaning of discrimination to you. Compare with a partner. Discuss words that are similar, and what words you may have chosen that were different.

What do these words say about our society and the difficulty one might have in an intervention?

__________________________

__________________________

Now that you understand well the differences between, Stereotype, Prejudice and Discrimination, prepare with your partner a short 5 minute skit to present to the class just one of these. The idea is to illustrate the problem, and come up with an intervention that could resolve the problem. The other students in your class will need to tell you whether this is an example of a Stereotype, Prejudice or Discrimination and explain it to you. You can then lead a discussion on your choice of intervention. Be as creative and as ‘real’ as you can. A template for the discussion is provided for you. Fill it out while you are creating your skit so that you are prepared to lead the discussion around your presentation.
Example of: ____________________________

Why? _____________________________

Act of intervention that may be possible?
______________________________
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quotes.

A Roma journalist:
'After the Second World War, the Roma in Kosovo were given surnames of Turkish, Serbian and Albanian origin, many of them derogatory: Delibalta ('Crazy Axe' in Turkish), Vragovic ('Devil's Children' in Serbian), Choulanjee (a rude word for peasant Roma) or Karach (the Turkish equivalent of 'nigger').'

A Roma from the Czech Republic:
'Four of us went to a park to get some exercise. About twenty skinheads started shouting, "Black pigs! We'll kill you!"'

A newspaper in 1998, on asylum seekers from Kosovo: 'Human sewage'.

Is it easy to call people names? How powerful is it? What's it like on the receiving end?

VIOLENCE
Two sides of a story:
'The villagers came in the middle of the night. While we were still in the house, the thugs threw rags soaked in petrol through the windows. They were shouting that they didn't want any Romany here, and that they were Hitler's followers, and that Hitler killed Romany and that they were going to do the same.'

'We went to have a bit of excitement. To shout a bit at those gypsies. It was quite exciting. We threw stones at them, and they threw stones at us. I wanted to get into the house they were in. My friend and I kicked the door in, and they smashed my head. We went home - well, we went to the local. The next day the police came after me. The house had burned down. At first I laughed. I didn't care at all. But I stopped laughing when the police came for me, but you know how it goes, I didn't feel sorry.'

'A bit of excitement.' What is the real nature of this excitement? What is the pleasure gained from shouting abuse? How close can this kind of violence come to something much worse? How close can threats come to being carried out? What sort of attitude makes it possible to abuse people without remorse?43
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Three Characters and a Tragedy

Read the following excerpt from Barbara Coloroso and answer the following questions.

1. Who are the three ‘characters’?
2. What is the tragedy?
3. Why is Coloroso alluding to an analogy of a play when she uses the title “Three characters and a tragedy?”
4. What is a bystander?
5. According to the title, there are only three characters, but actually there are more. How does Coloroso separate the three groups so that they have more specific ‘parts’ in the tragedy? What are they?
6. What happens when the characters perform more cruel acts?
7. What is a culture of cruelty and how is it important to the tragedy?
8. Why are nationalist indoctrination and paramilitary training important to genocidal regimes?
9. What does Sebastian Haffner say about the ‘trap of comradeship’ and its effects?
10. What are some examples of psychological stimulations and manipulations used by the Nazis in World War II?
11. What is Arthur Eddington referring to when he uses “and”?
12. How can “or” change the formula?
13. Who is the character that is the resister, the defender and the witness? Why is s/he important to the tragedy?
14. What do you think Robert J. Lifton means when he stated: “There’s no inherent human nature that requires is to kill or maim....We have the potential for precisely that behavior of the Nazis... or of some kind of altruistic or cooperative behavior. We can go either way. And I think that confronting these extreme situations is itself an act of hope because in doing that, we are implying and saying that there is an alternative. We can do better.”
15. What are the three conditions that Herbert Kellman says help to set the stage for genocide?
16. Who is seen as a ‘grave threat’ to the genocidal regime and why?
Three Characters and a Tragedy

_We used to think that if we knew one, we knew two, because one and one are two. We are learning that we must learn a great deal about “and.”_
—Arthur Eddington, Mathematician

The three characters in the tragedy of genocide are the bully, the bullied, and the bystander. There could be no genocide without a Talala, a Hitler, a Hutu Power—the bullies, the _genocidares_. But equally they could not have pulled off what they did without the complicity of bystanders. Author William Burroughs makes the provocative statement “There are no innocent bystanders,” and then asks the equally provocative question, “What were they doing there in the first place?” These not-so-innocent bystanders circle around the bullied—the one who is targeted. Starting with the bully/bullies on the left side of the circle, counterclockwise in order of complicity, the various characters surrounding the target are:

A. Bully/Bullies—planners, instigators, and perpetrators, i.e., _genocidares_ who plan, instigate, and/or take an active part in the genocide.

B. Henchmen—who do the Bully’s bidding by taking an active part, but do not actually plan or instigate the genocide.

C. Active Supporters—who cheer the Bully on and seek to reap the social, economic, political, and material gain resulting from the policy and procedures of the Bullies.

D. Passive Supporters—who get pleasure from the pain inflicted on the Target by others.

E. Disengaged Onlookers—who watch what happens and say, “It is not any of my business” or “It is a civil war,” or cite “ancient animosities”; or turn a blind eye and pretend they don’t see; or simply don’t take a stand.

F. Potential Witnesses—who oppose the actions of the bullies and know they ought to help those targeted but, for a variety of reasons and excuses, do not act.

This vicious social arrangement makes the killings possible by inviting the merger of role and person that, in turn, creates the capacity for internalizing the evil and shaping later evil behaviors. In other words, each person in the scenario becomes a character actor—someone who specializes in playing the role of an unusual or distinctive character. Slipping into a role offered in the genocide circle, it is easy for the bystanders to become invested in the logic and evil-doing practices of the instigating organization and become not just complicit but “owned by it.” In this tight-knit circle, characters find that the more cruel acts they perform, the more it enhances their reputation with the bullies (planners, instigators, and perpetrators) and among their peers. As this culture of cruelty flourishes, the characters are acting less and less out of obedience and compliance; in fact, they are often initiating and flaunting their own gratuitous and creative cruelties.

It is not a fluke that all three genocidal regimes—Young Turks, Nazis, and Hutu Power—introduced programs of nationalist indoctrination and paramilitary training for youth: Türk Gücü Cemiyeti, Hitlerjugend, and Impuzamugambi.

In _Defying Hitler_, Sebastian Haffner’s disturbing 1939 memoir chronicling the rise of Nazism, the author, a law candidate, describes the snazidious day-to-day changes in attitudes, beliefs, politics, and prejudices that began, for Germans, the slow descent into a “trap of comradeship” in which this culture of cruelty flourished as many of them became “owned by it.” “Comradeship,” as the Nazis meant it, became a “narcotic” that the people were introduced to from the earliest age, through the Hitler Youth movement (Hitlerjugend), the SA, military service, and involvement with thousands of camps and clubs. In this way, it destroyed their sense of personal responsibility and became a means for the process of dehumanization.

Haffner describes how this comradeship, in just a few weeks at a camp, molded a group of intellectual, educated men into an “unthinking, indifferent, irresponsible mass” in which bigoted, derogatory, and hateful comments “were commonplace, went unanswered and set the intellectual tone.”
The Nazis used a variety of psychological stimulations and manipulations to this end, such as slogans, flags, uniforms, Sieg Heils, marching columns, banners, and songs, to help create a dangerous, mindless "group think." One of the most disturbing aspects of this comradeship was how the men in the camp began to behave as a collective entity, who "instinctively ignored or belittled anything that could disturb our collective self-satisfaction. A German Reich in microcosm." This collectivity is the "and" in Arthur Eddington's mathematical formula. The bullies and the bystanders become a deadly combination that is more than the sum of its parts.

_Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities._

—Voltaire

G. Resister, defender, witness: There is an "or" that has the potential to radically change this formula. The fourth character, directly across from the bully, the antithesis of the bully, gives us hope that we can break out of this _trap of comradeship_. This character wears three different and vital garbs—those of the resister, the defender, and the witness. This character is one who will actively resist the tactics of the bully, stand up to the bully, speak out against the genocidal regime, and/or protect, defend, and speak up for those who are targeted. The cycle of violence can be interrupted when even one person has the moral strength and courage to resist the _genocidares_, defend those who have been targeted, or give witness to the cruelty in order to get it stopped. This character is an awkward and embarrassing reminder that choices are possible, even in the midst of genocide.

In all three genocides, it was found that if one person (or a small group of dedicated people) refused to go along with the _genocidares_, some others who were potential witnesses actually became witnesses, defenders, and/or resisters themselves. This group readily admitted that if it were not for those who took the lead in desisting, they probably would not have had the courage to do so themselves. In his research on "atrocity producing situations," Robert J. Lifton came to the conclusion, "There's no inherent human nature that requires us to kill or maim.... We have the potential for precisely that behavior of the Nazis ... or of some kind of more altruistic or cooperative behavior. We can go either way. And I think that confronting these extreme situations is itself an act of hope because in doing that, we are implying and saying that there is an alternative. We can do better."

Herbert Kellman's three conditions—unquestioning obedience to authority, routinization of cruelty, and dehumanization of a targeted group—help to set the stage for genocide and provide a necessary backdrop. Any time these three conditions exist in a society, a gang of bullies in positions of power can walk on with their genocidal script, get all the characters to rehearse, and raise the curtain on the first act.

People whose obedience is based on value orientation don't merely obey; they take an active role in formulating, evaluating, and questioning the politics of the state. It is those who question and challenge who were seen as a grave threat to the genocidal regime because, even in the face if routinization of cruelty and the dehumanization policies and procedures, their moral inhibitions against violence remain strong. Railing against such cruelty and inhumanity often energizes resisters, defenders, and witnesses, growing even more daring, more convicted, more resourceful, and more committed to rescuing those who the regime has targeted for extermination.
Types of Discrimination

Fill in the following chart to the best of your abilities; provide an example of each type of discrimination and then describe why each is discrimination and not prejudice. Refer to the definition if you need to. One has been completed for you as an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- is anything that has the effect, intentional or not, of limiting the opportunities of certain individuals or groups because of personal characteristics such as ethnicity or religion. Unlike prejudice or stereotypes, discrimination is an effect or result, not an attitude. Discrimination sometimes results from prejudice or stereotypes. However, it also comes from the failure, intentional or not, to avoid practices that disadvantage certain groups more than others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Skin colour</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Intelligence (IQ)</th>
<th>Class (socio-economics)</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: A swastika is spray-painted on the door of a synagogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is this discrimination and not prejudice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an action. The person spray-painted a symbol of Nazi hatred on a Jewish church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4th Stage of Discrimination- Systemic Discrimination I

As you saw in the last lesson, there are many examples of discrimination. The fourth stage is systemic discrimination.

Stereotype ➔ Prejudice ➔ Discrimination ➔ Systemic Discrimination

What do you think Systemic means?

Therefore:

Systemic Discrimination

Definition:

In this context, the transference from one stage to the next is one from the personal to the collective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>thought</th>
<th>Transference</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>transference</th>
<th>action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal: Stereotypes</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Personal: Discrimination</td>
<td>➔</td>
<td>Collective: Systemic Discrimination Genocide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systemic Discrimination cannot be implemented by one person, or one person in the government. There needs to be many people who have the same prejudice, for a country to enforce acts of discrimination through the governmental laws. Some prejudice has been passed down from generation to generation. Prejudice against Jews, called anti-Semitism, has been known for more than two thousand years. It is usually the case, however, that the passions of hatred against minorities by members of the majority are stirred up by charismatic leaders who exploit latent hatreds for their own political ends. These leaders are called "demagogues," and they depend upon propaganda and disinformation to achieve their ends. Many demagogues have been successful because people want to believe that there is a simple cause of their problems. Through the use of propaganda techniques, persuasive arguments are
made that one group or another is to blame for all of our problems, and these problems would go away "were it not for those (fill in the target minority)."

Here is an example:

Hitler’s “Final Solution” of the Jewish Problem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Prejudice</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Systemic Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Jews are controlling all of the money because they are money-mongers”</td>
<td>A German sees a Jew on the street and thinks: “They are stealing our money. That is why the country is in an economic depression.” (called using a scapegoat: A person or group who is given the blame for the mistakes or failures of others, promoted through the use of propaganda.(^{45}))</td>
<td>Media increases ‘hate’ through propaganda and biased news. “Krystallnacht”- Jewish stores are boycotted, attacked and destroyed in a mob/riot type rampage. Reason: “They are stealing our business and hoarding money”</td>
<td>Nuremburg laws: citizenship changes based on perceived ‘cleanliness’ of genetics. Restricted marriages Restricted movements and passport restrictions. Seizure of property by the government. Denial of education in public schools. Transfer of Jewish people to confined living arrangements called ‘Ghettos’. Public identification method through arm bands and badges with the ‘star of David’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many people think that Adolf Hitler committed these discriminatory acts due to his own hateful ideas. To be able to implement his discriminatory ideas he needed the help of the public. He received it. Burdened by WWI reparation payments, shame of losing the war, and looking for someone to ‘blame’; people more readily believed and acted upon what was being told to them by the media. Hitler was a very charismatic leader who was able to enflame his citizens into a fever of hatred. He also had two other things in his favour: a disgruntled public ready for change and action; and the monetary backing of the elite in society. Therefore it was

a combination of factors that gave Adolf Hitler a chance to implement his ideas. He had charisma, backing of the elite in power, and he had a public ready for a change after years of economic troubles and shame after the First World War.

Do you think Hitler is the only leader, past or present, that had the power to ‘move’ his/her people to a collective movement? If yes, who are they? What have they done? If no, explain why not.
**4\textsuperscript{th} Stage of Discrimination: Systemic Discrimination II**

From the last class we defined the term systemic discrimination and looked at Hitler’s stages of discrimination towards the Jewish people.

For the following stereotypes, provide examples of the next three stages. The first one has been completed for you as an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Prejudice</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Systemic Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“All homosexuals are pedophiles”</td>
<td>“That gay couple must be looking at the kids in the park as their next prey.”</td>
<td>“I’m leaving the park with my son, RIGHT NOW before they touch him! I’m going to warn the other parents in the park too so they can keep their kids safe!”</td>
<td>The government makes a law that homosexuals are not allowed to marry or adopt children as they are ‘bad’ role-models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| “All teen moms are promiscuous” | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
“All ‘blacks’ are gang members”

“All Muslims are terrorists”

“All mentally or physically challenged people can’t take care of themselves or anyone else”

“Women are not as smart as men”

Of the seven examples, including the example of Hitler, which stereotypes moved on to the fifth stage of discrimination: genocide?
Which ones did not? Why?
4th Stage of Discrimination- Systemic

Discrimination III

As we saw in a previous lesson, there are different kinds of systemic discrimination.

Can you remember any of them? Name five:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Why are they ‘systemic’?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Try to fill in the following information. Draw from skills you have learned in other classes about the media and advertising. Try to get the information you need from the clues in the picture.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td>PRETORIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where is this happening?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Genocide**

*Before & After Photo of a Young Cree Boy Forced to Attend A Canadian "Indian School" (1910)*

“A great general has said that the only good Indian is a dead one...
In a sense, I agree with the sentiment... all the Indian there is in the race should be dead. Kill the Indian in him, and save the man.”

Richard Pratt
Founder of Canadian Indian Industrial School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AVIS**

*Les Juifs ne sont pas désirés ici, Ste-Agathe est un village canadien français et nous le gardons ainsi.*

*NOTICE*

Jews are not wanted here in Ste. Agathe, so scram while the going is good.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What do all of these examples have in common?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

How are all of these ‘systemic’?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Do you think that any of these ‘laws’ are/were justified? Why?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quotes.

COLLATERAL DAMAGE

War reporter:

‘In the 20th century, civilians have been the major victims of war. Nameless millions, but they had their own names, their own place on earth, until war swept over them, killing them, uprooting them - real people with feelings common to everyone. Grief and pain and fear and the loss of home are emotions that have no nationality. Maybe hate has no nationality either; but I believe hate comes from killing. The first deaths strengthen and feed it. Until the killing starts, hate is an ugly idea, ugly words. War gives hate power and deforms the killers: kill or be killed, kill your own people, kill strangers - hate and killing become a habit.

Leaders make wars. People must first be inflamed with fear and hate, then organised and directed. There are always aggressor leaders, and they are recognisable - but their followers are an enigma. Why is it always so easy to rouse men to kill each other?’

Is it easy? If so, why?

‘Collateral damage’ (the title of this module) is the term used by the world’s military to refer to civilian deaths. What is the effect of using words like this to refer to events like that?

LAW AND ORDER

A Muslim political leader:

‘Sharia laws can only be applied in a settled, well-fed, successful country. When many people have nothing, you can’t cut off the hand of a hungry little thief. When war mutilates souls, sweep aside moral norms, and devalues life, you can’t punish with execution.’

This man is speaking with approval of law and order, and disapproval of war. It’s true that Sharia law traditionally includes punishments such as execution and cutting off a hand. How ‘settled’ can a country be in which these are the punishments? Is there a risk that violent punishment shows the seeds of violent action? Is this the right way to keep people from committing crimes?46

46 www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html
5th Stage of Discrimination- Genocide

Last class we discovered that there are five (5) stages of discrimination. Here they are again:

- Stereotype
- Prejudice
- Discrimination
- Systemic Discrimination
- Genocide

In recalling what you have learned so far, define “genocide” in your own words:

________________________________________________________________________

Brainstorm examples of genocides and provide as many details as you can think of:

Why do you think these genocides happened?

________________________________________________________________________

Research the ones you have brainstormed above. For the next class, come prepared with information from at least four.
There are many definitions for the word ‘genocide’. As you learned earlier, genocide was first ‘coined’ by Raphael Lemkin. He is quoted in every piece of research on genocide when researchers are dealing with a definition. Look at the quote by Totten and compare that with the definition in the dictionary and that of the UN. As a class, analyse the historical connection to each of these definitions and how they have become significant to today.

1. Raphael Lemkin combined the Greek *genos* (race, tribe) and *cide* (killing. He went on to define genocide as:

   ... the coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be the disintegration of the political and social institutions of culture, language, national feelings, religion, economic existence, of national groups and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group. (Lemkin, 1944, p.79, quoted in Totten, p.3-4)

2. According to the Dictionary.com (2012), Genocide means “the intentional murder of a people, race or kind for the purpose of total annihilation.”


   **Article 1**
   The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

   **Article 2**
   In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such:
   * (a) Killing members of the group;
   * (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
   * (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
   * (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
* (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article 3
The following acts shall be punishable:
* (a) Genocide;
* (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
* (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
* (d) Attempt to commit genocide;
* (e) Complicity in genocide. (Peace Pledge Union, 2012)

In the following pages you will read many definitions from Adam Jones’ book Genocide: A comprehensive Introduction. With a partner, take each definition and analyse/research the ‘writer’, the time the definition was written, and the significance of the year. In some cases there are multiple definitions by the same scholar. How has their definition changed over the years? Why do you think that is?

---

**BOX 1.1 GENOCIDE: SCHOLARLY DEFINITIONS (in chronological order)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter Drost</td>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vahakn Dadrian</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Louis Horowitz</td>
<td>1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leo Kuper</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Peter Drost (1959)**

"Genocide is the deliberate destruction of physical life of individual human beings by reason of their membership of any human collectivity as such."

**Vahakn Dadrian (1975)**

"Genocide is the successful attempt by a dominant group, vested with formal authority and/or with preponderant access to the overall resources of power, to reduce by coercion or lethal violence the number of a minority group whose ultimate extermination is held desirable and useful and whose respective vulnerability is a major factor contributing to the decision for genocide."

**Irving Louis Horowitz (1976)**

"[Genocide is] a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus... Genocide represents a systematic effort over time to liquidate a national population, usually a minority... [and] functions as a fundamental political policy to assure conformity and participation of the citizenry."

**Leo Kuper (1981)**

"I shall follow the definition of genocide given in the [UN] Convention. This is not to say that I agree with the definition. On the contrary, I believe a major omission to be in the exclusion of political groups from the list of groups protected. In the contemporary world, political differences are at the very least as significant a basis for massacre and annihilation as racial, national, ethnic or religious differences."
Then too, the genocides against racial, national, ethnic or religious groups are generally a consequence of, or intimately related to, political conflict. However, I do not think it helpful to create new definitions of genocide, when there is an internationally recognized definition and a Genocide Convention which might become the basis for some effective action, however limited the underlying conception. But since it would vitiate the analysis to exclude political groups, I shall refer freely... to liquidating or exterminatory actions against them."

Jack Nusan Porter (1982)

"Genocide is the deliberate destruction, in whole or in part, by a government or its agents, of a racial, sexual, religious, tribal or political minority. It can involve not only mass murder, but also starvation, forced deportation, and political, economic and biological subjugation. Genocide involves three major components: ideology, technology, and bureaucracy/organization."

Yehuda Bauer (1984)

n.b. Bauer distinguishes between "genocide" and "holocaust":

"[Genocide is] the planned destruction, since the mid-nineteenth century, of a racial, national, or ethnic group as such, by the following means: (a) selective mass murder of elites or parts of the population; (b) elimination of national (racial, ethnic) culture and religious life with the intent of 'denationalization'; (c) enslavement, with the same intent; (d) destruction of national (racial, ethnic) economic life, with the same intent; (e) biological decimation through the kidnapping of children, or the prevention of normal family life, with the same intent... [Holocaust is] the planned physical annihilation, for ideological or pseudo-religious reasons, of all the members of a national, ethnic, or racial group."

John L. Thompson and Gail A. Quets (1987)

"Genocide is the extent of destruction of a social collectivity by whatever agents, with whatever intentions, by purposive actions which fall outside the recognized conventions of legitimate warfare."

Isidor Wallimann and Michael N. Dobkowski (1987)

"Genocide is the deliberate, organized destruction, in whole or in large part, of racial or ethnic groups by a government or its agents. It can involve not only mass murder,
but also forced deportation (ethnic cleansing), systematic rape, and economic and biological subjugation."

**Henry Huttenbach (1988)**

"Genocide is any act that puts the very existence of a group in jeopardy."

**Helen Fein (1988)**

"Genocide is a series of purposeful actions by a perpetrator(s) to destroy a collectivity through mass or selective murders of group members and suppressing the biological and social reproduction of the collectivity. This can be accomplished through the imposed proscription or restriction of reproduction of group members, increasing infant mortality, and breaking the linkage between reproduction and socialization of children in the family or group of origin. The perpetrator may represent the state of the victim, another state, or another collectivity."

**Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn (1990)**

"Genocide is a form of one-sided mass killing in which a state or other authority intends to destroy a group, as that group and membership in it are defined by the perpetrator."

**Helen Fein (1993)**

"Genocide is sustained purposeful action by a perpetrator to physically destroy a collectivity directly or indirectly, through interdiction of the biological and social reproduction of group members, sustained regardless of the surrender or lack of threat offered by the victim."

**Steven T. Katz (1994)**

"[Genocide is] the actualization of the intent, however successfully carried out, to murder in its totality any national, ethnic, racial, religious, political, social, gender or economic group, as these groups are defined by the perpetrator, by whatever means." (n.b. Modified by Adam Jones in 2010 to read, "murder in whole or in part...")
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Israel Charny (1994)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Genocide in the generic sense means the mass killing of substantial numbers of human beings, when not in the course of military action against the military forces of an avowed enemy, under conditions of the essential defencelessness of the victim.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irving Louis Horowitz (1996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Genocide is herein defined as a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus [emphasis in original]. . . . Genocide means the physical dismemberment and liquidation of people on large scales, an attempt by those who rule to achieve the total elimination of a subject people.&quot; (n.b. Horowitz supports &quot;carefully distinguishing the [Jewish] Holocaust from genocide&quot;; he also refers to &quot;the phenomenon of mass murder, for which genocide is a synonym&quot;).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barbara Harff (2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Genocides and politicides are the promotion, execution, and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents – or, in the case of civil war, either of the contending authorities – that are intended to destroy, in whole or part, a communal, political, or politicized ethnic group.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manus I. Midlarsky (2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Genocide is understood to be the state-sponsored systematic mass murder of innocent and helpless men, women, and children denoted by a particular ethnoreligious identity, having the purpose of eradicating this group from a particular territory.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mark Levene (2005)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Genocide occurs when a state, perceiving the integrity of its agenda to be threatened by an aggregate population – defined by the state as an organic collectivity, or series of collectivities – seeks to remedy the situation by the systematic, en masse physical elimination of that aggregate, in toto, or until it is no longer perceived to represent a threat.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacques Sémenin (2005)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I will define genocide as that particular process of civilian destruction that is directed at the total eradication of a group, the criteria by which it is identified being determined by the perpetrator.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Daniel Chirot and Clark McCauley (2006)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;A genocidal mass murder is politically motivated violence that directly or indirectly kills a substantial proportion of a targeted population, combatants and noncombatants alike, regardless of their age or gender.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Martin Shaw (2007)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;[Genocide is] a form of violent social conflict, or war, between armed power organizations that aim to destroy civilian social groups and those groups and other actors who resist this destruction.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Donald Bloxham (2009)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;[Genocide is] the physical destruction of a large portion of a group in a limited or unlimited territory with the intention of destroying that group's collective existence.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with author permission.
Genocide is bullying?

Remember learning about the bully cycle (the bully, the bullied and the bystander) in a previous lesson? How do you think bullying could be compared to genocide?

Read the following excerpt and then answer the questions. As you read, underline anything you wish to explore or ask of your teacher later.

Questions:

1. Do you agree with Barbara Coloroso when she says that genocide is an extreme form of bullying? Why? Why not?
2. Give four examples that you know of that show “The tragedy of genocide has many rehearsals”.
3. In comparing genocides, each has a common theme, common formula and a tragic outcome. Can you compare Armenia to Germany? Or Rwanda and Darfur?
4. Can you think of any “Gorillas in our midst” today?
5. In the excerpt, there are four ways in which genocide can be resolved. What are they and give examples of each?
6. Consider the following quote:

   As an international community, we must get out of our seats – we can’t afford to be passive, inattentive, bored, alarmed, or merely deeply saddened. We can’t walk out and close the show, and send it somewhere else. We can’t merely banish the bullies and mourn those targeted for extermination.

   Do you have any ideas on what we should do in order to “rewrite the script”?

7. In the last paragraph, Barbara Coloroso says that those that can help us ‘rewrite’ are those that were witnesses, resisters, and defenders. Research and find examples of each of these people. Choose one and then present your active participant to the class. Focus on what they have or are currently doing to stop the process of genocide.
Extraordinary Evil: 
A Brief History of Genocide...and Why It Matters 
By Barbara Coloroso

It is a short walk from bullying to hate crimes to genocide—genocide is the most extreme form of bullying—a far too common system of behaviours that is learned in childhood and rooted in contempt for another human being who has been deemed by the bully and his or her accomplices, to be worthless, inferior, and undeserving of respect.

- Genocide is not an unimaginable horror. Every genocide throughout human history has been thoroughly imagined, meticulously planned, and brutally executed. The pain of a "moral world turned on its head" does not begin with the machete cuts of the Hutu Power, the gas chambers of the Nazis, the death marches of the Young Turks.

- The tragedy of genocide has many rehearsals that weaken moral inhibitions against violence, publicity that spreads bigotry and intolerance, a backdrop that establishes the climate, ominous sounds that signal the beginning and the end, scripts that heighten the tension and fuel the contempt, six scenes that seal the victims' fate, a slew of character actors, and an international audience that either fails to hinder or actually helps to energize the performance of extraordinary evil by ordinary people.

A crime without a name: Polish Jewish scholar, author, and lawyer Raphaël Lemkin coined the term genocide in 1943 in his book, Axis Rule in Occupied Europe. That book was a continuation of Lemkin's 1933 Madrid Proposal. Lemkin argued that if it could happen in the Ottoman Empire it could happen anywhere. It happened once; it can happen again. Genocide would have to be codified as an international crime that could be punished anywhere. Up to that point, no international convention existed to cover crimes perpetrated by a state (or party in power) against its own people.

- On December 9, 1948 Resolution 260 (III) A: The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted by the UN General Assembly. The Convention entered into force on January 12, 1951. In 1945, the Allies convened the International Military Tribunal at Nürnberg. None of the Nazi war criminals were found guilty of genocide.

- September 2, 1998 at the UN Tribunal for Rwanda in Arusha, Tanzania, Judge Laitly Kama pronounced the first ever verdict in a UN Tribunal for the crime of genocide. "The accused, Jean-Paul Akayesu, you are declared guilty of genocide." (In late January of 1997, at a genocide trial conducted in Rwanda, the highest ranking genocidaire in Rwandan custody, Fro_duald Karamira, was convicted of genocide and sentenced to death.)

Anatomy of Extraordinary Evil: Each genocide has its own story line, setting, and characters, but all have a common theme, common formula, and tragic outcome. Each have its unique aspects, and yet there are startling parallels and connecting threads from each one of them to the others.
Gorilla in Our Midst: Sustained Inattentional Blindness for Dynamic Events (1999 research project conducted by Daniel Simons and Christopher Chabris.) War and Genocide are almost always connected. It is in the interests of any genocidal regime to create a context that distracts attention from the true nature of its goals and behaviors, and the rhetoric of war and conflict lends itself to this effort. Eliminationist campaigns are the unexpected objects to which “outsiders” aren’t paying attention.

Conflict vs. Bullying. In peacekeeping one must remain neutral, impartial, and act with the consent of both parties. In the genocide of the Tutsi, Roméo Dallaire had no peace to keep; the gorilla was not just pounding its chest, it was leaving in its wake a trail of blood; and the world stood by, stricken by inattentional blindness.

- The moral imperative for intervention trumps the peacekeeping mandate—a mandate that is totally inappropriate and counterproductive in the face of such a beast. Trying to stop a genocide by using tools that are effective in stopping armed conflicts is futile, naive, and dangerous.

- The “gorilla in our midst” is not party to any form of conflict resolution—be it negotiation, truce, disarmament, or reason. Both genocide’s inception and its solution lie elsewhere. Armed conflict can be resolved through some form of conflict resolution—often with third party participation or intervention. Genocide must be stopped by a third party, perpetrators brought to justice, reparation made, and the community healed through restorative justice. If healing is not yet possible, people must be able to coexist in community.

Rewriting the script. Can we create new roles, change the plot, reset the stage, and scrap the tragic ending? The actors can’t do it alone. As an international community, we must get out of our seats—we can’t afford to be passive, inattentive, bored, alarmed, or merely deeply saddened. We can’t walk out and close the show, and send it somewhere else. We can’t merely banish the bullies and mourn those targeted for extermination.

- The roles are what must be abandoned—and the international community (on a global and local scale) must become an active participant in a total rewrite. Those who can guide us are the ones who in the face of other genocides were witnesses, resisters, and defenders, those who jumped onto the stage as the scripts were being written and sounded the alarm we refused to hear; the ones who refused to abandon those who were targeted; those who defied the genocidaires; and those who survived genocide and denied the genocidaires their victory.

Excerpts from Extraordinary Evil: A Brief History of Genocide...and Why It Matters
Barbara Coloroso, 2007
Illustrations Joseph Coloroso, 2007

Reproduced with author permission.
5th Stage of Discrimination - Genocide

Genocide is: The use of deliberate, systematic measures (such as killing, bodily or mental injury, unlivable conditions, prevention of births, forcible transfer of children of the group to another group) calculated to bring about the destruction of a racial, political or cultural group or to destroy the language, religion or culture of a group.\(^{48}\)

In this lesson we will be looking at documented historical acts of genocide around the world. It is important for you to understand that there are many more acts of genocide that are ‘undocumented’ by their government. Yet, we know they have happened from testimonials of survivors.

On the following map, find and label the following countries. Each of these countries in the chart has ‘documented’ or ‘undocumented’ historical genocides of no less than 100,000 people for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Ex-Yugoslavia</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Chechnya</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Political map of the world (2008)
As you can see, there have been many acts of genocide with numbers over 100,000 people. With your partner, answer the following questions:

1. Which countries were you surprised to see on the list?
   
   
   

2. Which of these countries are not a surprise to you? Why?
   
   
   

3. Do you know of any countries on the list that are still in conflict?
   
   
   

4. For the following chart, work in partners to research and fill in the blanks. One has been completed for you.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>#’s</th>
<th>Killers</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1915-1916 And 1922-1923</td>
<td>1-1.5 million</td>
<td>“Young Turk” government of the Ottoman Empire</td>
<td>Ethnic cleansing</td>
<td>Deportation Forced death marches Massacres</td>
<td>Armenian civilians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide⁴⁹. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quotes.

OBEYING ORDERS

A Tanzanian writer:

Armed policemen were ordered to open fire on the people outside the mosque. From the videotape it’s quite obvious that the aim was to kill the Muslims. The police commanders are seen and heard ordering their marksmen to take careful aim. In two cases the bullets only wounded the intended victims, and the police ordered the marksmen to shoot again. And they did, with unmistakable zest and ruthlessness.

There is one brief scene in the tape that always moves me to tears. The commander orders a young policeman to shoot. He shoots in the air. The commander orders him to aim his gun at the crowd. The young policeman is clearly torn between obeying his commander and obeying his conscience. The commander repeats the order. The policeman makes an attempt to obey his commander. He raises his gun, he looks at the crowd, but his hands become weaker and weaker, and the gun slowly falls to the ground.’

’I was only obeying orders,’ say many of the people responsible for atrocities in war and genocide. What should we do when orders and conscience are in conflict? What should we do about the arming of police officers? What should we do about the commanders who order the shooting of civilians?

NO CHOICE FOR SOLDIERS

Soldiers fighting Turkish Kurds:

’Whether you actually take part in a conflict or not, you are a part of it. You have to protect yourself. If you don’t want to harm them, people think you’re on the other side. The toughest war is the one you fight against being there at all: your civil war against yourself.’

’I’ve seen all I want to know. If the state met the Kurds’ needs for their culture and language, and improved the conditions of their lives, there’d be no need to have war at all. Who is the enemy? Not the Kurds. The enemy is the ruling classes - who else?’

What position does being a soldier put you in? The soldier speaking was not a career soldier, he was doing his (enforced) National Military Service: might that make a difference to his attitude? These interviews were published and their editor was arrested for ‘insulting the military’.

⁴⁹ www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html
RESPONSIBILITY
An African American writer about prisoners:
'It's easy for folks who have enough to eat, homes, land, work, to preach about forgiveness. But is it fair to preach it to people living in hellholes, jobless, starving? Are they to forgive the fat well-fed millions who voted for their starvation? Who voted for war? Who voted for prisons? Who voted for a people's repression? Who wish, in their heart of hearts, that those people had never been born? Should the starving forgive the repression to come, the genocide to come?'

What is fair?
DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

In groups of 2 or 3, pick a question, research and present one (1) of the following\(^{50}\):

- Discuss Adolf Hitler's reported statement, "Who still tells nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?" Does this statement have any validity today?

- Discuss the following: "Genocide can never be eliminated because it is deeply rooted in human nature." Do you agree or disagree?

- Why do some people join groups such as the KKK?

- Discuss how prejudice and discrimination are not only harmful to the victim but also to those who practice them.

- Is it possible to grow to adulthood without harboring at least some prejudice toward minorities?

- What can you do to fight prejudice in your neighborhood or school?

---

\(^{50}\) [www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html](http://www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html)
Group PowerPoint project and Culminating Activity

There are many different models being used to teach genocide. Included here are just three: The five stage model you have been learning, the 7 stage model by Linda Woolf and the 8 stage model by Gregory Stanton.

Choose a partner. Pick one model that you feel best suits the beliefs of your group. With your teacher choose one of the following countries and create a Power Point that teaches the model you have chosen and outlines clearly every stage as seen in the country of choice. You should include information about the country before the genocide, the genocide and the stages, after the genocide and any continuing issues as a result of the genocide. You have a maximum of 20 slides and the presentation will be 45 minutes long. Your teacher will model and show you an example by using a Power Point presentation following the genocide of aboriginals in Canada. The exemplar will use the 5 stages of discrimination model.

1. Namibia
2. Ukraine
3. Cambodia
4. Guatemala
5. Bosnia
6. Democratic Republic of the Congo
7. Afghanistan
8. Israel/Palestine
9. Iraq
10. Lebanon
11. Russia-Chechnya
12. Colombia
13. Ethiopia
14. Uganda

Or any of the others found on Stanton’s list of genocides since 1945 and approved by your teacher.51

51 Worldwithoutgenocide.org/current-conflicts. 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stereotypes - false or generalized beliefs about a group of people that result in categorizing members without regard for individual difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2</td>
<td>Prejudice - a set of opinions, attitudes and feelings that unfairly cast a group and its members in a negative light without legitimate reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3</td>
<td>Discrimination - inequitable treatment of people based on their race, gender, ethnicity, language, faith or sexual orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td>Systemic Discrimination - the policies and practices in organization that result in the inequitable treatment of members of certain groups named above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td>Genocide - the organized, systematic destruction of an identifiable group (ex. Racial, cultural, religious) by those in power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td>Genocide - killing and very existence is threatened. Formal sanctioned killing begins. *key point of international intervention. Will or will not start if action is perceived as either accepted or punished by the international community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 7</td>
<td>Denial - deny that any killings have happened and blame the victim. Final insult and disrespect of victims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 8</td>
<td>Denial - perpetrators of the genocide try to cover up mass killings and intimidate witnesses. They deny that they committed any crimes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**5 Stages of Discrimination – Ontario Ministry of Education**

**7 stages on the path to mass violence and genocide - Woolf**

**8 Stages of Genocide - Stanton**

**Classification** - categories of 'us' versus 'them' are identified based on ethnicity, race, religion or nationality.

**Symbolization** - names and symbols are given to classified categories. An example includes the yellow star for Jewish people during the holocaust. Symbolization does not typically result in genocide unless it is accompanied by dehumanization.

**Dehumanization** - One group denies humanity of the other group by equating them with animals, insects, or diseases. This eliminates the normal human revulsion against murder and makes killing someone of the other group easy.

**Organization** - governments, armies, or other groups of power unite and train militias to carry out the genocide.

**Polarization** - extremists further drive the two groups apart by spreading propaganda, limiting contact between them, or creating laws that ostracize one of the groups.

**Preparation** - victims are identified and separated. Death lists are drawn up. Weapons are distributed.

**Extermination** - mass killing of the identified victims begins. Killing is easy and the extermination is quick.
Ethnic cleansing: suggested definition of ‘ethnic cleansing’: (1992): expert advisory committee to security council includes: Murder, Extrajudicial executions, Sexual assault, Torture, Confinement of civilians to ghetto areas, Deliberate initiation of attacks or threats of attacks...on civilians and civilian areas, Wanton destruction of property, Forcible removal, displacement and deportations, and Indirect result of the above (Richter and Stanton, p. 210)

Fig. 3: Developed by Donita Duplisea with adaptations from
- 5 stages were adapted from: Ontario Ministry of Education and Training. Antiracism and Ethnocultural Equity in School Boards: Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation. 1993
- 8 stages identified by Gregory Stanton and adapted from Worldwithoutgenocide.org/current-conflicts. 2012
- 7 stages adapted from Woolf and Hulsizer “Psychosocial roots of genocide: risk, prevention, and intervention. 2005

Woolf and Hulsizer combine the 7 stages within a multilayered frame. In brief, the six levels include:

- Social Psychological Factors (SPF) — includes social cognition, social influence, and social relations. Examples may include: deindividualization, displaces aggression, obedience to authority, prejudice and propaganda.
- Parallel psychological processes- culture of violence and ideology of supremacy, stigmatization, dehumanization, moral disengagement, moral exclusion, impunity and perpetuation of violence.
- Historical and situational factors- group cultural history, destabilizing crisis, authoritarian leaders using SPF manipulation techniques, genocide.
- Levels of violence- hate crimes and institutional bias, loss of opportunity and privilege, loss of civil rights, isolation, loss of human rights, loss of existence, denial.
- Role of bystanders
- Levels of prevention- primary, secondary, intervention and post-genocide intervention.
Figure 1. Path to mass violence and genocide
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Let’s Debate!

Find three people in your class to make a group of four and have a full formal debate.

The topic: Is it genocide?

From the following, choose one topic for which you can fully argue and prove that it is or is not genocide.

1. Aboriginals in Canada
2. African slavery
3. Hiroshima bombing
4. UN sanctions in Iraq
5. Feminicide in China and India
Appendix 1

Answers to Prejudice Quiz

1. D: Punishing those who behave in prejudiced ways is impossible since most prejudiced behavior is difficult to observe or prove. Research has shown that those who are most prejudiced have generally received more punishment than most of us.

2. B: If one thinks prejudiced thoughts, one should not suppress them. One should actively replace prejudiced thoughts with more positive images of the group members about whom one has had prejudiced thoughts.

3. C: Prejudices cost our society and therefore are a real economic problem for all of us, not just those who are the victims of the prejudiced behavior. The cost of sexism and racism alone have been estimated at over one-half trillion dollars per year.

4. D: Most people are not prejudiced. Surveys show that well over 75 percent of people in the U.S. do not consider themselves to be racist. Research has shown that those who identify themselves as low in prejudiced beliefs still discriminate.

5. B: There are inexpensive methods of managing prejudiced behavior. There are ways of managing prejudiced behavior that cost next to nothing.

6. B: Those who risked their own lives to save Jewish people in Western Europe during the period that the Nazi were practicing genocide were no more religious than those who did not try to save Jewish people.

7. B: Those who saved Jewish people from Hitler's genocide had no more resources than those who did not attempt to save Jewish people.

8. A: Those who are in positions of authority can do a great deal to reduce prejudices within the ranks of an organization. They often have more leverage with those who are strongly prejudiced than they realize.

9. B: Being strongly prejudiced has much to do with a person's intellectual functioning and ability to make other types of judgments.

10. B: The motivation of a strongly prejudiced person who is committing an overtly prejudiced act is basically different than that of a person with lower levels of prejudiced behavior who is functioning out of a stereotyped perception.

11. A: When a person who is low in prejudiced beliefs behaves in a prejudiced way he or she generally feels a personal sense of discomfort following the behavior.
12. A: Those who are most strongly prejudiced toward a target group generally know no more negative stereotypes about those toward whom they are prejudiced than those who are low in prejudiced behavior toward the same group.

13. C: When the leading scientists of the world look at the issues that threaten our future there is clear consensus. The concerns of a majority of the leading scientists in the world about what threatens our future include concerns about prejudiced behavior, specifically sexism.

14. D: Sexism, racism, ageism, xenophobia, homophobia and the prejudices toward those with disabilities all have basically the same dynamics.
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Considerations and disclaimers when using this workbook:

a. The exercises in the workbook are designed to enable students to confront their own roles in various acts of discrimination. Often, these exercises provoke strong feelings and reactions, and both students and teachers need to be prepared to address these strong reactions. Students need to know that these reactions are very common and understandable. Students need to know that they can ask their teachers for help and guidance in dealing with these reactions. Teachers need to be prepared to help students understand and learn from their reactions. Students also need to know that they are in a safe environment in order to confront and explore their reactions.

b. This workbook is a work in progress as fulfillment of my Masters, compiled from my own teaching experiences into the current framework as a potentially useful teaching tool. The thinking involved in putting together this workbook is still developing and will need much more critical reflection and engagement with critical pedagogies in order to move forward. The workbook and teachers’ manual has not yet been tested in a classroom setting.

c. The workbook and manual have not been formally endorsed by any appropriate bodies. In granting the degree of Masters of Education for this work, UNB is acknowledging the academic and intellectual work undertaken here in the development of the workbook and teachers’ manual. But UNB does not endorse the formal use the workbook in any educational setting.

Aims and uses for this Workbook:

The purpose of the workbook is to bring to light the stages of discrimination with the hopes of reversing the current level of hate and violence in the schools. As a secondary school history teacher, it is frustrating and discouraging to witness discrimination in motion. I have developed this workbook as a practical resource to teach the stages of discrimination in grades 11 and 12. It is a clear program geared towards helping young people identify, stop and reverse the stages of discrimination. This workbook uses course profile documents created by the Toronto District School Board and is cross referenced with other provincial grade 11 History courses so that teachers are supplied with materials that would directly link to their teaching of the course and others of the
same nature, such as English and Civics. The workbook also reflects historical thinking and puts content and cognitive design in place to prepare for the teaching of grade 12 Social Science and History courses.

There are many frameworks commonly used in the context of genocide education. The grade 12 Ontario Social Science course HSB4M- Challenge and Change: An Introduction of Anthropology, Psychology and Sociology textbook entitled Transitions in Society: The Challenge of Change (Bain, Colyer, Des Rivieres and Dolan. 2002) uses the five stages of discrimination model developed in 1993 by the Ontario Ministry of Education. Gregory Stanton’s eight stages of genocide (2004) are also used in the new locally developed Toronto District School Board course: Genocide and Crimes against Humanity (CHG38). My research found the seven stages on the path to mass violence and genocide by Linda Woolf and Michael Hulsizer (2005). Using psychosocial factors, the authors of this article seem to combine the five and eight stage model. It is however my belief that the five stage model is the best framework not only to use in the classroom with CHG38, but it is also best for the understanding of the students.52

Construction and Design:

The design of the workbook was such that I used a backward design. I worked through all of the components needed to reach my goal in creating a teaching tool. Below is a

52 More on these three frameworks can be seen in the additional pedagogy section of this introduction. Sound knowledge of the three is imperative to aid discussion, increase knowledge of current literature, and help to guide the students through their Culminating activity.
visual of the process and even though it may seem that each component is separate, in reality none of them could have functioned alone in the creation of the project.

This workbook is a tool to be used specifically for adolescent students and is backed, not only by cognitive educational psychology, but also cognitive instructional design. My research focuses on curriculum and critical theory. Therefore, a critical analysis of the curriculum policy from which the five stages framework was created, of the title and its effect on my choices, and of discourse in genocide education were a must in order to justify this as a tool in the classroom. The construction of the workbook incorporates, a number of parallel 'givens' with a focus on acceptance:

5) Without acceptance of all, there can never be peace.

6) Discrimination is discrimination whether by gender, socio-economic level, sexual preference, “race”, religion or mental/physical ability.
7) There is no country in the history of the world, past or modern, that has not reached the stage of genocide (including Canada).

8) Focus must be first on the idea of “unlearning” the discriminations that the students might hold, and then focus on the “relearning” of what it means to fully accept any one.

All work has subordinate goals. My workbook is no different. My goals have been clear from the beginning: to introduce a framework to help ‘illuminate’ the transfer of stereotypes and prejudices to acts of discrimination, systemic discrimination and genocide. Through a framework supported by cognitive theory and cognitive instructional design theory, my goal is to have the students construct and make meaning of the discriminatory practices of others, as well as their own.

Method of annotation for the Teacher’s Manual:

The workbook and teacher’s manual, are linked to the Ontario Curriculum expectations (KICA or TACK), and provide something concrete to be used for CHG38 or any other History/Social Science course. Lesson plans were not included in the teacher manual as they should echo the workbook’s design emphasis on cognitive and constructivist theory. Some answers are suggested, but just as the students need to create their own meaning, so do the teachers. Supplementary materials can be found here in the introduction, attached additional online resources, appendix, through the author’s theory publishing at UNB or easily accessed in the bibliography.
Theory and discussion imperative to understanding your students and the material:

Adolescents: Are they ready for the real world?

Adolescents are developmentally ready for the sophistication of the material provided in the workbook. They have the intellectual level to comprehend the benefits and consequences of hatred and its eradication through peace education. Adolescence is a critical time in the process of “creating” their self-identity and self-worth, therefore a program at this level would have the most lasting effects for pro-social behaviour modification models. To Hamburg and Hamburg (2004), the solution to violence and hatred is a program of prevention that involves attitudinal changes for the students, and the teachers.

Basic adolescent development shows that advances in teens encompass both increases in knowledge and the ability to think abstractly; and in the ability to reason more effectively, allowing the individual to think and reason in a wider perspective. The thoughts, ideas and concepts developed at this period of life increasingly influence their future, playing a major role in character and personality formation.

The following table outlines some of the cognitive changes in adolescence. Bolded regions have pertinence to the workbook and will be referred to often as part of the discussion.
Improvements in cognitive ability

By the time individuals reach age 15, their basic thinking abilities are comparable to those of adults. These improvements occur in five areas during adolescence:

6. **Attention.** Improvements are seen in selective attention, the process by which one focuses on one stimulus while tuning out another. Divided attention, the ability to pay attention to two or more stimuli at the same time, also improves.

7. **Memory.** Improvements are seen in both working memory and long-term memory.

8. **Processing speed.** Adolescents think more quickly than children. Processing speed improves sharply between age five and middle adolescence; it then begins to level off at age 15 and does not appear to change between late adolescence and adulthood.

9. **Organization.** Adolescents are more aware of their own thought processes and can use mnemonic devices and other strategies to think more efficiently.

10. **Metacognition.** A cognitive ability that involves thinking about thinking itself. It often involves monitoring one’s own cognitive activity during the thinking process.

Hypothetical and abstract thinking

Adolescents’ thinking is less bound to concrete events than that of children: they can contemplate possibilities outside the realm of what currently exists.

1. One manifestation of the adolescent’s increased facility with thinking about possibilities is the improvement of skill in deductive reasoning, which leads to the development of hypothetical thinking. This provides the ability to plan ahead, see the future consequences of an action and to provide alternative explanations of events. It also makes adolescents more skilled debaters, as they can reason against a friend’s or parent’s assumptions. Adolescents also develop a more sophisticated understanding of probability.

2. The appearance of more systematic, abstract thinking is another notable aspect of cognitive development during adolescence. This also permits the application of advanced reasoning and logical processes to social and ideological matters such as interpersonal relationships, politics, philosophy, religion, morality, friendship, faith, democracy, fairness, and honesty.

3. A third gain in cognitive ability involves thinking about thinking itself, or

---

53 Fig. 1 summarized from O’Donnell, Reeve and Smith. (2007). *Educational Psychology: reflection for action.* Hoboken. Wiley & Sons. and Wikipedia (Feb 2012). Bolding and underlining are of my own doing.
**metacognition.** Adolescents’ improvements in knowledge of their own thinking patterns lead to better self-control and more effective studying. Adolescents are much better able than children to understand that people do not have complete control over their mental activity.

Related to **metacognition** and **abstract thought**, perspective-taking involves a more sophisticated **theory of mind**. Adolescents reach a stage of social perspective-taking in which they can understand how the thoughts or actions of one person can influence those of another person, even if they personally are not involved.

### Relativistic thinking

Compared to children, adolescents are **more likely to question others’ assertions**, and less likely to accept facts as absolute truths. Through experience outside the family circle, they learn that rules they were taught as absolute are in fact relativistic. They begin to differentiate between rules instituted out of common sense—not touching a hot stove—and those that are based on culturally-relative standards (codes of etiquette, not dating until a certain age), a delineation that younger children do not make. This can lead to a period of questioning authority in all domains.

### Wisdom

Wisdom, or **the capacity for insight and judgment that is developed through experience**, increases between the ages of fourteen and twenty-five, then levels off. Thus, it is during the adolescence-adulthood transition that individuals acquire the type of wisdom that is associated with age.

### Risk-taking

Much research has been done on adolescent risk-taking, particularly on whether and why adolescents are more likely to take risks than adults. Behavioral decision-making theory says that adolescents and adults both weigh the potential rewards and consequences of an action.

During adolescence, there is an extremely high emphasis on approval of peers as a reward due to adolescents’ increased self-consciousness. There may be evolutionary benefits to an increased propensity for risk-taking in adolescence—without risk-taking, teenagers would not have the motivation or **confidence necessary to make the change** in society from childhood to adulthood.

Adolescents are the most receptive to the information given in the five stages of discrimination model as improvements in cognitive ability make the target students for
the workbook that much more receptive to the information. For example, in the area of increased attention, the grade 11 students would easily handle more than one stimulus at a time, and have more capacity to focus and therefore process more information. The speed at which they can now process information also helps with the level of comprehension needed in a very dynamic and difficult topic area, and helps them follow the argument as they pull more information from their memory. Clarity, precision, explicitness and generality are absolute necessities when dealing with the five stages of discrimination model and the schema from which students need to draw from for making higher level connections. It is not only the subject matter that is of importance, but also the framework in which it is presented. The skills asked of them in the workbook are at a level that requires the ability to gather, process, and organize a large amount of information. For example, one of the workbook assignments is to formally debate whether or not a certain occurrence in history was actually genocide. The ideas, data, and concepts are not absolutely concrete. The amount of information the students will need to accumulate and process is vast, but at this age they are ready for such a challenge.

Only an age group with some life experience would understand the complexity of the stages of discrimination and genocide. Of particular importance is the development of relativist thinking, abstract thinking, acquisition of wisdom, and risk-taking at this age (O’Donnell et al. 2007). The goal of the course and the workbook is to increase the knowledge of the students and produce young adults who are ready to act upon what they have learned.
Finally, adolescents are the group that can bring about the most immediate change to our society. When one envisions a group of people most likely to cause immediate change we envision the young, the energetic, the altruistic, and the risk-takers. In essence we look to them to carry the torch of change for our future. We should be fostering their knowledge and their enthusiasm for change. Teenagers are the group that will bring about the most immediate change and as secondary teachers especially, need to provide the path towards positive change and make it happen.

Teens possess a great deal of wisdom and the ability to reflect on what they have learned, and they have a marked increase in insight and judgment. Adolescents also possess an increase in relativistic thinking. They are more likely to question the assertions of others and the idea of absolute truth. Although educators may feel frustrated at the secondary students’ questioning of authority, this questioning is a skill we continue to teach and model in our lessons: truths are relative. Who is right or wrong in a debate is relative to the data put forth in the argument; who has committed an atrocity against human kind is relative to the perspective of the witnesses; who is in charge of making the decisions on our future is relative to the problem trying to be solved. The skill of questioning authority is one that we want adolescents to have in order for them to combat ideologies that may be detrimental to them and society in general.

Adolescents are the group most likely to embrace the knowledge and the change needed to stop the hatred. They are the group that will be entering ‘adult society’ in
the most immediate future. In their article, “Psychosocial roots of genocide: risk, prevention, and intervention” (2005), Linda Woolf and Michael Hulsizer state the importance of targeting this age group:

Children who develop prejudicial attitudes and biases are more likely to become adults with these same beliefs. Thus, schools and universities are natural environments of education about hate, tolerance, and diversity...It is important to note that teens and young adults are particularly susceptible for recruitment into organizations of hate and violence. Thus, diversity educations need to include “inoculation” against potential recruitment. (Woolf & Hulsizer. p.122)

Woolf and Hulsizer (2005) outline that as educators we are the primary mechanism of prevention when it comes to mass violence and genocide. It is our combined future that we are developing, and our adolescents are this immediate change. According to Hamburg and Hamburg (2004):

In the long run, the vitality of any society and its prospects for the future depend on the quality of its people - on their knowledge and skill, health and vigor, and the decency of their human relations. Preventing children from having damaged lives would therefore have powerfully beneficial social and economic impacts, including a more effective workforce, higher productivity, lower health costs, lower prison costs, and so much relief of human distress. Youth violence is the tip of the iceberg. Tragic as it is, it should give us a powerful stimulus to enhance the life chances of all children, including those who suffer personal misery and lost opportunities in quiet pain and sometimes violent eruptions that can do irrevocable damage (Hamburg and Hamburg. p.98)

Teenagers sit on the volatile edge. They can either be recruited for hate or as the workbook outlines they can be recruited for peace. As quoted by Braddock and McPartland, “for many youth 10-15 years old, early adolescence offers opportunities to
choose a path toward a productive and fulfilling life. For many others, it represents their last best chance to avoid a diminished future. (Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1989).)” (Braddock and McPartland, p.1). It is up to us as educators to ensure that we are the ‘last best chance’ these students have for a positive future. We must trust that we have passed on the skill sets and drive to our younger generation that will allow them to make this world a more accepting and peaceful place.

Discrimination versus genocide: What is the foundation of the Five Stages of Discrimination?

No matter the number of stages, using either the word ‘discrimination’ or ‘genocide’ brings about a very different connotative reaction from the reader. A simple change of word does make a difference. Genocide, for example, gives the reader a more graphic visual and gets attention, as the result of the stages is apparent. The idea of using the title ‘Stages of genocide’ implies the end result and that by the time the stages have run their course we are too late to stop it. The simple definition of the word itself shows the narrow view of these stages. The focus then is on what, rather than how and why genocide happens.
According to Dictionary.com (2012)\textsuperscript{54}, Genocide means \textit{the intentional murder of a people, race or kind for the purpose of total annihilation}. What the word \textbf{does not} allow is the interpretation and the practice of the different kinds of genocide and how a society arrives at this level of violence. There are many definitions for the word genocide and that is an integral part of the issue in using the term in a model or public discourse. The term was first introduced to scholars after the Second World War by Raphael Lemkin. Quoted here by Samuel Totten (2009)\textsuperscript{55} in his book Century of Genocide: critical essays and eyewitness accounts:

Raphael Lemkin combined the Greek \textit{genos} (race, tribe) and \textit{cide} (killing), and defines genocide as:

... the coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be the disintegration of the political and social institutions of culture, language, national feelings, religion, economic existence, of national groups and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group. (Lemkin, 1944, Totten, p.3-4)

Additionally, the United Nations’ Convention on Genocide resulted in a definition that is ambiguous and lacks cohesion, even for scholars and those who have ratified the document.

\textsuperscript{54}The OME model does not include a definition of genocide, even though it is part of its model. The OME has begun to add anti-discrimination sections to their course profiles.

\textsuperscript{55}Lemkin is quoted or used in almost every piece of literature in genocide studies. I use here Totten’s quote simply to outline a base definition in order to move to other definitions. It is not my intent to fully deconstruct every possible definition, only to show that the existence of one single meaning of the word genocide is not fully accepted.
In the workbook, students will be given a chance to critically compare the different definitions of genocide, their historical ‘positionality’ and those actions contrary to the UN convention.\textsuperscript{56} “To this end, various alternative terms have been proposed: atrocity crimes (Scheffer, 2007), ethnic cleansing, or simply “large-scale loss of life” (ICISS, 2001). Others have suggested “crimes against humanity” is a more relevant and helpful term than genocide (Schabas, 2006)” (Conley-Zilkic & Totten, p.610). To James Waller (2007) author of Becoming Evil: How ordinary people commit genocide and mass killing, there are two underlying ideas for scholars to use as terminology:

\begin{quote}
Scholars use two terms to classify the collective violence stemming from state-directed terrorism. \textit{Mass killing} means killing members of a group without the intention to eliminate the whole group or killing large numbers of people without a precise definition of group membership. Collective violence becomes genocide when a specific group is systematically and intentionally targeted for destruction. (Waller, p.14).
\end{quote}

Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) go further to express their ideas as to which term is the most appropriate with each action. In their research, the debate becomes ethnocide versus genocide. According to Chalk and Jonassohn, genocide is the one sided killing of one group as defined by another whereas ethnocide involves a wider use in which “a group disappears without mass killing. [Could also include] the suppression of a culture, a language, a religion…” (Chalk and Jonassohn, p.23). It is no wonder that if the scholars themselves cannot agree on a definition, it is assured that the word should not be used with students in a framework for teaching acceptance. The definition is

\textsuperscript{56} See appendix attached to Teacher’s Manual
too ambiguous and when used in the title creates a connotation and a conceptual image that is constricting in nature.

Whereas genocide exhibits finality and death, the use of the term discrimination, on the other hand, brings into the discussion for the title of the framework not only the end result or final product of discrimination (genocide), but it also enlightens the reader on the origins of these atrocities. A quick look at the definition shows a much more appropriate and complex term used for describing the path to genocide. The OME in their current 2009 equity and inclusion policy documents define discrimination as:

Unfair or prejudicial treatment of individuals or groups on the basis of race, ancestry, place of origin, colour, ethnic origin, citizenship, creed, sex, sexual orientation, age, marital status, or disability, as set out in the Ontario Human Rights Code, or on the basis of other, similar factors. Discrimination, whether intentional or not, has the effect of limiting the opportunities, benefits, or advantages of certain individuals or groups because of personal characteristics such as ethnicity or religion. Unlike prejudice or stereotypes, discrimination is an effect or result, not an attitude. Discrimination sometimes results from prejudice or stereotypes. However, it also comes from the failure, intentional or not, to avoid practices that disadvantage certain groups more than others. Discrimination may be evident in organizational and institutional structures, policies, procedures, and programs.” (OME, p. 88)

The OME policy “Equity and Inclusive Education in Ontario Schools” editions 2009, and the policy from which the framework is quoted, PPM No. 119 (subject of development and implementation of school board policies on antiracism and ethnocultural equity) 1993, do not use the word genocide in the document or glossary. Could this be due to

57 Even though genocide is included as the fifth stage in the OME framework, nowhere in the document does it include a definition of the word. The policy document will be analysed in a separate chapter.
58 All underling is the workbook author’s emphasis
the ambiguity of the term? It remains unclear. Therefore, due to research in the systemic patterning of discriminatory behaviour, and the workbook, the term discrimination can be deemed as more powerful, more useful and more accurate to outline the teaching of the path to genocide. Not only is it the lack of solidity in the definition that causes pause in the use of the word genocide, but it is also the fact that in the OME definition of discrimination, there is already a link to the first two stages: Stereotypes and Prejudice. This illustrates much better the underlying issues students should know: that it is how genocide can be possible in every society, and not only the what of a genocidal occurrence.

The five stages of discrimination model encompass the importance of individual as well as group behaviour. According to the Peace Pledge Union,

Genocide is not a wild beast or a natural disaster. It is mass murder deliberately planned and carried out by individuals, all of whom are responsible whether they made the plan, gave the order or carried out the killings. Whatever its scale, genocide is made up of individual acts, and individual choices to perform them. So human individuals need to make the commitment, as early in life as possible, that they will have no truck59 with it. To do that, the way genocide becomes possible has to be understood. (PPU, 2012)

The intent of the research is to break this systemic pattern by deconstructing each ‘stage’. In using the discrimination as its base definition, then the five stage framework also illustrates the effect or result of attitudes that turn into action. The stages of genocide however, focus primarily on the actions directly preceding and during the violence. In using the OME’s framework, discrimination is also central to two

59 British slang for what I think means: have no time for or acceptance of.
important pillars in the five stages model as there is a differentiation between discrimination and systemic discrimination as being separate entities in the genocide process. This is an important idea when trying to outline to students the importance of intervention in the early stages of discrimination. It is often the conceptual ideas that inhibit our goal. As Moshman (2001) states,

...even if we could agree on a definition of genocide and could be utterly objective in applying it, actual human rights catastrophes, as we have seen, nearly always spill across any set of conceptual categories (Jonassohn and Bjornson, 1998). Genocidal elements can be detected in many or most cases of mass killing, cultural extermination, ethnic cleansing political disappearances, religious inquisition, group enslavement, and other atrocities. Even if genocide is indeed the ultimate crime, we cannot categorically distinguish acts that meet this threshold of evil from those that do not. Rather, we might use the lens of genocide to bring into focus the most evil and horrifying aspects of a wide variety of crimes against groups. (Moshman, p. 443).

It is the conceptual idea of the atrocities of genocide that overpower the underlying ideas of the stages of discrimination that precede it that make the choice of using the word discrimination over using the word genocide as the correct one.

Current frameworks used in Genocide Education:

There are two common frameworks that can be used in the adolescent classroom to teach acceptance: Stanton’s eight stages model, and the OME five stages model. Woolf and Hulsizer (2005) outline a six-level simultaneous horizontal and seven-level vertical model (Figure 2) that is of great use for the teacher. Their model reflects the complex yet “organized and orchestrated” (Woolf and Hulsizer, p. 106) path to
genocide. The obvious and major difference between models seen in Figure 1\textsuperscript{60} is in the number of stages each incorporates. Other significant differences include the starting-point for each model (when does genocide begin), the meaning held within each stage and the ordering of these stages.

| Stage 1 | Stereotypes - false or generalized beliefs about a group of people that result in categorizing members without regard for individual difference | "The Norm" - normative for in-groups to maintain stereotypes and negative attitudes towards an out-group. "Informal" individual killings/abuse | Classification - categories of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ are identified based on ethnicity, race, religion or nationality. |
| Stage 2 | Prejudice - a set of opinions, attitudes and feelings that unfairly cast a group and its members in a negative light without legitimate reasons | Loss of privilege and opportunity - members of out-group may be denied access to certain services, excluded from organizations, or limitations in educational opportunities or jobs. Process of stigmatization occurs with an increase in stereotypes and derogatory images linked to negative attributes. May proceed to classifying and identifying. | Symbolization - names and symbols are given to classified categories. An example includes the yellow star for Jewish people during the holocaust. Symbolization does not typically result in genocide unless it is accompanied by dehumanization. |
| Stage 3 | Discrimination - inequitable treatment of people based on their race, gender, ethnicity, language, faith or sexual orientation | Loss of basic civil rights - changes in laws. Dehumanization begins and is promoted by leaders and elite. | Dehumanization - One group denies humanity of the other group by equating them with animals, insects, or diseases. This eliminates the normal human revulsion against murder and makes killing someone of the other |

\textsuperscript{60} Fig.1: Developed by Donita Duplisea

5 stages were adapted from: Ontario Ministry of Education and Training. Antiracism and Ethnocultural Equity in School Boards: Guidelines for Policy Development and Implementation. 1993

8 stages identified by Gregory Stanton and adapted from Worldwithoutgenocide.org/current-conflicts. 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Group Easy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4</td>
<td><strong>Systemic Discrimination</strong> - the policies and practices in organization that result in the inequitable treatment of members of certain groups named above. <strong>Forced Isolation</strong> - ghettoization, deportations, ethnic cleansing*. Moral disengagement. Increase in euphemistic language and 'informal' sanctioned killings. <strong>Organization</strong> - governments, armies, or other groups of power unite and train militias to carry out the genocide.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5</td>
<td><strong>Genocide</strong> - the organized, systematic destruction of an identifiable group (ex. Racial, cultural, religious) by those in power. <strong>Deprivation of basic human rights</strong> - denied education, access to adequate food and shelter, and relegated to subsistence living. Moral exclusion as victim becomes excluded entirely from the normal moral realm (easy to kill 'them' the enemy). <strong>Polarization</strong> - extremists further drive the two groups apart by spreading propaganda, limiting contact between them, or creating laws that ostracize one of the groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6</td>
<td><strong>Genocide</strong> - killing and very existence is threatened. Formal sanctioned killing begins. <strong>Preparation</strong> - victims are identified and separated. Death lists are drawn up. Weapons are distributed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 7</td>
<td><strong>Denial</strong> - deny that any killings have happened and blame the victim. Final insult and disrespect of victims. <strong>Extermination</strong> - mass killing of the identified victims begins. Killing is easy and the extermination is quick.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 8</td>
<td><strong>Denial</strong> - perpetrators of the genocide try to cover up mass killings and intimidate witnesses. They deny that they committed any crimes, and try to blame what happened on the victims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Ethnic cleansing: suggested definition of 'ethnic cleansing': (1992): expert advisory committee to security council includes: Murder, Extrajudicial executions, Sexual assault, Torture, Confinement of civilians to ghetto areas, Deliberate initiation of attacks or threats of attacks...on civilians and civilian areas, Wanton destruction of property, Forcible removal, displacement and deportations, and Indirect result of the above (Richter and Stanton, p. 210)
The issue of genocide requires complex understanding of the ‘multilayeredness’ of the event. Woolf and Hulsizer combine the seven stages of violence within a multilayered frame. In brief, the six levels include:

- **Social Psychological Factors (SPF)** – includes social cognition, social influence, and social relations. Examples of the following may be included: deindividuation, displaced aggression, obedience to authority, prejudice and propaganda.
- **Parallel psychological processes** – culture of violence and ideology of supremacy, stigmatization, dehumanization, moral disengagement, moral exclusion, impunity and perpetuation of violence.
- **Historical and situational factors** – group cultural history, destabilizing crisis, authoritarian leaders using SPF manipulation techniques, genocide.
- **Levels of violence** – hate crimes and institutional bias, loss of opportunity and privilege, loss of civil rights, isolation, loss of human rights, loss of existence, denial.
- **Role of bystanders**
- **Levels of prevention** – primary, secondary, intervention and post-genocide intervention.

Upon first glance, most of the stages described on Woolf and Hulsizer’s path to mass violence and genocide are limited to the section on levels of violence. However, when looking at the six levels together, it is more easily understood how other factors help to push individuals and groups towards genocidal acts. In essence, where Stanton focuses on actions in genocide, Woolf and Hulsizer’s seven stage model is only a portion of multiple factors leading up to and during genocide. Below is a visual of all levels of Woolf and Hulsizer’s model, including their connections.

---

Woolf and Hulsizer reinforce the OME framework. All five stages of discrimination can be seen in either the vertical and/or the horizontal levels of this seven stage model. For example, acts of discrimination can be seen in the Social Psychological Factors (SPF) section in deindividualization, displaced aggression, and propaganda; in parallel processes through dehumanization, moral disengagement, moral exclusion, impunity and perpetuation of violence; in historical and situational factors such as group cultural history and authoritarian leaders & SPF manipulation; in all levels of violence, role of bystanders and levels of prevention. Woolf and Hulsizer provide a level of connection between the CHG38 course (Genocide and Crimes against Humanity) and to HSB4M
(Challenge and Change: an introduction to anthropology, psychology and sociology) as it echoes the previous learning in the anthropological, psychological and sociological paradigms. The information given by Woolf and Hulsizer is more useful at first for the instructor, whereas the five stages model would be simpler for recall and application in a cross-curricular context for the student. The workbook is concise and facilitates itself more to the OME model. It does however also have subordinate goals of including much of the research of Woolf and Hulsizer (2005) and Coloroso (2007) by including connections to moral choices, the role of bystanders and intervention strategies.

**Complexities involved in using these materials and overall teaching strategy when using the workbook:**

When teaching a course such as this, sensitivity and awareness are paramount to its success. Students have multiple frames of reference and are molding them towards the idea of full acceptance. Sometimes, it may seem that the material is perpetuating a stereotype or prejudice, but it will in the end be dispelled through the exercises in the workbook and control over class discussions.

Discrimination and genocide do not happen without warning. Barbara Coloroso (2007) quotes author Gavin de Becker in her book *Extraordinary Evil: A Brief History of Genocide*: “Though we want to believe that violence is a matter of cause and effect, it is actually a process, a chain in which violent outcome is only one link”. (Coloroso, p. 143) Hatred has to be bred step by step until it can be used for violence. Each link in the chain carefully crafted and attached to the preceding link. As was seen with Woolf
and Hulsizer (2005), there are many influences and occurrences that happen in order to foster an attitude of hate, allowing some people to contribute in genocide. It cannot be disputed that genocide is not an event that is unplanned or not manipulated by those in charge. The idea is that hatred and genocide are indeed developed through primary and secondary institutions.

Teachers stand at the forefront as agents of acceptance. We must ensure that the derogatory thoughts (stereotyping and prejudice) do not progress from the thought stage to the action stages of discrimination, systemic discrimination and genocide. An area all too familiar in the classrooms today is the instances of bullying. There are many policies and new laws being put in place as reactionary measures as the result of malicious and heinous bullying in Canadian schools. What is hard for some to understand is that:

...genocide is in fact the most extreme form of the drama known as bullying, perpetrated by ordinary human beings who go home to dinner after deeply humiliating and then killing men, women, and children. By conceding that genocide is not outside the realm of ordinary human behavior; we can then begin to examine the roots and the climate that facilitates its pathological growth....bullying is to criminal bullying (hate crime) is to genocide. (Coloroso, 2007, p. 52)

It becomes difficult to reason that we want to use an agent of socialization (classrooms) to combat hatred when it has been used as an institution of hatred in the past. The hope is to stop the stages of discrimination in its inception so that later, the

---

62 Reference to Residential Schools in Canada, Nazi Germany, Rwanda, etc.
63 Reference to Residential Schools in Canada, Nazi Germany, Rwanda, etc.
same institution will not be used as a vehicle for systemic discrimination. The hope is to stop the progression of the development of discrimination so it may not continue.

Understanding the transfer from one stage to another:

There comes a point in the stages of discrimination model where the perpetrators move from thoughts to action (transference). In the model, the first two stages (stereotypes and prejudice) are still in the thought stages of development, whereas once a person has performed a discriminatory action, thoughts have moved into actions. These actions move from individual actions to group actions once they are sanctioned or go unpunished by society. It can easily be seen how one stage can lead to another until ‘ordinary’ people are preforming acts of genocide. For Sternberg (2003), “It is important to keep in mind that whereas hate is an emotion, genocide, like terrorism and massacres is an action”. (Sternberg, p. 299) For teachers, the idea of the OME model is to first illuminate the fact that actions have preconceived thoughts and that genocide is no different. Demonstrating the idea of the power of thoughts into actions, might stop thoughts before they become actions.

Outlining the stages of discrimination must be accomplished on a platform of equality. To continually point our fingers at the perpetrators of only the atrocities in Turkey, Germany and Rwanda, leaves room for the misinterpretation by our students that it can never happen to them and it can never happen in Canada. This is utterly untrue.
One must only remember our own history of Japanese Internment camps, and the past and current atrocities inflicted on our Aboriginal peoples to see that we are, just as every human group on the planet, capable of inflicting pain on others. In some cases the period of violence and discrimination has finished and we have learned from our mistakes, but in other cases such as for our First Nations, Metis and Inuit this period of discrimination and genocide is far from finished.\(^6^4\)

If there is no one to stop the hatred, growth happens. It has time to grow if there is no intervention for change. This workbook is an attempt to stop the growth and reverse the development of discrimination. Coloroso (2007) outlines this process:

Racist bullying doesn’t just happen. Children have to be taught to be racist before they can engage in racist bullying... (it) takes place in a climate where children are taught to discriminate against a group of people, where differences are seen as bad, and where the common bonds of humanity are not celebrated.

Children learn the language of racial slurs and the rules of bigoted behavior systematically through thought (stereotype), feeling (prejudice), and action (discrimination). First, children are taught to stereotype— that is, to generalize about an entire group of people without regard to individual differences...

Second, children are taught to prejudge a person based on the stereotype. Prejudice is a feeling...

Combine racist thought and feeling, and you get children willing to discriminate against individuals in that group. Racist discrimination morphs readily into scapegoating a particular child or group of children— selecting someone to suffer in place of others or attaching blame or wrongdoing to a specific child when it is not clear who is at fault, and someone must be at fault.

When racist attitudes collocate with the contempt inherent in bullying, they create a deadly combination that enables the genocidaires to package their

\(^6^4\) Refer to Roland Chrisjohn and his book The Circle Game for more information
genocidal ideological plans with the pseudo-science of racial hygiene and purity. (Coloroso, p.67-68)

Coloroso echoes the first three stages of discrimination: stereotype, prejudice and discrimination as entities taught and modeled one stage at a time. With each stage being allowed to grow, it has become imperative to understand the importance of stopping the growth of hatred between such developments.

Hamburg (2010) also reiterates this idea when he points out that, “I conclude, firmly supported by recent research, that there is ample warning time to act, since danger is typically clear – years in advance of the carnage,” (Hamburg, p.7). He also states that, “...the time required to build the machinery of genocide can be used for prevention. The deadly warning signs are especially manifested in the expression of virulent, persistent, and flagrant prejudice” (Hamburg, p.10). Of utmost interest is when he states one of the solutions is to “...mold a constituency for prevention through comprehensive public education on the necessity and feasibility of preventing mass violence”. (Hamburg, p.7) Prevention through education is a primary key to halting the stages of discrimination that act as a base for further violence.

The warning signs to the path of genocide are well marked. Once our students have ‘gone into the real world’ we can only hope that teachers have fostered enough pro-social behaviour and acceptance of others. This workbook cannot erase all thought of hatred and violence from the mind of every student exposed to it. But, it is the hope that it will have an effect on the students that use it, and that they take even a little of the knowledge forward into their lives and become future leaders with an agenda of
peace. Teachers, possess a certain amount of dialectic authority\textsuperscript{65} over the words used in our classrooms.

\textsuperscript{65} Dialectic authority means involving studies that account for the importance of opposites and contradictions within all forms of knowledge and the relationship between these opposites. Knowledge is not complete in and of itself. It is produced in a larger process and can never be understood outside of its historical development and its relationship to other information. (Kincheloe, p. 42)
Student Forward

What is the workbook about?

This workbook was constructed to reflect and teach the five stages of discrimination. It is only one way of looking at the problem, but one which will deconstruct the issue and reconstruct your thoughts on the process and progression of discriminatory thoughts to large scale human atrocities.

You are taking this history course because you have a desire to learn and stop genocide and crimes against humanity. This workbook will help you to understand the complex issue while at the same time getting you to realize your own bias and experiences.

Why is it important to examine discrimination?

While the study of genocides from a historical viewpoint has its own importance, we must know the basis for which all the atrocities and crimes against humanity are forged. It is only by examining the stages of discrimination that we can truly understand and reverse this process. You will be asked to examine and deconstruct the stages in order to construct your own meaning around the idea of acceptance and peace.

What is ‘Peace education’? How does it connect to discrimination?

Your teachers are here to guide you through not only the material, but your own reflections and experiences. Teachers, who believe in the idea of acceptance, strive for peace in order to combat the result of discrimination: genocide. For without acceptance and understanding, there can never be peace. They are the only solutions and education is our medium.

What are the intended objectives in completing this Workbook?

The objectives are simple on the surface: learn the 5 stages of discrimination and their effects on you and the world; and unlearn your own prejudices and discriminatory thoughts/bias. The material you will learn in this course will be difficult at times, but we are all confident that you will take the information forward and be the change you desire in the world.
Stages of Discrimination- Introduction

Sometimes, to understand a problem we need to start with the result and then go back to the beginning. We will start with a definition and then trace how the phenomenon happened. This is sometimes called the ‘archeology of knowledge’.\(^{66}\)

Let’s start with the final stage of discrimination and then work through the different stages to see how we all could get to the point of genocide.

Definition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genos</th>
<th>Cide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People, race, kind</td>
<td>Act of killing, murder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, genos + cide = genocide: The intentional murder of a people, race or kind for the purpose of total annihilation.\(^{67}\)

Can you define or guess the meaning of the following words:

- Linguicide: __________________ ________
- Gendercide: _________________________
- Senicide: ___________________________
- Ecocide: ___________________________
- Suicide: ___________________________  
- Eliticide: __________________________
- Memoricide: _________________________

Can you think of different ways genocide happens?

----------

\(^{66}\) A term used by Michel Foucault that means the analysis of systematic body of knowledge and power. Jardine, Gail McNicol. (2005). *Foucault and Education*. NY. Peter Lang. p. 15

How do you think a country gets involved in genocide?

________________________________________

________________________________________

Can you think of any countries that have had genocide?

________________________________________

________________________________________

Can you think of any countries that have NOT had genocide?

________________________________________

Genocide is the last stage of discrimination. Brainstorm with a partner ‘clues’ or indicators that a genocide could happen.

A long list can be found in the section on genocide or on www.worldwithoutgenocide.org

None depending on the definition

Can you pick your top three indicators from the brainstorming activity above?
There is a model scholars have created that reflects how societies may transition to genocide. It is called the Stages of Discrimination:

- Stereotype → Prejudice → Discrimination → Systemic Discrimination → Genocide

Look at the following excerpt and question from Adam Jones’ book entitled: Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction.

On a sheet of paper, answer the following questions. Be ready to share your point of view!!

Which ‘cides’ do you think deserve to be considered genocidal, and which do not? Explain your reasoning in each case.
BOX 1.3 THE OTHER "-CIDES" OF GENOCIDE

The literature on genocide and mass violence has given rise to a host of terms derived from Raphael Lemkin’s original “genocide.” A sampling follows.

**Classicide.** Term coined by Michael Mann to refer to “the intended mass killing of entire social classes.” *Examples:* The destruction of the “kulaks” in Stalin’s USSR (Chapter 5); Cambodia under the Khmer Rouge (Chapter 7). *Source:* Michael Mann, *The Dark Side of Democracy* (Cambridge University Press, 2004).


**Ecocide.** The wilful destruction of the natural environment and ecosystems, through (a) pollution and other forms of environmental degradation and (b) military efforts to undermine a population’s sustainability and means of subsistence. *Examples:* Deforestation in the Amazon and elsewhere; US use of Agent Orange and other defoliants in the Vietnam War (see p. 76); Saddam Hussein’s campaign against the Marsh Arabs in Iraq (see Figure 1.3). *Source:* Jared Diamond, *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed* (Viking, 2004).


**Ethnocide.** Term originally coined by Raphael Lemkin as a synonym for genocide; subsequently employed (notably by the French ethnologist Robert Jaulin) to describe patterns of cultural genocide, i.e., the destruction of a group’s cultural, linguistic, and existential underpinnings, without necessarily killing members of the group. *Examples:* The term has been used mostly with reference to indigenous peoples (Chapter 3, Box 5a.1), to emphasize that their “destruction” as a group involves more than simply the murder of group members. *Source:* Robert Jaulin, *La paix blanche: Introduction à l’ethnocide* ("White Peace: Introduction to Ethnocide") (Seuil, 1970).

The UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (2007) declares (Article 8): “Indigenous peoples and individuals have the right not to be subjected to forced
assimilation or destruction of their culture," and instructs states to “provide effective mechanisms for prevention of, and redress for . . . any action which has the aim or effect of depriving them of their integrity as distinct peoples, or of their cultural values or ethnic identities . . . "


Fratricide. Term coined by Michael Mann to describe the killing of factional enemies within political (notably communist) movements. Examples: Stalin's USSR (Chapter 5); Mao's China (Chapter 5); the Khmer Rouge (Chapter 7). Source: Michael Mann, The Dark Side of Democracy (Cambridge University Press, 2004).
**Gendercide.** The selective destruction of the male or female component of a group, or of dissident sexual minorities (e.g., homosexuals, transvestites). Term originally coined by Mary Anne Warren in 1985. *Examples:* Female infanticide; gender-selective massacres of males (e.g., Srebrenica, Bosnia in 1995) (see Chapter 13). *Source:* Adam Jones, ed., Gendercide and Genocide (Vanderbilt University Press, 2004).


**Memoricide.** The destruction “not only... of those deemed undesirable on the territory to be ‘purified,’ but... [of] any trace that might recall their erstwhile presence (schools, religious buildings and so on)” (Jacques Sémelin). Term coined by Croatian doctor and scholar Mirko D. Grmek during the siege of Sarajevo. *Examples:* Israel in Palestine; Bosnia-Herzegovina in the 1990s. *Source:* Edgardo Civalleri, “‘When Memory Turns into Ashes’... Memoricide During the XX Century,” *Information for Social Change,* 25 (Summer 2007).


**Policide.** Barbara Harff and Ted Gurr’s term for mass killing according to political affiliation, whether actual or imputed. *Examples:* Harff and Gurr consider “revolutionary one-party states” to be the most common perpetrators of genocide. The term may also be applied to the mass killings of alleged “communists” and “subversives” in, e.g., Latin America during the 1970s and 1980s. *Source:* Barbara Harff, “No Lessons Learned from the Holocaust? Assessing Risks of Genocide and Political Mass Murder since 1955,” *American Political Science Review,* 97: 1 (2003).

**Urbicide.** The obliteration of urban living-space as a means of destroying the viability of an urban environment, undermining the sustainability of its population and eroding the cosmopolitan values they espouse. The term was apparently coined by Marshall Berman in 1987 in reference to the blighted Bronx borough in New York; it was popularized by former Belgrade mayor Bogdan Bogdanovic and a circle of Bosnian architects to describe the Serb siege of Sarajevo (1992–95). *Examples:* Carthage (146 BCE); Stalingrad (1942); Sarajevo (1992–95); Gaza (2008–09). *Source:* Martin Coward, *Urbicide: The Politics of Urban Destruction* (Routledge, 2008).

1st Stage of Discrimination – Stereotypes

Last class we discovered that there are five (5) stages of discrimination. Here they are again:

Stereotype ➔ Prejudice ➔ Discrimination ➔ Systemic Discrimination ➔ Genocide

In your group, can you come up with a mnemonic for the 5 stages so that you will be able to remember them more easily?

As you can see there are five easy steps to remember. During the course of working on these worksheets, you will be introduced to each one individually so that you have a full understanding of each. Let us begin with the first stage of discrimination: stereotypes

What is your definition of a stereotype?

Now look up the definition of stereotype in the dictionary and write it below:

Is your definition different from that of the dictionary? How? Why do you think they are different?

Do you feel your definition to be more accurate? Why?

---

Stereotypes - false or generalized beliefs about a group of people that result in categorizing members without regard for individual difference

---

68 Mnemonic means that you make up a sentence using the first letter of each word as the first letter of your ‘catch phrase’ so that you can easily remember everything.
Provide four (4) examples of stereotypes that you know. (For example: “All Asians are good at Math”)

1. __________________________  2. __________________________

3. __________________________  4. __________________________

In the chart below, ‘deconstruct’ one of the stereotypes above. Why is it considered a well-known stereotype and what is the truth of this stereotype? For example, in taking the stereotype “All Asians are good at Math”, we can say this is a stereotype well-known to us based on the high Math test scores coming out of some Asian countries. The reality is that not ALL people of Asian decent are good at Math. Like all other people there is a balance of different strengths whether it is language, sports or History.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Proof</th>
<th>What is the truth?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to the five stages of discrimination at the beginning of the worksheet. Why do think stereotypes come before prejudice?

__________________________________________________________________________

In your group, come up with four “solutions” from the perspective of your age group to dispel the myth of a stereotype:

5.  ________________________________________________

6.  ________________________________________________

7.  ________________________________________________

8.  ________________________________________________
Choose one of the solutions you came up with and sketch a poster that you could use in your school to show other classmates the dangers of stereotypes and your solution for it. You will be presenting this to the class.
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quote.

A German Jewish emigrant:
'It dawned on me that if I looked into my own heart I could find seeds of hatred there, too. I realised that they are there in every human being. Arrogant thoughts, feelings of irritation, coldness, anger, envy, even indifference - these are the roots of what happened in Nazi Germany.'

Are there any other emotions that can lead to hatred? What are they? What does 'hatred' mean? What is it like to feel it? What is it like to be on the receiving end? Does hatred ever feel right and good? If so, when? Does that mean it is right and good? 

69 www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html
2\textsuperscript{nd} Stage of Discrimination – Prejudice

We previously learned that the first stage of discrimination is Stereotypes. If stereotypes people hold in their thoughts are not 'corrected', they lead to the second stage which is prejudice.

\textbf{Stereotype} \rightarrow \textbf{Prejudice}

Can you define prejudice?

Can you think of some examples from your own life?

Now look in the dictionary and see if your definition is correct. Write the definition below:

Prejudice: a set of opinions, attitudes and feelings that unfairly cast a group and its members in a negative light without legitimate reasons

What do you think the difference is between a stereotype and a prejudice?

Complete the following quiz:

Use this quiz to test your knowledge concerning the origins and prevalence of prejudice in our society, as well as the viability of various antidotes and solutions. Some of the answers may surprise you.

1. Punishing those who behave in prejudicial ways is:

A- the quickest solution to ending the problems of prejudicial behaviour.
B - a response that is impossible since most prejudiced behavior is difficult to observe or prove.
C - unlikely to make a major difference since those who are the most prejudiced tend to have already received more punishment than most of us have received.
D - Both B and C.

2. If one thinks prejudicial thoughts, one should suppress them or avoid thinking them.

A - Yes, Thoughts are very close to actions and one should avoid thinking negative thought about other groups of people.
B - No. One should not suppress the thoughts, but should actively replace them with more positive images of the group members.
C - No. Prejudicial thoughts are normal and harmless; they are part of being in a group.
D - Yes. If we don't start on a personal level to reduce prejudiced thinking, then the problems simply grow.

3. Prejudices don’t cost our society and therefore are really only a problem to those who are the victims of prejudicial behaviour.

A - To discuss the monetary cost of prejudiced behavior is impossible.
B - The cost of prejudiced behavior is a human cost and is not a national economic issue.
C - The cost of sexism and racism alone have been estimated at over one-half trillion dollars per year.
D - Both A and B are true.

4. Most people are not prejudiced.

A - Surveys show that well over 75 percent of people in the U.S. do not consider themselves to be racist.
B - Those who discriminate represent a very small proportion of the U.S. population.
C - Research has shown that those who identify themselves as low in prejudiced beliefs still discriminate.
D - Both A and C are true.

5. There are no inexpensive methods of managing prejudicial behaviour.

A - This is true because prejudiced behavior is so widespread, but we still need to try.
B - There are ways of managing prejudiced behavior that cost next to nothing.
C - While the training might be expensive the long term savings are worth the investment.
6. Those who risked their own lives to save Jewish people in Western Europe during the period that the Nazis were practicing genocide were more religious than those who did not try to save Jewish people.

A - True
B - False

7. Those who saved Jewish people from Hitler's genocide had more resources than those who did not.

A – True, they had larger attics or larger basements.
B - False, they had no more resources.

8. Those who are in positions of authority can do a great deal to manage prejudice within the ranks of an organization.

A - True
B - False

9. Being strongly prejudicial has little to do with a person's intellectual functioning or ability to make other types of judgments.

A - True
B - False

10. The motivation of a strongly prejudicial person who is committing an overtly prejudicial act is basically the same as that of a person with lower levels of prejudicial behaviour who is functioning out of a stereotyped perception.

A - True
B - False

11. When a person who does not hold prejudicial beliefs behaves in a prejudiced way he or she often feels a personal sense of discomfort.

A - True
B - False

12. Those who are most strongly prejudicial toward a target group generally know no more negative stereotypes about those they are prejudicial toward than those who are low in prejudicial behaviour toward the same group.
13. When the leading scientists of the world look at the issues that threaten our future they look at environmental concerns not prejudicial behaviour.

A - Scientists have little agreement about the things that threaten our future and there is nothing that even looks like a consensus.
B - There is clear consensus among the majority of leading scientists in the world about what threatens our future and it includes concerns about prejudiced behavior.
C - There is clear consensus among the majority of the leading scientists in the world about what threatens our future and it includes concerns about prejudiced behavior, specifically sexism.

14. Sexism, racism, ageism, xenophobia, homophobia and prejudices toward those with ‘disabilities’ all have basically the same dynamics.

A - They are all basically the same except for homophobia which functions very differently from the others.
B - Each is different and has its own set of dynamics.
C - They are all basically the same except for prejudices toward those with disabilities, which function very differently from the others.
D - They are all basically the same.

*answers can be found in the Appendix

* Adapted “Prejudices Quiz” by psychologist and human relations consultant Dr. Jim Cole. To learn more about Dr. Cole’s training programs and materials, visit his web-site at www.beyondprejudice.com or telephone (509) 925-5226. http://remember.org/guide/History.root_stereotypes.html
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quotes.

A Russian writer:

'What mattered about Vitya was that he was my trusted friend, not that he was Jewish. My friend Khristik was Armenian, and Balbek was a Nagay, and Lida was Ukrainian, and Magda was German.

'From what age do we develop this neanderthal dislike, irritation and hostility towards people of a different tribe or faith or origin? From childhood? From birth? I really want to know how it comes to be there in a person at all.

I can say that for us in the children’s home someone’s nationality was of no importance whatever. I can’t remember a single instance of anti-Semitism or racism among the children, unless it came down from the young thugs, older than us, who wintered in the orphanages and taught us the criminal’s ideology - which isn’t human nature but comes from a different hideous world of brutal oppression that was to swallow many of us.

Neither Nazism nor racism are present as original sin in children who are just beginning life; they are born internationalists. It’s only later, within the family, at school, in the street, from peer groups, that prejudice begins to break through, with its ability to subvert any primal truth. And here nothing helps, neither education, nor a profession, nor even belonging to an intellectual élite.'

How do we become prejudiced against people? Is the writer correct in saying it can’t be overcome once it’s taken hold? Can it be held in check by choosing not to let it dictate how one behaves?

A Croatian writer:

'I met a Turk who was working in Germany. He complained, "When I’m in Germany, they see me as a Turk, but when I visit Turkey, they don’t think of me as one of them, they think of me as a foreigner, a German. I always feel I have to choose between the two, and I don’t like it." "Well, how do you feel/ Who do you think you are?" I asked. "I am both," he replied. It was only others who had a problem with his identity. But in a culture of nationalism, identity is made up of borders, territory and blood, and one is forced to choose.'

What do you think of as your nationality? Does it matter to you? Does other people’s nationality matter to you? Do you think someone can have ‘identity’ without bringing nationality into it?70

70 www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html
Transference

So far we have learned the first two stages of the discrimination model.

**Stereotype → Prejudice →**

For a person to go from one stage to another there must be transference. To go from stage two to stage three, an individual must move information from their thoughts/mind to actions.

Therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thought</th>
<th>Transference</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Can you define transference?

Do you think the arrow is a good symbol to represent the concept of transference? Why? Why not?

Can you think of times when you have committed an act of discrimination (advertently or inadvertently)? Describe

Where do you think the discrimination you possessed at the time came from?

What can you do to stop a thought from changing into an action?
The action to stop transference is often called an “intervention”; something that stops a continued action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thought</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Can you think of any “interventions” that could have stopped you from committing an act of discrimination that you described above?
3rd Stage of Discrimination- Discrimination

In the last worksheet, we discussed the idea of transference. Moving from one stage to the next involves transference. With this next stage, Discrimination, a person moves from thoughts (that do not necessarily hurt people), to an action, where people may be hurt, mentally or physically.

**Stereotype** ➔ **Prejudice** ➔ **Discrimination**

Define Discrimination in your own words:

Discrimination- inequitable treatment of people based on their race, gender, ethnicity, language, faith or sexual orientation

Underline words in your definition that highlight the primary meaning of discrimination to you. Compare with a partner. Discuss words that are similar, and what words you may have chosen that were different.

What do these words say about our society and the difficulty one might have in an intervention?

Now that you understand well the differences between, Stereotype, Prejudice and Discrimination, prepare with your partner a short 5 minute skit to present to the class just one of these. The idea is to illustrate the problem, and come up with an intervention that could resolve the problem. The other students in your class will need to tell you whether this is an example of a Stereotype, Prejudice or Discrimination and explain it to you. You can then lead a discussion on your choice of intervention. Be as creative and as ‘real’ as you can. A template for the discussion is provided for you. Fill it out while you are creating your skit so that you are prepared to lead the discussion around your presentation.

Example of: ____________________________
Why?

Act of intervention that may be possible?
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quotes.

A Roma journalist:
‘After the Second World War, the Roma in Kosovo were given surnames of Turkish, Serbian and Albanian origin, many of them derogatory: Delibalta (‘Crazy Axe’ in Turkish), Vragovic (‘Devil’s Children’ in Serbian), Choulanjee (a rude word for peasant Roma) or Karach (the Turkish equivalent of ‘nigger’).’

A Roma from the Czech Republic:
‘Four of us went to a park to get some exercise. About twenty skinheads started shouting, “Black pigs! We’ll kill you!”’

A newspaper in 1998, on asylum seekers from Kosovo: ‘Human sewage’.

Is it easy to call people names? How powerful is it? What’s it like on the receiving end?

VIOLENCE
Two sides of a story:
‘The villagers came in the middle of the night. While we were still in the house, the thugs threw rags soaked in petrol through the windows. They were shouting that they didn’t want any Romany here, and that they were Hitler’s followers, and that Hitler killed Romany and that they were going to do the same.’

‘We went to have a bit of excitement. To shout a bit at those gypsies. It was quite exciting. We threw stones at them, and they threw stones at us. I wanted to get into the house they were in. My friend and I kicked the door in, and they smashed my head. We went home - well, we went to the local. The next day the police came after me. The house had burned down. At first I laughed. I didn’t care at all. But I stopped laughing when the police came for me, but you know how it goes, I didn’t feel sorry.’

‘A bit of excitement.’ What is the real nature of this excitement? What is the pleasure gained from shouting abuse? How close can this kind of violence come to something much worse? How close can threats come to being carried out? What sort of attitude makes it possible to abuse people without remorse?71

71 www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html
Three Characters and a Tragedy

Read the following excerpt from Barbara Coloroso and answer the following questions.

17. Who are the three ‘characters’?
18. What is the tragedy?
19. Why is Coloroso alluding to an analogy of a play when she uses the title “Three characters and a tragedy?”
20. What is a bystander?
21. According to the title, there are only three characters, but actually there are more. How does Coloroso separate the three groups so that they have more specific ‘parts’ in the tragedy? What are they?
22. What happens when the characters perform more cruel acts?
23. What is a culture of cruelty and how is it important to the tragedy?
24. Why are nationalist indoctrination and paramilitary training important to genocidal regimes?
25. What does Sebastian Haffner say about the ‘trap of comradeship’ and its effects?
26. What are some examples of psychological stimulations and manipulations used by the Nazis in World War II?
27. What is Arthur Eddington referring to when he uses “and”?
28. How can “or” change the formula?
29. Who is the character that is the resister, the defender and the witness? Why is s/he important to the tragedy?
30. What do you think Robert J. Lifton means when he stated: “There’s no inherent human nature that requires is
to kill or maim....We have the potential for precisely that behavior of the Nazis... or of some kind of altruistic or cooperative behavior. We can go either way. And I think that confronting these extreme situations is itself an act of hope because in doing that, we are implying and saying that there is an alternative. We can do better."

31. What are the three conditions that Herbert Kellman says help to set the stage for genocide?

32. Who is seen as a ‘grave threat’ to the genocidal regime and why?
Three Characters and a Tragedy

We used to think that if we knew one, we knew two, because one and one are two. We are learning that we must learn a great deal about “and.”

—Arthur Eddington, Mathematician

The three characters in the tragedy of genocide are the bully, the bullied, and the bystander. There could be no genocide without a Talatat, a Hitler, a Hutu Power—the bullies, the genocidaires. But equally they could not have pulled off what they did without the complicity of bystanders. Author William Burroughs makes the provocative statement “There are no innocent bystanders,” and then asks the equally provocative question, “What were they doing there in the first place?” These not-so-innocent bystanders circle around the bullied—the one who is targeted. Starting with the bully/bullies on the left side of the circle, counterclockwise in order of complicity, the various characters surrounding the target are:

A. Bully/Bullies—planners, instigators, and perpetrators, i.e., genocidaires who plan, instigate, and/or take an active part in the genocide.

B. Henchmen—who do the Bully’s bidding by taking an active part, but do not actually plan or instigate the genocide.

C. Active Supporters—who cheer the Bully on and seek to reap the social, economic, political, and material gain resulting from the policy and procedures of the Bullies.

D. Passive Supporters—who get pleasure from the pain inflicted on the Target by others.

E. Disengaged Onlookers—who watch what happens and say, “It is not any of my business” or “It is a civil war,” or cite “ancient animosities”; or turn a blind eye and pretend they don’t see; or simply don’t take a stand.

F. Potential Witnesses—who oppose the actions of the bullies and know they ought to help those targeted but, for a variety of reasons and excuses, do not act.

This vicious social arrangement makes the killings possible by inviting the merger of role and person that, in turn, creates the capacity for internalizing the evil and shaping later evil behaviors. In other words, each person in the scenario becomes a character actor—someone who specializes in playing the role of an unusual or distinctive character. Slipping into a role offered in the genocide circle, it is easy for the bystanders to become invested in the logic and evil-doing practices of the instigating organization and become not just complicit but “owned by it.” In this tight-knit circle, characters find that the more cruel acts they perform, the more it enhances their reputation with the bullies (planners, instigators, and perpetrators) and among their peers. As this culture of cruelty flourishes, the characters are acting less and less out of obedience and compliance; in fact, they are often initiating and flaunting their own gratuitous and creative cruelties.

It is not a fluke that all three genocidal regimes—Young Turks, Nazis, and Hutu Power—introduced programs of nationalist indoctrination and paramilitary training for youth: Türk Güçü Cemiyeti, Hitlerjugend, and Impuzamugambi.

In Defying Hitler, Sebastian Haffner’s disturbing 1939 memoir chronicling the rise of Nazism, the author, a law candidate, describes the insidious day-to-day changes in attitudes, beliefs, politics, and prejudices that began, for Germans, the slow descent into a “trap of comradeship” in which this culture of cruelty flourished as many of them became “owned by it.” “Comradeship,” as the Nazis meant it, became a “narcotic” that the people were introduced to from the earliest age, through the Hitler Youth movement (Hitlerjugend), the SA, military service, and involvement with thousands of camps and clubs. In this way, it destroyed their sense of personal responsibility and became a means for the process of dehumanization.

Haffner describes how this comradeship, in just a few weeks at a camp, molded a group of intellectual, educated men into an “unthinking, indifferent, irresponsible mass” in which bigoted, derogatory, and hateful comments “were commonplace, went unanswered and set the intellectual tone.”
The Nazis used a variety of psychological stimulations and manipulations to this end, such as slogans, flags, uniforms, Sieg Heils, marching columns, banners, and songs, to help create a dangerous, mindless "group think." One of the most disturbing aspects of this comradeship was how the men in the camp began to behave as a collective entity, who "instinctively ignored or belittled anything that could disturb our collective self-satisfaction. A German Reich in microcosm." This collectivity is the "and" in Arthur Eddington’s mathematical formula. The bullies and the bystanders become a deadly combination that is more than the sum of its parts.

*Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities.*

—Voltaire

G. Resister, defender, witness: There is an "or" that has the potential to radically change this formula. The fourth character, directly across from the bully, the antithesis of the bully, gives us hope that we can break out of this *trap of comradeship.* This character wears three different and vital garbs—those of the resister, the defender, and the witness. This character is one who will actively resist the tactics of the bully, stand up to the bully, speak out against the genocidal regime, and/or protect, defend, and speak up for those who are targeted. The cycle of violence can be interrupted when even one person has the moral strength and courage to resist the *genocidaire,* defend those who have been targeted, or give witness to the cruelty in order to get it stopped. This character is an awkward and embarrassing reminder that choices are possible, even in the midst of genocide.

In all three genocides, it was found that if one person (or a small group of dedicated people) refused to go along with the *genocidaire,* some others who were potential witnesses actually became witnesses, defenders, and/or resisters themselves. This group readily admitted that if it were not for those who took the lead in deserting, they probably would not have had the courage to do so themselves. In his research on "atrocities producing situations," Robert J. Lifton came to the conclusion, "There’s no inherent human nature that requires us to kill or maim... We have the potential for precisely that behavior of the Nazis... or of some kind of more altruistic or cooperative behavior. We can go either way. And I think that confronting these extreme situations is itself an act of hope because in doing that, we are implying and saying that there is an alternative. We can do better."

Herbert Kellman’s three conditions—unquestioning obedience to authority, routinization of cruelty, and dehumanization of a targeted group—help to set the stage for genocide and provide a necessary backdrop. Any time these three conditions exist in a society, a gang of bullies in positions of power can walk on with their genocidal script, get all the characters to rehearse, and raise the curtain on the first act.

People whose obedience is based on value orientation don’t merely obey; they take an active role in formulating, evaluating, and questioning the politics of the state. It is those who question and challenge who were seen as a grave threat to the genocidal regime because, even in the face of routinization of cruelty and the dehumanization policies and procedures, their moral inhibitions against violence remain strong. Railing against such cruelty and inhumanity often energizes resisters, defenders, and witnesses, growing even more daring, more convicted, more resourceful, and more committed to rescuing those who the regime has targeted for extermination.

Excerpts from *Extraordinary Evil: A Brief History of Genocide...and Why It Matters*  
Barbara Coloroso, 2007

Reproduced with author permission.
### Types of Discrimination

Fill in the following chart to the best of your abilities; provide an example of each type of discrimination and then describe why each is discrimination and not prejudice. Refer to the definition if you need to. One has been completed for you as an example.

**Discrimination**

- is anything that has the effect, intentional or not, of limiting the opportunities of certain individuals or groups because of personal characteristics such as ethnicity or religion. Unlike prejudice or stereotypes, discrimination is an effect or result, not an attitude. Discrimination sometimes results from prejudice or stereotypes. However, it also comes from the failure, intentional or not, to avoid practices that disadvantage certain groups more than others.\(^{72}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Religion</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Skin colour</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Intelligence (IQ)</th>
<th>Class (socio-economics)</th>
<th>Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: A swastika is spray-painted on the door of a synagogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is this discrimination and not prejudice? This is an action. The person spray-painted a symbol of Nazi hatred on a Jewish church.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4th Stage of Discrimination - Systemic Discrimination I

As you saw in the last lesson, there are many examples of discrimination. The fourth stage is systemic discrimination.

Stereotype → Prejudice → Discrimination → Systemic Discrimination

What do you think System means?

Therefore:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Systemic Discrimination Definition:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In this context, the transference from one stage to the next is one from the personal to the collective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thought</th>
<th>Transference</th>
<th>action</th>
<th>transference</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal: Stereotypes Prejudice</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Personal: Discrimination</td>
<td>→</td>
<td>Collective: Systemic Discrimination Genocide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systemic Discrimination cannot be implemented by one person, or one person in the government. There needs to be many people who have the same prejudice, for a country to enforce acts of discrimination through the governmental laws. Some prejudice has been passed down from generation to generation. Prejudice against Jews, called anti-Semitism, has been known for more than two thousand years. It is usually the case, however, that the passions of hatred against minorities by members of the majority are stirred up by charismatic leaders who exploit latent hatreds for their own political ends. These leaders are called "demagogues," and they depend upon propaganda and disinformation to achieve their ends. Many demagogues have been successful because people want to believe that there is a simple cause of their problems. Through the use of propaganda techniques, persuasive arguments are
made that one group or another is to blame for all of our problems, and these problems would go away "were it not for those (fill in the target minority)."

Here is an example:

Hitler’s “Final Solution” of the Jewish Problem:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Prejudice</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Systemic Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Jews are controlling all of the money because they are money-mongers”</td>
<td>A German sees a Jew on the street and thinks: “They are stealing our money. That is why the country is in an economic depression.” (called using a scapegoat: A person or group who is given the blame for the mistakes or failures of others, promoted through the use of propaganda.(^\text{73}))</td>
<td>Media increases ‘hate’ through propaganda and biased news. “Krystallnacht”- Jewish stores are boycotted, attacked and destroyed in a mob/riot type rampage. Reason: “They are stealing our business and hoarding money”</td>
<td>Nuremburg laws: citizenship changes based on perceived ‘cleanliness’ of genetics. Restricted marriages Restricted movements and passport restrictions. Seizure of property by the government. Denial of education in public schools. Transfer of Jewish people to confined living arrangements called ‘Ghettos’. Public identification method through arm bands and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many people think that Adolf Hitler committed these discriminatory acts due to his own hateful ideas. To be able to implement his discriminatory ideas he needed the help of the public. He received it. Burdened by WWI reparation payments, shame of losing the war, and looking for someone to ‘blame’; people more readily believed and acted upon what was being told to them by the media. Hitler was a very charismatic leader who was able to enflame his citizens into a fever of hatred. He also had two other things in his favour: a disgruntled public ready for change and action; and the monetary backing of the elite in society. Therefore it was a combination of factors that gave Adolf Hitler a chance to implement his ideas. He had charisma, backing of the elite in power, and he had a public ready for a change after years of economic troubles and shame after the First World War.

Do you think Hitler is the only leader, past or present, that had the power to ‘move’ his/her people to a collective movement? If yes, who are they? What have they done? If no, explain why not.
4\textsuperscript{th} Stage of Discrimination: 
Systemic Discrimination II

From the last class we defined the term systemic discrimination and looked at Hitler's stages of discrimination towards the Jewish people.

For the following stereotypes, provide examples of the next three stages. The first one has been completed for you as an example.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stereotype</th>
<th>Prejudice</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Systemic Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;All homosexuals are pedophiles&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;That gay couple must be looking at the kids in the park as their next prey.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I'm leaving the park with my son, RIGHT NOW before they touch him! I'm going to warn the other parents in the park too so they can keep their kids safe!&quot;</td>
<td>The government makes a law that homosexuals are not allowed to marry or adopt children as they are &quot;bad&quot; role-models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;All teen moms are promiscuous&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;All 'blacks' are gang members&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Answers will vary. Be aware that this exercise can elicit much discussion and must be dealt with sensitivity towards each group.
Stereotype | Prejudice | Discrimination | Systemic Discrimination
---|---|---|---
"All Muslims are terrorists"
"All mentally or physically challenged people can’t take care of themselves or anyone else"
"Women are not as smart as men"

Of the seven examples, including the example of Hitler, which stereotypes moved on to the fifth stage of discrimination - genocide?

All of the stereotypes have moved through the stages to genocide depending on one’s definition. Refer to UN definition.
Which ones did not? Why?

All of the examples listed have gone to the last stage.
As we saw in a previous lesson, there are different kinds of systemic discrimination.

Can you remember any of them? Name five:

Why are they considered 'systemic'?

Try to fill in the following information. Draw from skills you have learned in other classes about the media and advertising. Try to get the information you need from the clues in the picture.

Where: Canada
When: WWII
How: Clothing, photo type, people in the photos being put on trains while guarded
What: All civil rights and liberty of movement
Whom: Japanese Canadians
Why: This is a breach of human rights of Canadian citizens based on stereotypes, prejudice and discrimination towards the Japanese Canadian people due to Japan's involvement in the war.
Systemic: It was the government of Canada that sanctioned these changes to the law.
Where is this happening?

When is this happening?

How do you know?

What right is lost?

By whom?

Why is it wrong?

How is it systemic?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Image of a protest sign with the text: "GOD did not say I can't Drive."]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Image of Pretoria station with the text: "PRETORIA, SUBURBAN STATION FOR NON-WHITES."]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cultural Genocide**

*Before & After Photo of a Young Cree Boy Forced to Attend A Canadian "Indian School" (1910)*

> "A great general has said that the only good Indian is a dead one...
>
> In a sense, I agree with the sentiment... all the Indian there is in the race should be dead. Kill the Indian in him, and save the man."

Richard Pratt
Founder of Canadian Indian Residential Schools

---

**AVIS**

*Les Juifs ne sont pas désirés ici, Ste-Agathe est un village canadien français et nous le gardons ainsi.*

**NOTICE**

*Jews are not wanted here in Ste. Agathe, so scam while the going is good.*
Where is this happening?

When is this happening?

How do you know?

What right is lost?

By whom?

Why is it wrong?

How is it systemic?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do all of these examples have in common?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How are all of these examples of 'systemic'?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you think that any of these 'laws' are/were justified? Why?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where is this happening?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When is this happening?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do you know?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What right is lost?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By whom?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why is it wrong?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is it systemic?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quotes.

COLLATERAL DAMAGE

War reporter:

‘In the 20th century, civilians have been the major victims of war. Nameless millions, but they had their own names, their own place on earth, until war swept over them, killing them, uprooting them - real people with feelings common to everyone. Grief and pain and fear and the loss of home are emotions that have no nationality. Maybe hate has no nationality either; but I believe hate comes from killing. The first deaths strengthen and feed it. Until the killing starts, hate is an ugly idea, ugly words. War gives hate power and deforms the killers: kill or be killed, kill your own people, kill strangers - hate and killing become a habit.

Leaders make wars. People must first be inflamed with fear and hate, then organised and directed. There are always aggressor leaders, and they are recognisable - but their followers are an enigma. Why is it always so easy to rouse men to kill each other?’

Is it easy? If so, why?

'Collateral damage' (the title of this module) is the term used by the world's military to refer to civilian deaths. What is the effect of using words like this to refer to events like that?

LAW AND ORDER

A Muslim political leader:

'Sharia laws can only be applied in a settled, well-fed, successful country. When many people have nothing, you can't cut off the hand of a hungry little thief. When war mutilates souls, sweep aside moral norms, and devalues life, you can't punish with execution.'

This man is speaking with approval of law and order, and disapproval of war. It's true that Sharia law traditionally includes punishments such as execution and cutting off a hand. How 'settled' can a country be in which these are the punishments? Is there a risk that violent punishment shows the seeds of violent action? Is this the right way to keep people from committing crimes?\(^74\)

\(^74\) www.ppu.org.uk/genocide/talk1.html
5th Stage of Discrimination- Genocide

Last class we discovered that there are five (5) stages of discrimination. Here they are again:

Stereotype ➞ Prejudice ➞ Discrimination ➞ Systemic Discrimination ➞ Genocide

In recalling what you have learned so far, define “genocide” in your own words:

____________________________________________________________________________________

Brainstorm examples of genocides and provide as many details as you can think of:

Genocide

Why do you think these genocides happened?

Research the ones you have brainstormed above. For the next class, come prepared with information from at least four.
There are many definitions for the word ‘genocide’. As you learned earlier, genocide was first ‘coined’ by Raphael Lemkin. He is quoted in every piece of research on genocide when researchers are dealing with a definition. Look at the quote by Totten and compare that with the definition in the dictionary and that of the UN. As a class, analyse the historical connection to each of these definitions and how they have become significant to today.

4. Raphael Lemkin combined the Greek *genos* (race, tribe) and *cide* (killing. He went on to define genocide as:

... the coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves. The objectives of such a plan would be the disintegration of the political and social institutions of culture, language, national feelings, religion, economic existence, of national groups and the destruction of the personal security, liberty, health, dignity, and even the lives of the individuals belonging to such groups. Genocide is directed against the national group as an entity, and the actions involved are directed against individuals, not in their individual capacity, but as members of the national group. (Lemkin, 1944, p.79, quoted in Totten, p.3-4)

5. According to the Dictionary.com (2012), Genocide means “the intentional murder of a people, race or kind for the purpose of total annihilation.”


*Article 1*

The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

*Article 2*

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

* (a) Killing members of the group;
* (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
* (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
* (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
* (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article 3
The following acts shall be punishable:
* (a) Genocide;
* (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
* (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
* (d) Attempt to commit genocide;
* (e) Complicity in genocide. (Peace Pledge Union, 2012)

In the following pages you will read many definitions from Adam Jones’ book *Genocide: A comprehensive Introduction*. With a partner, take each definition and analyse the research ‘writer’, the time the definition was written and the significance of the year. In some cases there are multiple definitions by the same scholar. How has their definition changed over the years? Why do you think that is?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BOX 1.1 GENOCIDE: SCHOLARLY DEFINITIONS (in chronological order)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Peter Drost (1959)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Genocide is the deliberate destruction of physical life of individual human beings by reason of their membership of any human collectivity as such.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vahakn Dadrian (1975)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Genocide is the successful attempt by a dominant group, vested with formal authority and/or with preponderant access to the overall resources of power, to reduce by coercion or lethal violence the number of a minority group whose ultimate extermination is held desirable and useful and whose respective vulnerability is a major factor contributing to the decision for genocide.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irving Louis Horowitz (1976)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;[Genocide is] a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus . . . Genocide represents a systematic effort over time to liquidate a national population, usually a minority . . . [and] functions as a fundamental political policy to assure conformity and participation of the citizenry.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leo Kuper (1981)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I shall follow the definition of genocide given in the [UN] Convention. This is not to say that I agree with the definition. On the contrary, I believe a major omission to be in the exclusion of political groups from the list of groups protected. In the contemporary world, political differences are at the very least as significant a basis for massacre and annihilation as racial, national, ethnic or religious differences.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Then too, the genocides against racial, national, ethnic or religious groups are generally a consequence of, or intimately related to, political conflict. However, I do not think it helpful to create new definitions of genocide, when there is an internationally recognized definition and a Genocide Convention which might become the basis for some effective action, however limited the underlying conception. But since it would vitiate the analysis to exclude political groups, I shall refer freely . . . to liquidating or exterminatory actions against them.”

Jack Nusan Porter (1982)

“Genocide is the deliberate destruction, in whole or in part, by a government or its agents, of a racial, sexual, religious, tribal or political minority. It can involve not only mass murder, but also starvation, forced deportation, and political, economic and biological subjugation. Genocide involves three major components: ideology, technology, and bureaucracy/organization.”

Yehuda Bauer (1984)

n.b. Bauer distinguishes between “genocide” and “holocaust”:

“[Genocide is] the planned destruction, since the mid-nineteenth century, of a racial, national, or ethnic group as such, by the following means: (a) selective mass murder of elites or parts of the population; (b) elimination of national (racial, ethnic) culture and religious life with the intent of ‘denationalization’; (c) enslavement, with the same intent; (d) destruction of national (racial, ethnic) economic life, with the same intent; (e) biological decimation through the kidnapping of children, or the prevention of normal family life, with the same intent . . . [Holocaust is] the planned physical annihilation, for ideological or pseudo-religious reasons, of all the members of a national, ethnic, or racial group.”

John L. Thompson and Gail A. Quets (1987)

“Genocide is the extent of destruction of a social collectivity by whatever agents, with whatever intentions, by purposive actions which fall outside the recognized conventions of legitimate warfare.”

Isidor Wallimann and Michael N. Dobkowski (1987)

“Genocide is the deliberate, organized destruction, in whole or in large part, of racial or ethnic groups by a government or its agents. It can involve not only mass murder,
but also forced deportation (ethnic cleansing), systematic rape, and economic and biological subjugation.

**Henry Huttenbach (1988)**

"Genocide is any act that puts the very existence of a group in jeopardy."

**Helen Fein (1988)**

"Genocide is a series of purposeful actions by a perpetrator(s) to destroy a collectivity through mass or selective murders of group members and suppressing the biological and social reproduction of the collectivity. This can be accomplished through the imposed proscription or restriction of reproduction of group members, increasing infant mortality, and breaking the linkage between reproduction and socialization of children in the family or group of origin. The perpetrator may represent the state of the victim, another state, or another collectivity."

**Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn (1990)**

"Genocide is a form of one-sided mass killing in which a state or other authority intends to destroy a group, as that group and membership in it are defined by the perpetrator."

**Helen Fein (1993)**

"Genocide is sustained purposeful action by a perpetrator to physically destroy a collectivity directly or indirectly, through interdiction of the biological and social reproduction of group members, sustained regardless of the surrender or lack of threat offered by the victim."

**Steven T. Katz (1994)**

"[Genocide is] the actualization of the intent, however successfully carried out, to murder in its totality any national, ethnic, racial, religious, political, social, gender or economic group, as these groups are defined by the perpetrator, by whatever means." (n.b. Modified by Adam Jones in 2010 to read, "murder in whole or in part. . . .")
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Israel Charny</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>&quot;Genocide in the generic sense means the mass killing of substantial numbers of human beings, when not in the course of military action against the military forces of an avowed enemy, under conditions of the essential defencelessness of the victim.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Louis Horowitz</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>&quot;Genocide is herein defined as a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus [emphasis in original]. . . . Genocide means the physical dismemberment and liquidation of people on large scales, an attempt by those who rule to achieve the total elimination of a subject people.&quot; (n.b. Horowitz supports &quot;carefully distinguishing the [Jewish] Holocaust from genocide&quot;; he also refers to &quot;the phenomenon of mass murder, for which genocide is a synonym&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Harff</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>&quot;Genocides and politicides are the promotion, execution, and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents – or, in the case of civil war, either of the contending authorities – that are intended to destroy, in whole or part, a communal, political, or politicized ethnic group.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manus I. Midlarsky</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>&quot;Genocide is understood to be the state-sponsored systematic mass murder of innocent and helpless men, women, and children denoted by a particular ethnoreligious identity, having the purpose of eradicating this group from a particular territory.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Levene</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>&quot;Genocide occurs when a state, perceiving the integrity of its agenda to be threatened by an aggregate population – defined by the state as an organic collectivity, or series of collectivities – seeks to remedy the situation by the systematic, en masse physical elimination of that aggregate, in toto, or until it is no longer perceived to represent a threat.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jacques Sémenlin (2005)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I will define genocide as that particular process of civilian destruction that is directed at the total eradication of a group, the criteria by which it is identified being determined by the perpetrator.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daniel Chirot and Clark McCauley (2006)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A genocidal mass murder is politically motivated violence that directly or indirectly kills a substantial proportion of a targeted population, combatants and noncombatants alike, regardless of their age or gender.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Martin Shaw (2007)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[Genocide is] a form of violent social conflict, or war, between armed power organizations that aim to destroy civilian social groups and those groups and other actors who resist this destruction.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donald Bloxham (2009)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“[Genocide is] the physical destruction of a large portion of a group in a limited or unlimited territory with the intention of destroying that group’s collective existence.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Genocide is bullying?

Remember learning about the bully cycle (the bully, the bullied and the bystander) in a previous lesson? How do you think bullying could be compared to genocide?

Read the following excerpt and then answer the questions. As you read, underline anything you wish to explore/ask of your teacher later.

Questions:

8. Do you agree with Barbara Coloroso when she says that genocide is an extreme form of bullying? Why? Why not?

9. Give four examples that you know of that show "The tragedy of genocide has many rehearsals".

10. In comparing genocides, each has a common theme, common formula and a tragic outcome. Can you compare Armenia to Germany? Or Rwanda and Darfur?

11. Can you think of any "Gorillas in our midst" today?

12. In the excerpt, there are four ways in which genocide can be resolved. What are they and give examples of each?

13. Consider the following quote:

   As an international community, we must get out of our seats – we can’t afford to be passive, inattentive, bored, alarmed, or merely deeply saddened. We can’t walk out and close the show, and send it somewhere else. We can’t merely banish the bullies and mourn those targeted for extermination.

   Do you have any ideas on what we should do in order to “rewrite the script”?

14. In the last paragraph, Barbara Coloroso says that those that can help us ‘rewrite’ are those that were witnesses, resisters, and defenders. Research and find examples of each of these people. Choose one and then present your active participant to the class. Focus on what they have or are currently doing to stop the process of genocide.
Extraordinary Evil:
A Brief History of Genocide... and Why It Matters
By Barbara Coloroso

It is a short walk from bullying to hate crimes to genocide—genocide is the most extreme form of bullying—a far too common system of behaviours that is learned in childhood and rooted in contempt for another human being who has been deemed by the bully and his or her accomplices, to be worthless, inferior, and undeserving of respect.

- **Genocide** is not an unimaginable horror. Every genocide throughout human history has been thoroughly imagined, meticulously planned, and brutally executed. The pain of a “moral world turned on its head” does not begin with the machete cuts of the Hutu Power, the gas chambers of the Nazis, the death marches of the Young Turks.

- The tragedy of genocide has many rehearsals that weaken moral inhibitions against violence, publicity that spreads bigotry and intolerance, a backdrop that establishes the climate, ominous sounds that signal the beginning and the end, scripts that heighten the tension and fuel the contempt, six scenes that seal the victims’ fate, a slew of character actors, and an international audience that either fails to hinder or actually helps to energize the performance of extraordinary evil by ordinary people.

*A crime without a name*: Polish Jewish scholar, author, and lawyer Raphaël Lemkin coined the term *genocide* in 1943 in his book, *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. That book was a continuation of Lemkin’s 1933 Madrid Proposal. Lemkin argued that if it could happen in the Ottoman Empire it could happen anywhere. It happened once; it can happen again. Genocide would have to be codified as an international crime that could be punished anywhere. Up to that point, no international convention existed to cover crimes perpetrated by a state (or party in power) against its own people.

- On December 9, 1948 Resolution 260 (III) A: The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide was adopted by the UN General Assembly. The Convention entered into force on January 12, 1951. In 1945, the Allies convened the International Military Tribunal at Nürnberg. None of the Nazi war criminals were found guilty of genocide.

- September 2, 1998 at the UN Tribunal for Rwanda in Arusha, Tanzania, Judge Laity Kama pronounced the first ever verdict in a UN Tribunal for the crime of genocide. “The accused, Jean-Paul Akayesu, you are declared guilty of genocide.” (In late January of 1997, at a genocide trial conducted in Rwanda, the highest ranking *genocidaire* in Rwandan custody, Froduald Karamira, was convicted of genocide and sentenced to death.)

*Anatomy of Extraordinary Evil*: Each genocide has its own story line, setting, and characters, but all have a common theme, common formula, and tragic outcome. Each has its unique aspects, and yet there are startling parallels and connecting threads from each one of them to the others.
**Gorilla in Our Midst: Sustained Inattentional Blindness for Dynamic Events** (1999 research project conducted by Daniel Simons and Christopher Chabris.) War and Genocide are almost always connected. It is in the interests of any genocidal regime to create a context that distracts attention from the true nature of its goals and behaviors, and the rhetoric of war and conflict lends itself to this effort. Eliminationist campaigns are the unexpected objects to which "outsiders" aren't paying attention.

**Conflict vs. Bullying.** In peacekeeping one must remain neutral, impartial, and act with the consent of both parties. In the genocide of the Tutsi, Roméo Dallaire had no peace to keep; the gorilla was not just pounding its chest, it was leaving in its wake a trail of blood, and the world stood by, stricken by inattentional blindness.

- The moral imperative for intervention trump the peacekeeping mandate—a mandate that is totally inappropriate and counterproductive in the face of such a beast. Trying to stop a genocide by using tools that are effective in stopping armed conflicts is futile, naïve, and dangerous.

- The “gorilla in our midst” is not party to any form of conflict resolution—be it negotiation, truce, disarmament, or reason. Both genocide's inception and its solution lie elsewhere. Armed conflict can be resolved through some form of conflict resolution—often with third party participation or intervention. Genocide must be stopped by a third party, perpetrators brought to justice, reparation made, and the community healed through restorative justice. If healing is not yet possible, people must be able to coexist in community.

**Rewriting the script.** Can we create new roles, change the plot, reset the stage, and scrap the tragic ending? The actors can't do it alone. As an international community, we must get out of our seats—we can't afford to be passive, inattentive, bored, alarmed, or merely deeply saddened. We can't walk out and close the show, and send it somewhere else. We can't merely banish the bullies and mourn those targeted for extermination.

- The roles are what must be abandoned—and the international community (on a global and local scale) must become an active participant in a total rewrite. Those who can guide us are the ones who in the face of other genocides were witnesses, resisters, and defenders, those who jumped onto the stage as the scripts were being written and sounded the alarm we refused to hear; the ones who refused to abandon those who were targeted; those who defied the genocidaires; and those who survived genocide and denied the genocidaires their victory.

Excerpts from *Extraordinary Evil: A Brief History of Genocide...and Why It Matters*  
Barbara Coloroso, 2007  
Illustrations Joseph Coloroso, 2007

Reproduced with author permission.
5th Stage of Discrimination - Genocide

Genocide is: The use of deliberate, systematic measures (such as killing, bodily or mental injury, unlivable conditions, prevention of births, forcible transfer of children of the group to another group) calculated to bring about the destruction of a racial, political or cultural group or to destroy the language, religion or culture of a group.75

In this lesson we will be looking at documented historical acts of genocide around the world. It is important for you to understand that there are many more acts of genocide that are ‘undocumented’ by their government. Yet, we know they have happened from testimonials of survivors.

On the following map, find and label the following countries. Each of these countries in the chart has ‘documented’ or ‘undocumented’ historical genocides of no less than 100,000 people for each.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkey</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>Ex-Yugoslavia</th>
<th>Cambodia</th>
<th>Chechnya</th>
<th>Guatemala</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>Burma</td>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kosovo</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Nepal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>Tibet</td>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>El Salvador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Political map of the world (2008)
As you can see, there have been many acts of genocide with numbers over 100,000 people. With your partner, answer the following questions:

5. Which countries were you surprised to see on the list?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

6. Which countries were not a surprise to you? Why?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

7. Do you know of any countries on the list that are still in conflict?
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________

8. For the following chart, work in partners to research and fill in the blanks. One has been completed for you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>#'s</th>
<th>Killers</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Target</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>1915-1916 And 1922-1923</td>
<td>1-1.5 million</td>
<td>“Young Turk” government of the Ottoman Empire</td>
<td>Ethnic cleansing</td>
<td>Deportation Forced death marches Massacres</td>
<td>Armenian civilians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Points of Reflection

Consider the following excerpt from “Talking Points” by the Peace Pledge Union Information on Genocide. In your journal, answer the questions that follow the quotes.

OBEYING ORDERS

A Tanzanian writer:

*Armed policemen were ordered to open fire on the people outside the mosque. From the videotape it’s quite obvious that the aim was to kill the Muslims. The police commanders are seen and heard ordering their marksmen to take careful aim. In two cases the bullets only wounded the intended victims, and the police ordered the marksmen to shoot again. And they did, with unmistakable zest and ruthlessness.*

*There is one brief scene in the tape that always moves me to tears. The commander orders a young policeman to shoot. He shoots in the air. The commander orders him to aim his gun at the crowd. The young policeman is clearly torn between obeying his commander and obeying his conscience. The commander repeats the order. The policeman makes an attempt to obey his commander. He raises his gun, he looks at the crowd, but his hands become weaker and weaker, and the gun slowly falls to the ground.*

'I was only obeying orders,' say many of the people responsible for atrocities in war and genocide. What should we do when orders and conscience are in conflict? What should we do about the arming of police officers? What should we do about the commanders who order the shooting of civilians?

NO CHOICE FOR SOLDIERS

Soldiers fighting Turkish Kurds:

*Whether you actually take part in a conflict or not, you are a part of it. You have to protect yourself. If you don’t want to harm them, people think you’re on the other side. The toughest war is the one you fight against being there at all: your civil war against yourself.*

*I've seen all I want to know. If the state met the Kurds' needs for their culture and language, and improved the conditions of their lives, there'd be no need to have war at all. Who is the enemy? Not the Kurds. The enemy is the ruling classes - who else?*

What does being a soldier let you in for? The soldier speaking was not a career soldier, he was doing his (enforced) National Military Service: might that make a difference to his attitude? These interviews were published and their editor was arrested for 'insulting the military'.
RESPONSIBILITY
An African American writer about prisoners:
'It's easy for folks who have enough to eat, homes, land, work, to preach about forgiveness. But is it fair to preach it to people living in hellholes, jobless, starving? Are they to forgive the fat well-fed millions who voted for their starvation? Who voted for war? Who voted for prisons? Who voted for a people's repression? Who wish, in their heart of hearts, that those people had never been born? Should the starving forgive the repression to come, the genocide to come?'

What is fair?
DISCUSSION QUESTIONS

In groups of 2 or 3, pick a question, research and present one (1) of the following:

- Discuss Adolf Hitler's reported statement, "Who still tells nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?" Does this statement have any validity today?

- Discuss the following: "Genocide can never be eliminated because it is deeply rooted in human nature." Do you agree or disagree?

- Why do some people join groups such as the KKK?

- Discuss how prejudice and discrimination are not only harmful to the victim but also to those who practice them.

- Is it possible to grow to adulthood without harboring at least some prejudice toward minorities?

- What can you do to fight prejudice in your neighborhood or school?
Group PowerPoint project and Culminating Activity

There are many different models being used to teach genocide. Included here are just three: The five stage model you have been learning, the 7 stage model by Linda Woolf and the 8 stage model by Gregory Stanton.

Choose a partner. Pick one model that you feel best suits the beliefs of your group. With your teacher choose one of the following countries and create a PowerPoint that teaches the model you have chosen and outlines clearly every stage as seen in the country of choice. You should include information about the country before the genocide, the genocide and the stages, after the genocide and any continuing issues as a result of the genocide. You have a maximum of 20 slides and the presentation will be 45 minutes long. Your teacher will model and show you an example by using a PowerPoint presentation following the genocide of aboriginals in Canada using the 5 stages of discrimination model.

15. Namibia
16. Ukraine
17. Cambodia
18. Guatemala
19. Bosnia
20. Democratic Republic of the Congo
21. Afghanistan
22. Israel/Palestine
23. Iraq
24. Lebanon
25. Russia-Chechnya
26. Colombia
27. Ethiopia
28. Uganda

Or any of the others found on Stanton's list of genocides since 1945 and approved by your teacher.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Stages on the path to mass violence and genocide- Woolf (2005)</th>
<th>8 Stages of Genocide- Stanton (1996)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Stereotypes</strong>-false or generalized beliefs about a group of people that result in categorizing members without regard for individual difference</td>
<td>“The Norm”- normative for in-groups to maintain stereotypes and negative attitudes towards an out-group. “Informal” individual killings/abuse</td>
<td>Classification- categories of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ are identified based on ethnicity, race, religion or nationality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Prejudice</strong>-a set of opinions, attitudes and feelings that unfairly cast a group and its members in a negative light without legitimate reasons</td>
<td>Loss of privilege and opportunity- members of out-group may be denied access to certain services, excluded from organizations, or limitations in educational opportunities or jobs. Process of stigmatization occurs with an increase in stereotypes and derogatory images linked to negative attributes. May proceed to classifying and identifying.</td>
<td>Symbolization- names and symbols are given to classified categories. An example includes the yellow star for Jewish people during the holocaust. Symbolization does not typically result in genocide unless it is accompanied by dehumanization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Discrimination</strong>-inequitable treatment of people based on their race, gender, ethnicity, language, faith or sexual orientation</td>
<td>Loss of basic civil rights- changes in laws. Dehumanization begins and is promoted by leaders and elite.</td>
<td>Dehumanization- One group denies humanity of the other group by equating them with animals, insects, or diseases. This eliminates the normal human revulsion against murder and makes killing someone of the other group easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Systemic Discrimination</strong>- the policies and practices in organization that result in the inequitable treatment of members of certain groups named above.</td>
<td>Forced Isolation- ghettoization, deportations, ethnic cleansing*. Moral disengagement. Increase in euphemistic language and ‘informal’ sanctioned killings.</td>
<td>Organization- governments, armies, or other groups of power unite and train militias to carry out the genocide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Genocide</strong>-the organized, systematic destruction of an identifiable group (ex. Racial, cultural, religious) by those in power.</td>
<td>Deprivation of basic human rights- denied education, access to adequate food and shelter, and relegated to subsistence living. Moral exclusion as victim becomes excluded entirely from the normal moral realm (easy to kill ‘them’ the enemy).</td>
<td>Polarization- extremists further drive the two groups apart by spreading propaganda, limiting contact between them, or creating laws that ostracize one of the groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Genocide</strong>- killing and very existence is threatened. Formal sanctioned killing begins. *key point of international intervention. Will or will not start if action is perceived as either accepted or punished by the international community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Preparatory victims are identified and separated. Death lists are drawn up. Weapons are distributed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><strong>Denial</strong>-deny that any killings have happened and blame the victim. Final insult and disrespect of victims.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extermination- mass killing of the identified victims begins. Killing is easy and the extermination is quick.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Denial</strong>- perpetrators of the genocide try to cover up mass killings and intimidate witnesses. They deny that</td>
<td></td>
<td>Denial- perpetrators of the genocide try to cover up mass killings and intimidate witnesses. They deny that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Woolf and Hulsizer (2005) combine the 7 stages within a multilayered frame. In brief, the six levels include:

- **Social Psychological Factors (SPF)** – includes social cognition, social influence, and social relations. Examples may include: deindividualization, displaces aggression, obedience to authority, prejudice and propaganda.
- **Parallel psychological processes**– culture of violence and ideology of supremacy, stigmatization, dehumanization, moral disengagement, moral exclusion, impunity and perpetuation of violence.
- **Historical and situational factors**– group cultural history, destabilizing crisis, authoritarian leaders using SPF manipulation techniques, genocide.
- **Levels of violence**– hate crimes and institutional bias, loss of opportunity and privilege, loss of civil rights, isolation, loss of human rights, loss of existence, denial.
- **Role of bystanders**
- **Levels of prevention**– primary, secondary, intervention and post-genocide intervention.
Let’s Debate!

Find four people in your class and have a full formal debate.

The topic is: Is it genocide?

From the following, choose one topic for which you can fully argue and prove that it is or is not genocide.

6. Aboriginals in Canada
7. African slavery
8. Hiroshima bombing
9. UN sanctions in Iraq
10. Feminicide in China and India
Appendix 1

Answers to Prejudice Quiz

1. D: Punishing those who behave in prejudiced ways is impossible since most prejudiced behavior is difficult to observe or prove. Research has shown that those who are most prejudiced have generally received more punishment than most of us.

2. B: If one thinks prejudiced thoughts, one should not suppress them. One should actively replace prejudiced thoughts with more positive images of the group members about whom one has had prejudiced thoughts.

3. C: Prejudices cost our society and therefore are a real economic problem for all of us, not just those who are the victims of the prejudiced behavior. The cost of sexism and racism alone have been estimated at over one-half trillion dollars per year.

4. D: Most people are not prejudiced. Surveys show that well over 75 percent of people in the U.S. do not consider themselves to be racist. Research has shown that those who identify themselves as low in prejudiced beliefs still discriminate.

5. B: There are inexpensive methods of managing prejudiced behavior. There are ways of managing prejudiced behavior that cost next to nothing.

6. B: Those who risked their own lives to save Jewish people in Western Europe during the period that the Nazi were practicing genocide were no more religious than those who did not try to save Jewish people.

7. B: Those who saved Jewish people from Hitler’s genocide had no more resources than those who did not attempt to save Jewish people.

8. A: Those who are in positions of authority can do a great deal to reduce prejudices within the ranks of an organization. They often have more leverage with those who are strongly prejudiced than they realize.

9. B: Being strongly prejudiced has much to do with a person’s intellectual functioning and ability to make other types of judgments.

10. B: The motivation of a strongly prejudiced person who is committing an overtly prejudiced act is basically different than that of a person with lower levels of prejudiced behavior who is functioning out of a stereotyped perception.

11. A: When a person who is low in prejudiced beliefs behaves in a prejudiced way he or she generally feels a personal sense of discomfort following the behavior.
12. **A:** Those who are most strongly prejudiced toward a target group generally know no more negative stereotypes about those toward whom they are prejudiced than those who are low in prejudiced behavior toward the same group.

13. **C:** When the leading scientists of the world look at the issues that threaten our future there is clear consensus. The concerns of a majority of the leading scientists in the world about what threatens our future include concerns about prejudiced behavior, specifically sexism.

14. **D:** Sexism, racism, ageism, xenophobia, homophobia and the prejudices toward those with disabilities all have basically the same dynamics.
### Appendix 2

Answer key for chart:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>1.6 million</th>
<th>6 million people of Jewish decent and 6 million ‘others’</th>
<th>1.6 million</th>
<th>80,000</th>
<th>30,000</th>
<th>100-110,000</th>
<th>800,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason</strong></td>
<td>Colonization and imperialism</td>
<td>Ethnic cleansing</td>
<td>Idealistic and political control</td>
<td>Political and land control</td>
<td>Political and land control</td>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>Ethnic-cleansing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method</strong></td>
<td>Torture</td>
<td>Systemic killings in death ‘factories’, Massacres Starvation Work camps</td>
<td>Killed starved</td>
<td>Massacres</td>
<td>Torture Disappearance Execution Assassination</td>
<td>Massacres Torture Rape</td>
<td>Guns Axes Machete s Fire and live burial Rape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>First Nations</td>
<td>Jewish people, homosexuals, mentally and physically challenged</td>
<td>Opposition to Kuhmer Rouge</td>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>Civilians</td>
<td>Opposing ethnic peoples</td>
<td>Tutsi tribal peoples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place</strong></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Cambodi a</td>
<td>East Timor</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Bosnia-Herzegov ina</td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

References: [http://remember.org/guide/History.root.stereotypes.html](http://remember.org/guide/History.root.stereotypes.html)

[http://s.spachman.tripod.com/Argument/discrim_scenarios.htm](http://s.spachman.tripod.com/Argument/discrim_scenarios.htm)
Appendix 3

Theoretical discussions to aide in instruction of course material:

Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn (1990) point out in The History and Sociology of Genocide: Analyses and Case Studies that the “UN [definition] is the only internationally recognized definition...The lack of rigor in the UN definition of genocide is responsible for much of the confusion that plagues scholarly work in the field”.

(Chalk and Jonassohn, p. 11) Entitled: The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, it was adopted by Resolution 260 (III) A of the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948 and states in part:

Article 1
The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Article 2
In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:
* (a) Killing members of the group;
* (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
* (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
* (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
* (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article 3
The following acts shall be punishable:
* (a) Genocide;
* (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
* (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
* (d) Attempt to commit genocide;
* (e) Complicity in genocide. (Peace Pledge Union, 2012)

It is clear in my reading that there are blatant ‘holes’ in this definition. One must ask if it is due to the historical ‘positionality’ of the term, or if some ideas were intentionally left out for the protection of the ratifying governments. Scholars have been critical concerning the 1948 UN definition of genocide, as it is the definition most used as a measure against actions deemed genocidal and requiring of action. However, current reflection on the UN definition illustrates areas of concern for groups not specifically a ‘race or culture’. For example, in the preamble for Article 2 there are three major groups that do not have protection under the UN convention: gender, political affiliation and sexual preference. Areas that in Canada we now see some protection of under our human rights codes due to the acceptance of feminist jurisprudence and equal rights. Unfortunately, even today, not all countries have ratified the 1948 Convention on Genocide and included the protection of these three groups in their own laws. Women, political rivals and the LBGTTIQ groups are still targets of violence and murder without punishment.

The wording in Article 2 had other problems as well. One of the major issues of the definition is in the interpretation of each clause. It is up to the discretion of each country whether or not genocide has been committed by “inflicting conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction”.

76 Lesbian, Bi-sexual, Gay, Trans-gendered, Two-minded, Inter-sexed and Queer
77 Reference to Article 2
away the rationale of genocide by citing conditions of war, terrorism or environmental conditions. For an enlightening look at the powers of interpretation, refer to Roland Chrisjohn and Sherri Young’s book, The Circle Game, where in discussing the Indian Residential School system, they undoubtedly prove that Canada has committed genocide of First Nations people in every clause of Article 2 with no punishment under Article 3. Chrisjohn (2006) states:

Canada signed the Convention on November 28, 1949 and adopted it by unanimous vote in Parliament on May 21, 1952. Thus, depending upon the precise date at which you wish to date the closure of the last residential School (late 70’s to early 80’s), Residential Schools continued to operate for some 30 years after Canada had signed the Convention. (Chrisjohn, p.60)78

With governments or the UN allowed to interpret for themselves whether they have in fact committed genocidal acts, there is no clear outline whether outside forces must intervene. Without a clear definition of genocide, there can be no clear moment in which we are forced to act. The problem with the UN and Lemkin definition according to Bauer (1984) quoted here by Chalk and Jonassohn (1990) is that there are actually two crimes.

“The first...should be called genocide and should refer to

The planned destruction, since the mid-nineteenth century, of a racial, national, or ethnic group as such, by the following means; (a) selective mass murder of elites or parts of the population; (b) elimination of national (racial, ethnic) culture and religious life with the intent of “denationalization”; (c) enslavement, with the same intent; (d) destruction of national (racial, ethnic) economic life, with the same intent; (e) biological decimation through the kidnapping of children, or the prevention of normal family life, with the same intent.

78 Bolding is true to the text and not my own. For further discussion refer to Chrisjohn pages 59-60 for a full discussion of each clause and its connection to the genocide of First Nations people in Canada.
The second crime Bauer calls holocaust meaning—“the planned physical
annihilation, for ideological or pseudo-religious reasons, of all the members of a
national, ethnic, or racial group” (Chalk and Jonassohn, p.20)

The fact that there can be no consensus over the mere definition makes it difficult to
use in a model.

...over the years many scholars have proposed alternative definitions of
genocide. To this day, though, no single definition has been generally
accepted as definitive. This constitutes a serious problem, especially as it
relates to intervention and prevention of genocide— not to mention the
prosecution of cases that involve genocidal-like actions. It also complicates the
work of scholars as they undertake the study of the preconditions, processes,
and ramifications of genocide. (Totten, p.4)

Scholars such as Chalk and Johansson (1990) argue that it is the ambiguity and absence
of political groups as targets that has caused many of the incidents of in-action by the
UN towards acts of genocide. The Rwandan genocide is a well-known example of the
indifference and the controversy of definition driven action plans. Conley-Zilkic and
Totten (2009) show that:

The vast majority of cases fall... between massive atrocities targeted against
civilians of certain groups and genocide is not clear. While the actual violence
being perpetrated doesn’t change if one calls it “genocide” or something else,

---

79 Chalk and Jonassohn’s book, *The History and Sociology of Genocide*, was published in 1990 and
written before the genocides in Bosnia and Rwanda. Note here as well that there is discourse around the
use of the word genocide, holocaust and Holocaust. In Chalk’s book there is a discussion of the
difference between genocide and holocaust where the targets of systemic discrimination of the Polish in
WWII was deemed genocide, but the annihilation of the Jews by Nazi’s was deemed a holocaust. Note
the use of the lower case h. Adam Jones states that the use of capitalization H versus h denotes the
different between the Holocaust (of the Jews during WWII) and holocaust as the term used for other
mass killings/genocide.

80 For complete lists of definitions, including Lemkin’s definition and typologies please refer to
Moshman, p.437-439; Chalk, p.3, 8, 9 and list of literature review pgs. 12-23; Jones, pgs. 10-12. He has
an extensive list that can be seen in chronological order in his book pgs. 16-20. Here, there are 22
separate definitions of the word genocide. A copy of these pages can be seen in my workbook as well.
the terminology matters because of the increased ethical imperative ascribed to “genocide.” Too often once the specter of “genocide” looms, debates and discussion about prevention and response to the phenomenon are sidetracked by the single issue of whether or not “genocide” is indeed threatened or occurring and what extraordinary measure this particular crime warrants. (Conley-Zilkic & Totten, p.610)

Discussion of current models (refer to chart in the introduction):

In an overall comparison between these models, my position differs from Stanton’s position (1996) not only in each of his chosen stages, but also in the ordering of these stages. A quick reference to Figure 1 will show an extreme contrast between models in the number of stages and in their meaning. It can be argued that Stanton does not show the ‘true’ comprehensive path to genocide as he starts his model well after a society is on its way to acts of annihilation. Attending to these very early stages in the development towards genocide are, to my mind, a vital part of the comprehension of genocide and therefore also to the teaching of acceptance. The five stages of discrimination model and Woolf’s model however begins with the individual, and this best illustrate the easy transfer of hate from individual thoughts to societal action.

Focusing first on the individual, where discriminatory thoughts begin, is the missing portion to Stanton’s model. The stages within the longer, seven and eight stage, models overlap a great deal and are, in fact, merely examples of events outlined in the five stage model used by the Ontario Ministry of Education (OME).

The models also differ considerably in ordering and in the meaning of the content in each stage. The first stage by Stanton outlines the idea that classification is the first
step to genocide. The idea that a society ‘classifies’ groups into ‘us’ versus ‘them’ is not an instant occurrence, neither is it a ‘stage’ or ‘step’ unto itself. It is argueable that classification is actually an example seen in the first four stages in the OME model. The classifying of people can occur in stereotyping people into certain groups, and coupling the group with common negative behaviour traits. It can also be seen in prejudging the same people one has stereotyped into groups. For example, upon seeing a group of Afro-Canadian teenagers one might ‘classify’ them by prejudging that they belong to a gang. Further, classification of individuals is seen in both levels of discrimination, whether it is by the individual or the government. Audrey Bryan and Frances Vavrus (2005), in discussing Scheper-Hughes, speak of a continuum of thoughts and actions that eventually lead to classification and later genocide:

[She] suggests the existence of a genocidal continuum comprised of a series of ‘small wars and invisible genocide’s that occur within the context of schools, hospitals, prisons, the workplace and so on. ...

Prejudice and stereotyping, which are fundamental to the process of moral exclusion, may be considered amongst these everyday common acts of violence to which Scheper-Hughes alludes. When carried to their extreme, prejudicial attitudes, behaviors and stereotyping foster delegitimisation, or the classification of out-groups into extremely negative categories that enable their exclusion, and in instances of serious conflict, violence and harm (Bar-Tal, 1989, 1990). Delegitimisation, therefore, is a fundamental process that permits moral exclusion. Although intimately related to stereotyping and prejudice, delegitimisation has a number of distinct features: it uses extremely negative, salient, and atypical bases for categorisation (such as characterising members of an out-group as parasites or comparing them to other groups that serve as symbols of malice or evil); it dehumanises the delegitimised group by maintain that its members do not deserve humane treatment and by labeling and characterising its members as not belonging to the human race (e.g., animals, demons, inferior races and so on); it implies that the delegitimised group has the potential to endanger one’s own group by
describing them as a political entity that poses a threat to the values of the society and is a danger to the system, and it tends to be associated with intense, negative emotions of rejection, such as anger, fear, hatred, contempt, or disgust (Bar-Tal, 1990). Delegitimisation is particularly prevalent in intractable conflict regions, i.e., in regions where conflicts are prolonged, involve great animosity and exemplify vicious cycles of violence. (Bryan and Vavrus, p. 187)

What is missing from Stanton’s stages of genocide is the idea that stereotyping and prejudice can be the precursors of acts of discrimination known as delegitimisation. These acts can be either performed by individuals or in the case of groups, systemic discrimination.

Stanton’s second stage of symbolization also raises questions in a comparison. Stanton’s second stage is compiled of examples that can be found spread across different areas of the five stages model. Stanton isolates ‘symbolization’ - that is using names or code words and markings as identifiers - into one stage, whereas symbolization occurs throughout the process of discrimination can be seen in particular through prejudice, discrimination, systemic discrimination and even genocide itself. For example, the use of the code word ‘cockroaches’ during the Rwandan genocide was seen in each of the five stages of the OME model, and was even used over the radio as an incitement to begin the killings.

Stanton’s third stage is dehumanization. Yet again, dehumanization is seen in stages one through three in the OME model as these stages reflect on many of the common thoughts and feelings experienced by perpetrators towards a group of individuals. In order to later commit violence against others, the group needs to be seen as less than an accepted human. By confining dehumanization to one stage rather than seeing its
reflection in many different stages minimizes its importance in the progression from stereotypes to genocide.

Stanton also explores organization in his fourth stage. To say that organization is a separate stage is to deny that it must happen formally or informally along the continuum of the process. Organization must happen at each stage, for nothing of the magnitude of genocide can be a random occurrence.

In the polarization stage, the key actions Stanton discusses are the spreading of propaganda, limiting contact and creating laws to ostracize the out-group from the in-group. But again, I argue that propaganda is an example seen in the all stages of discrimination. Limiting contact and creating laws are examples of systemic discrimination whereby ostracizing of others can be done physically or emotionally. Neither of these two ways of ostracizing necessarily involves the government. To combine them under the one heading of polarization does not reflect the complexity of the issue and the power of each separate tactic being used.

The separation of different issues and recombining them is ultimately needed in trying to produce a framework for others to follow and understand. It is in this separation and combining that Stanton and the OME most differ. In the next stage of preparation by Stanton he combines the identification and the segregation of groups with the preparation to distribute weapons. In fact identifying, creating death lists and separating individuals can be seen in many different levels, primarily in the systemic discrimination and genocide stage of the OME model. How a society comes to group
themselves differently from those being targeted has its roots in stereotypes and prejudice. Stanton does not deny this fact, but in his organization he seems to have assumed that the reader understands that stereotypes and prejudice preceded the stage of classification.

The only area in which both models parallel each other is in the genocide and extermination stages. The intent and actions are the same: annihilation and destruction of the out-group. Although there is discussion and research connected to the typology of genocide and will be discussed further in the section.

Finally, the area which is the most misplaced is the stage of denial. For example, Stanton places ‘denial’ as the last stage of genocide, where it could be argued that denial is used before, during and after genocide. Denial can be seen in the individual during the stereotype, prejudice and discrimination stages. It can also be seen in the systemic discrimination stage through the rewriting of textbooks, political speeches, religious indoctrination, and print in the media. Obviously, denial during the genocide stage is very apparent and is reflected through the foreign media and political forum. The type of denial to which Stanton refers is when genocide has occurred: at this stage it is used in order to ‘wash’ away the reality of the violence and any of the ownership of the actions as well, when it becomes a clear effort to evade punishment by outside forces. Denial of the previous occurrence of violence – formally through teaching in schools or informally in homes - is evidence of denial occurring at many stages, and until denial at these stages is acknowledged, wrongs will not have been righted and
hurt feelings will fester. To relegate denial to only the final stage is yet again to limit its occurrence in other stages towards genocide.

In comparing the OME’s five stage model and Stanton’s eight stage model, I have questioned Stanton’s ordering and treatment of the issues and stages of genocide in several ways. Overall, Stanton’s intentions are to single out for discussion several key processes of genocide as it is in its immediate preparation. While this method has obvious intellectual merit, it can be argued that in such a separation, the constant and invidious nature of these processes may not be fully recognised by the students for whom the OME model would be of most use. Following is an explanation of why Stanton’s and Woolf and Hulsizer’s approach may fall short in addressing and teaching acceptance in the Secondary School curriculum.

The primary goal in the teaching of acceptance is the prevention of future violence. Adolescents need to learn not only the history of genocides, but have the skills to prevent more violence in the future. There are prime differences on the motive and utility of each of the models. The eight stages of genocide model refer only to what happens during genocide. Understanding the process is useful in a course such as History as it allows a class to analyse the events after the fact. Using Stanton’s model, genocide can be understood as a series of processes that have occurred, but Stanton’s model cannot go towards further peace and acceptance because it does not fully address why genocide occurs, and therefore cannot equip students with the means to recognize and prevent the possibility of current occurrences in their own societies. The
OME’s five stage model and Woolf and Hulsizer’s seven stage model of discrimination however, allow for the analysis of how genocide may come about and are useful in many different subject areas including, English, History, Human Geography, Anthropology, Psychology and Sociology, Law or any of the other Humanity or Social Science courses. Where Stanton’s model is limited to few courses, the other models incorporate more opportunities to help foster acceptance in adolescents.
Appendix 4

Frontline’s: “Ghosts of Rwanda” Student Copy

This is a documentary film. Much like a newspaper article, it is to show you the facts. Try to answer the 5w’s before we watch the film. You can go back and fill in answers that you do not know as you watch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; How?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were two main tribal groups in Rwanda at the time. Fill in the similarities and differences between the two as you watch the film.

- group 1: _______
- group 2: _______________
Did you see many differences? Why do you think that is?

Why would Somalia have had any influence on actions being taken by the UN in Rwanda?

Why do you think the UN ‘pulled’ their troops?

What interventions could have been implemented to stop the killings? Try to come up with some ideas. When and how would they have had the most effect?

There were some ‘rescue missions’. Who did they take? Do you feel these people were their only choice? How do you feel about the mandate of “white over black”?

How did the ‘culture of obedience’ and the colonial history of Rwanda help in pushing the country towards genocide?

How was propaganda used to incite violence and hatred?

What happened at a church in Nyarubuye on April 15, 1994? Why does this part of the story ‘bother’ us so much more than others?
How can the media be a blessing and a hindrance at the same time?

The Red Cross is well known for being impartial in order to assure help to many victims of violence. In Rwanda, M. Philippe Guillard felt that there is a time to “shut up and a time to take responsibility to speak up”. He went against the Red Cross mandate and let the media in Europe know what was happening. Do you feel he did the right thing?

It is estimated that the Red Cross was able to save ____________ lives. However, the death toll in the first two weeks was ____________ and in next two weeks it had added another _____________.

Why did the world not care?

For the following quotes from the documentary write your thoughts and reactions beside them.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quote</th>
<th>Reaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“US has no friends, US only has interests. The US has no interests in Rwanda”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>““[Dallaire was] abandoned by his own organization.” Guillard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“In each of us there is such a potential for good and such a potential for evil”. Wilkens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“By the time the genocide was over...I was so angry at America...America the beautiful....America the brave...I was angry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the government and the people who could have done things and they didn’t”. Wilkens

“Send me troops”. Dallaire

The UN debated a great deal over the use of the word ‘genocide’. What would have been the difference in the outcome had the UN accepted the use of the word? Why?

Genocide means the intentional murder of a people, race or kind for the purpose of total annihilation. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide which was adopted by Resolution 260 (III) A of the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948 states in part:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Article 1</th>
<th>The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Article 2 | In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:  
* (a) Killing members of the group;  
* (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;  
* (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;  
* (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;  
* (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group. |
| Article 3 | The following acts shall be punishable:  
* (a) Genocide;  
* (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;  
* (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;  
* (d) Attempt to commit genocide;  
* (e) Complicity in genocide. (Peace Pledge Union, 2012) |
Take the articles of the convention and underline the portions that you feel reflect that what happened in Rwanda was genocide. Explain your answer choices:

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

In your opinion, how many acts of genocide make genocide? Explain your reasoning.

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

You saw some very horrific images during the documentary. Why do you think people saw them and still nothing happened?

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

Would you have reacted? What could you have done?

______________________________________________

______________________________________________

Courage has many faces and there were people who had covert plans to save the Tutsi’s when no one else would help. Think of three examples and put them in the chart. Did each work? Why? Why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Example 2</th>
<th>Example 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When the UN finally agreed to act six weeks after the killings started, why did it still not help quickly enough?

By July 1994, the killings had stopped and ____________________________ had won the war.

How many Tutsi's were documented to have been killed?

Do you find that the world's slow response was: "Too little, too late"? Why?

Romeo Dallaire wrote a book about the genocide entitled "Shake hands with the Devil". What is this title in reference to?

Do you think Romeo Dallaire should feel guilty? Are his comments correct when he says that his mission failed and therefore he failed?

So whose fault is it? Brainstorm the following 'players' as they all play a part in the genocide. Later we will be having a debate on whether the genocide in Rwanda was of the fault of the UN. Try to think of all sides of each groups' history, thoughts, feelings and personality characteristics in the genocide. Here are a 'few'. Elaborate as much as you can with your partner. Remember that this is only a starting point and is intended for you to see how all of these people/nations played a part in the genocide in Rwanda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hutus- Interhamwe</th>
<th>Kwamba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘the’ church/religion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Peacekeepers</td>
<td>Canadians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Belgian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ghanaian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Senegalese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Romeo Dallaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Paul Kagame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwandanian Government and PM Agathe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid workers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Carl Wilkens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Gromo Alex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is a documentary film. Much like a newspaper article, it is to show you the facts. Try to answer the 5w’s before we watch the film. You can go back and fill in answers that you do not know as you watch.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who?</th>
<th>Who: Hutu and Tutsi, UN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What?</td>
<td>What: Genocide of 800,000+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When?</td>
<td>When: April-July, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where?</td>
<td>Where: Rwanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why?</td>
<td>Why: Tensions between both groups. Peace agreement weak and civil war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; How?</td>
<td>How: Propaganda, massing of weapons, machetes, death lists, political assassinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were two main tribal groups in Rwanda at the time. Fill in the similarities and differences between the two as you watch the film.

Did you see many differences? Why do you think that is?
Why would Somalia have had any influence on actions being taken by the UN in Rwanda?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Why do you think the UN 'pulled' their troops?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

What interventions could have been implemented to stop the killings? Try to come up with some ideas. When and how would they have had the most effect?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

There were some 'rescue missions'. Who did they take? Do you feel these people were their only choice? How do you feel about the mandate of "white over black"?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

How did the 'culture of obedience' and the colonial history of Rwanda help in pushing the country towards genocide?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
How was propaganda used to incite violence and hatred?

What happened at a church in Nyarubuye on April 15, 1994?

Why does this part of the story ‘bother’ us so much more than others?

5000 Tutsis had sought refuge. They were slaughtered. One girl survived: Valentina who stayed in the church for 43 days.

How can the media be a blessing and a hindrance at the same time?

The Red Cross is well known for being impartial in order to assure help to many victims of violence. In Rwanda, M. Philippe Guillard felt that there is a time to “shut up and a time to take responsibility to speak up”. He went against the Red Cross mandate and let the media in Europe know what was happening. Do you feel he did the right thing?

It is estimated that the Red Cross was able to save ____________ lives. However, the death toll in the first two weeks was ________________ and in the next two weeks it had added another ________________.

Why did the world not care?

For the following quotes from the documentary write your thoughts and reactions beside them.
"US has no friends, US only has interests. The US has no interests in Rwanda"

"[Dallaire was] abandoned by his own organization." Guillard

"In each of us there is such a potential for good and such a potential for evil". Wilkens

"By the time the genocide was over...I was so angry at America...America the beautiful....America the brave...I was angry with the government and the people who could have done things and they didn't". Wilkens

"Send me troops". Dallaire

The UN debated a great deal over the use of the word 'genocide'. What would have been the difference in the outcome had the UN accepted the use of the word? Why?

The UN would have been mandated to act under the UN convention. Without the use of the word, they did not have to do anything and did not.
Genocide means the intentional murder of a people, race or kind for the purpose of total annihilation. The Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide which was adopted by Resolution 260 (III) A of the United Nations General Assembly on 9 December 1948 states in part:

Article 1
The Contracting Parties confirm that genocide, whether committed in time of peace or in time of war, is a crime under international law which they undertake to prevent and to punish.

Article 2
In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:
* (a) Killing members of the group;
* (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
* (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
* (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
* (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Article 3
The following acts shall be punishable:
* (a) Genocide;
* (b) Conspiracy to commit genocide;
* (c) Direct and public incitement to commit genocide;
* (d) Attempt to commit genocide;
* (e) Complicity in genocide. (Peace Pledge Union, 2012)

Take the articles of the convention and underline the portions that you feel reflect that what happened in Rwanda was genocide. Explain your answer choices:

In your opinion, how many acts of genocide make genocide? Explain your reasoning.

You saw some very horrific images during the documentary. Why do you think people saw them and still nothing happened?

Would you have reacted? What could you have done?
Courage has many faces and there were people who had covert plans to save the Tutsi’s when no one else would help. Think of three examples and put them in the chart. Did each work? Why? Why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example 1</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example 2</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Example 3</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the UN finally agreed to act six weeks after the killings started, why did it still not help quickly enough?

Everyone knew of what was happening in Rwanda through the media, but did nothing as it was not in ‘their’ interests.

By July 1994, the killings had stopped and _______ had won the war. How many Tutsis were documented to have been killed?

Do you find that the world’s slow response was: “Too little, too late”? Why?
Romeo Dallaire wrote a book about the genocide entitled "Shake hands with the Devil". What is this title in reference to?

Shaking Hands with the Devil reflects having to make agreements with the very people organizing the genocide: the death squads and their leaders. It also means shaking hands with non-human things after seeing the leaders with blood splatters on their clothes.

Do you think Romeo Dallaire should feel guilty? Are his comments correct when he says that his mission failed and therefore he failed?

So whose fault is it? Brainstorm the following ‘players’ as they all play a part in the genocide. Later we will be having a debate on whether the genocide in Rwanda was of the fault of the UN. Try to think of all sides of each group's history, thoughts, feelings and personality characteristics in the genocide. Here are a 'few'. Elaborate as much as you can with your partner. Remember that this is only a starting point and is intended for you to see how all of these people/nations played a part in the genocide in Rwanda.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hutus- Interhamwe</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Kwamba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ‘the’ church/religion |                                                |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Peacekeepers</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Canadians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Belgian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ghanaian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Senegalese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| General Romeo Dallaire|                                                |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Paul Kagame</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwandan Government and PM Agathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Aid workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Carl Wilkens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Gromo Alex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The media</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Helpful resources and teacher materials:

- [www.kidsareworthit.com](http://www.kidsareworthit.com)
- [www.genocidewatch.org](http://www.genocidewatch.org)
- [www.genocidetext.net](http://www.genocidetext.net)
- [www.worldwithoutgenocide.org/current-conflicts](http://www.worldwithoutgenocide.org/current-conflicts)
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**Movie**

CHG38 Course Guideline: (taken from TDSB documents)

This course investigates examples of genocide in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, including the Holocaust, Armenia, and Rwanda. Students will investigate the terms genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes and explore them through the lens of historical analysis. Students will examine identity formation and how "in groups" and "out groups" are created, including an analysis of how bias, stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination impact on various groups. Throughout the course, students will gain an understanding of the role of perpetrator, victim, bystander, rescuer, opportunist, and resister. As the course unfolds students will be challenged to draw appropriate connections between the history of genocide and Canadian history. Note: This is a Ministry approved locally developed optional credit course.

OVERALL EXPECTATIONS:

By the end of this course, students will:

C1 – analyze interactions between social groups in societies that have experienced genocide;

C2 – analyze the characteristics of societies that are “inclusive” or “exclusive”;

C3 – analyze the ways in which vulnerable communities can be protected or abused by nation states and the international community;

C4 – analyze the effectiveness of various models used to rebuild communities after the experience of genocide.

Change and Continuity

Overall Expectations

By the end of this course, students will:

CC1 – analyze the changes in societies that lead to genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes;

CC2 – analyze the ways in which institutions in society can contribute to stability, as well as inequality;

CC3 – analyze the causes of societal breakdown that lead to the extreme consequences of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes.
Citizenship and Heritage

Overall Expectations

By the end of this course, students will:

CH1 – analyze the changing nature of the relationship between individuals and groups to authority before, during, and after genocide;

CH2 – evaluate the extent to which the rights, privileges, and obligations of citizenship impact on the protection of human rights during times of genocide;

CH3 – demonstrate an understanding of the importance in memorializing genocide as a means of ensuring the legacy of social traditions, values, religion, and art forms.

Social, Economic, Political, and Legal Structures

Overall Expectations

By the end of the course, students will:

S1 – analyze the changing nature of the power relationship between social structures and institutions;

S2 – analyze how economic forces have been used to promote, justify, and counteract genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes;

S3 – analyze the ways that political ideologies, organizations, movements, and structures have been used to defend or undermine individual and collective rights.

Methods of Historical Inquiry

Overall Expectations

By the end of this course, students will:

M1 – use methods of historical inquiry to locate, gather, evaluate, and organize research materials from a variety of sources;

M2 – interpret and analyze information gathered through research, employing concepts and approaches appropriate to historical inquiry;

M3 – communicate the results of historical inquiries, using appropriate terms and
concepts and a variety of forms of communication.
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Email sent April 9, 2014

Good day Mr. Jones,

I am writing to you today to ask permission to use a portion of your book Genocide: A comprehensive Introduction. I have created a workbook to teach the Five Stages of Discrimination as outlined by the Ontario Ministry of Education. This workbook and teacher's manual is to be used specifically with a Grade 11 History Course offered by the OME entitled: History of Genocide and Human Atrocities.

The pages in question that I wish to use in my work are pages 16-20 (history of the definitions of genocide) and pages 26-29 (the other 'cides' of genocide).

If you wish, I would be pleased to forward a copy of my work so that you could see the excerpts I wish to use in context. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your time,

Donita Duplisea
Secondary Teacher and Masters of Education candidate at the University of New Brunswick.

Dear Donita, thanks for your interest in my work. Actually, the whole first chapter is available copyright-cleared for educational use, and is posted to my website at http://www.genocidetext.net/gaci_origins.pdf. So any portions of that chapter (and chapter 6 on the Jewish Holocaust, which is also posted to the website) can be freely used for your purposes. Good luck with your workbook!

Best wishes,

Adam Jones

Adam Jones, Ph.D. • Professor, Political Science • University of British Columbia • IKBSAS • Arts Building • 1147 Research Road • Kelowna, BC, Canada V1V 1V7
Photography: Global Photo Archive: 11,000+ free hi-res images from around the world
Email Sent April 9, 2014

Good day,

I am writing to you today to ask permission to use a portion of your work from your website. I have created a workbook to teach the Five Stages of Discrimination as outlined by the Ontario Ministry of Education. This workbook and teacher’s manual is to be used specifically with a Grade 11 History Course offered by the OME entitled: History of Genocide and Human Atrocities.

The pages in question that I wish to use in my work are the handouts from your website that include: The Bully Cycle; Bully, Bullied and Bystander; and Extraordinary Evil.

I would be pleased to forward a copy of my work so that you could see the excerpts I wish to use in context if you wish. I look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you for your time,

Donita Duplisea
Teacher and Masters of Education candidate at the University of New Brunswick.

Reply received April 9, 2014

Dear Donita,

You are welcome to use the material as long as the credit appears—especially on the Bully Circle which is adapted from Dan Olweus with permission. I would love to see your material and how you are able to use my work in your curriculum. Wishing you the best with your project.

Warm regards,

Barbara Coloroso
The attached is the proper circle to use.
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Bachelor of Education: French and English; University of New Brunswick, 1999

Master of Education: Critical Studies; University of New Brunswick, 2014
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