

PS 372 Psychological Perspectives on War and Peace Syllabus

Instructor: Professor Kathleen Malley-Morrison

Office address: Psychology Dept. Rm 112B

Phone: 617-353-3628

Office Hours: Wed 11-12, & by appointment

Blog: <http://engagingpeace.com>

Email (preferred to phone messages, checked daily): kkmalley@comcast.net

Course Description: The areas of war and peace studies are interdisciplinary, with contributions from psychology, philosophy, theology, all of the social sciences, and evolutionary biology; however, this course will focus primarily on *psychological* perspectives on war and peace. That is, the course will address the question of *why men (and women) fight*, what variables influence civilian support for governmental aggression, and research on protest, apology, and reconciliation following conflict. More specifically, the course will consider why some men (and some women) support the decisions of their leaders to go to war, to kill, to torture, and to tolerate the deaths of civilians—to support and do all of these things even when they violate international laws and human rights agreements, and to do so while considering themselves to be moral human beings. The course will also address issues related to conflict resolution and peace building, why some men and women become war resisters, the factors related to the quest for peace, and what it takes to have a culture of peace.

Issues of war and peace are clearly critical and you are expected to think critically about them. Similarly, you are expected to consider readings, films, and posts and comments on the blog engagingpeace.com critically. This does not mean simply criticizing everything you read, see, and hear. It means being thoughtful and analytical and making every effort to consider the material objectively and learn from it, whatever your prior assumptions are. The course will be highly interactive—a virtual forum for discussing the assigned readings as well as your own and your classmates' comments on the blog engagingpeace.com.

REQUIREMENTS

I. Reading Assignment

A selection of articles for each class is available through the course Blackboard Learn page. You are expected to read at least two of the listed articles for each class—the starred selection plus at least one additional article. You should be prepared to discuss those two articles in class, within the context of mini-discussion groups led by yourself or a classmate; each week these discussion groups will address questions about the week's reading as formulated by Professor Malley-Morrison for Week 2 and by the student mini-discussion group leaders in subsequent weeks.

II. Class participation/Mini-Discussion Groups

*To facilitate discussion of the readings, and help you keep up with the weekly reading assignments, each class will include approximately 6 small mini-discussion groups. In these groups, leaders will first engage group members in discussing among themselves their group's questions (as formulated by the leaders and posted on Blackboard Learn a week before each class) and then briefly share the highlights of their discussions with the larger class.

*You should come to every class prepared to discuss the week's readings either as discussion group leaders or as members of a discussion group.

*To prepare to participate as members of discussion groups: you should access the materials and questions posted on Blackboard Learn a week in advance of each class and prepare to discuss them in relation to the two articles you read. Bring at least one page of notes with your name on the page and submit it to your group leader each week. Following each week's discussions, the discussion leaders will submit typed summaries of the discussions that they led, along with each group member's page of notes, to Professor Malley-Morrison as email attachments.

III. Discussion group leadership papers

*All students will sign up to lead two small group mini-discussion sections within the larger class during the semester—one during each half of the semester.

*Leaders have four responsibilities for each of their two discussion leader assignments:

(1) Formulate a question or questions that will build on and call for reflection on the key article (starred) for the week as well as the other optional articles from which each student will choose to read at least one in addition to the key article.

(2) Post their questions (not the answers!) on the Blackboard Learn site at least seven days before the class in which they will serve as a leader;

(3) Prepare for and lead an in-class discussion of the group's responses to the question/questions, and

(4) Within a week following the discussion they have led, write and submit a brief summary of the group's responses to the questions raised for discussion and relate those responses to appropriate material in the key article for the week, and the other articles selected by group members. In their typed summaries, leaders should provide the names of the students in their group, indicate which answer/ideas the students provided, and attach each student's page of notes. The summaries, like all written assignments for the course, should be submitted in Word as email attachments to Professor Malley-Morrison as well as being posted on Blackboard Learn. All students are invited to submit replies to each other's posted summaries.

*Format: The well-developed mini-discussion summaries should make several explicit references to the key article as well as to each of the other readings for the week. Each summary should begin with the leader's name and the week in which the discussion took place. It should also list the names of the students in the discussion group. Leaders should then provide the questions they posted in advance of leading the mini-discussion, and the major points made by the contributors to the mini-discussion. Remember that part of the leaders' responsibility will be to help the students in their groups make the connections that provided the basis of the week's questions—and to help explore additional connections that can be made, based on the group's input.

*To begin, on Blackboard Learn, write your name on the sign-up sheet and indicate:

1) your top four choices (rank-ordered) for your first leadership responsibility (during the first half of the course) and

2) your top four choices (rank-ordered) for your second leadership responsibility (during the second half of the course). Please then submit your completed sign-up sheet to Professor KMM as an email attachment. If possible, you will be assigned to one of your top two choices for each half of the semester, although assignments will be made on a first come, first serve basis, depending on the order in which the rank-ordered requests are submitted.

IV. Mini-Term Papers

During the course of the semester, you will complete two mini-term papers. The preparation of each of these two papers will involve submitting five comments to the blog <http://engagingpeace.com>, drawing links between the reading you are doing each week and any posts on the blog published within the 2015 calendar year. You are encouraged to make

connections between the work done for the mini-discussions and the material in the 10 posts you select for analysis. *N.B. In addition to submitting five individual comments to the blog before each of the specified due dates, you need to make a copy of each of your posted comments and paste them into a MSWORD document that you will submit as an email attachment to Professor KMM twice during the semester for grading—Oct 14 for the first paper and Dec 9 for the second paper.* If for any reason you are uncomfortable submitting comments to the blog, talk with Professor KMM to determine an alternative assignment.

V. Presentation

For the final class, be prepared to participate in a brief but engaging group presentation regarding a selected topic based on the semester’s reading and discussions relevant to issues of war and peace.

Academic Conduct: Remember that it is your responsibility to be familiar with the CAS Academic Conduct Code (available in CAS 105) and my responsibility to report any cases of suspected academic misconduct to the Dean’s Office. If you submit an assignment that is judged by the Dean as plagiarized (after a hearing in front of a student/faculty Academic Conduct Committee), I will have to assign a grade of F to that assignment.

GRADING: 100 point basis

- 1) *Two Discussion Leader Summaries, 20 points each*
- 2) *Two Mini-Term Papers, 20 points each*
- 3) *Participation (both oral and as indicated in weekly notes for mini-discussions), 10 points*
- 4) *Final Presentation, 10 points*

CALENDAR

Date	Topic	Assignment
W Sept 2	Intro to course	
W Sept 9	Psychological perspectives	
W Sept 16	Foundations of violence	
W Sept 23	Radicalization & Extremism	
W Sep 30	Torture	
W Oct 7	Terrorism & counter-terrorism	
W Oct 14	Conflict resolution	first mini-term paper
W Oct 21	Culture of peace	
W Oct 28	protests & activism	
W Nov 4	apology & forgiveness	
W Nov 11	Reconciliation & peacebuilding	
W Nov 18	Conferences	
W Nov 25	Thanksgiving break, no class.	
W Dec 2	Presentations	
W Dec 9	Presentations	second mini-term paper

Psychology of War and Peace Required and Recommended Reading

Read at least two articles for each class; always read the article with a *.

W Sept 9 Psychological Perspectives on War

- *Eidelson, R. J. & Eidelson, J. I. (2003). Dangerous ideas: Five beliefs that propel groups toward conflict. *American Psychologist*, 58, 182-192.
- Marsella, A. (2012, November 9). The United States of America: A “culture of violence.” *Transcend*.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the perpetration of inhumanities. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 3, 193–209.
- Hedges, C. (2003). War is a force that gives life meaning. [Excerpt from book]
- Hirsch-Hoefler, S., Canetti, D., Rapaport, C., & Hobfoll, S. E. Conflict will harden your heart: Exposure to violence, psychological distress, and peace barriers in Israel and Palestine. *British Journal of Political Science*,
- Stevens, M.J. (2005). What is terrorism and can psychology do anything to prevent it? *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 23, 507-526.
- Sternberg, RJ (2003). A duplex theory of hate: Development and application to terrorism, massacres, and genocide. *Review of General Psychology*, 7(3), 299-328.
-

Sullivan, M. (2014, December 22). The “Breaking bad” Syndrome? UCLA anthropologist exposes the moral side of violence. UCLA Newsroom. Available from <http://newsroom.ucla.edu/releases/breaking-bad-syndrome-UCLA-anthropologist-exposes-moral-side-violence>

W Sept 16 Cognitive Foundations of Violence

- *Aquino, K., Reed, A., II., Thau, S. & Freeman, D. (2006). A grotesque and dark beauty: How moral identity and mechanisms of moral disengagement influence cognitive and emotional reactions to war. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*
- McAlister, A. L., Bandura, A., & Owens, S. V. (2006). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in support of military force: The impact of Sept. 11. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25, 141-165.
- Lakoff, G. Metaphors and war, Pt. I. Retrieved from: http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/sixties/HTML_docs/Texts/Scholarly/Lakoff_Gulf_Metaphor_1.html
- Malley-Morrison, K, & Caputi, R. (2013, Fall). Moral disengagement: America’s missing conscience. *The War Crimes Times*, 4-5.
- Malley-Morrison, K., Oh, D. Y., Wu, T., & Zaveri, T. (2009). Moral disengagement and engagement. *Beliefs and Values*, 1, 151-167.
- Finkel, N. J. (2006). Moral monsters and Patriot Acts: Rights and duties in the worst of times. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 12, 242–277.
- Castanheira, C., Corgan, M. & Malley-Morrison, K. (2008, Spring/Summer). Assumptions about national security in the U.S. & U.K. *Peace Psychology*, 17(1), 9-11.

W Sept 23 Extremism

- *Ashy, M.A. & Malley-Morrison, K. (2007, Spring). Attitudes towards war in the Middle East from an extremism model perspective. *International Psychology Bulletin*, 11, 8-12.
-

- Moghaddam F. M. (2005). The staircase to terrorism: A psychological exploration. *American Psychologist*, 60, 161-169.
- Bélanger, J.J., Caouette, J., Sharvit, K., & Dugas, M. (2014). The psychology of martyrdom: Making the ultimate sacrifice in the name of a cause. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 107(3), 494-515.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Belanger, J., Gelfand, M. G., Gunaratna, R., Hetiarrachchi, M., Reinares, F., . . . Sharvit, K. (in press). Terrorism, a (self) love-story: Redirecting the significance-quest can end violence. *American Psychologist*.
- Corner, E. & Gill, P. (2014) A False Dichotomy? Mental illness and lone-actor terrorism. *Law and Human Behavior*
- Pilecki, A., Muro, J.M., Hammack, P.L. & Clemons, C.M. (2014). Moral exclusion and the justification of U.S. counterterrorism strategy: Bush, Obama, and the terrorist enemy figure. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of the Peace Society*.20, 285-299.
- Canetti, D., Hall, B.J., Rapaport, C., & Wayne, C. (2013). Exposure to terrorism and Political extremism: a stress-based process. *European Psychologist*

W Sept 30 Perspectives on Torture

- *Arrigo, J.M. (2004). Utilitarian argument against torture interrogation of terrorists (2004). *Science and Engineering Ethics* , 10, 1-28.
- Fiske, S. T., Harris, L. T., & Cuddy, A. J. C. (2004, November 26). Why ordinary people torture enemy prisoners, *Science*, 306, 1482-1483.
- Annas, G. W. (2005). Unspeakably cruel: Torture, medical ethics, and the law. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 352, 2127-2132.
- Bufacchi, V. & Arrigo, J. M. (2006). Torture, terrorism and the state: A refutation of the ticking-bomb argument. *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 23, 355-373.
- Soldz, S. (n.d.) Deception detection and torture: the American Psychological Association serves the Intelligence Services. In P. Zwerlin, *The CIA on campus*.
- Soldz, S. (2011). Fighting torture and psychological complicity. *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*.
- Eidelson, R., Pilusuk, M., & Soldz, S. (n.d.) The dark side of “comprehensive soldier fitness.”
- Malley-Morrison, K. & Castanheira, H. (2008). Can governmental aggression be acceptable: Views from the United States and Spain. *International Psychology Bulletin*, 12, 16-21.

Wed Oct 7 Terrorism and counter-terrorism

- *LoCicero, A. (2015). Domestic consequences of US counter-terrorism efforts: Making it harder to prevent homegrown terrorism. *The Open Psychology Journal*, 8, 32-37.
- Sinclair, S., & LoCicero, A. (2010) Do fears of terrorism predict trust in government? *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 1, pp.57 – 68.
- Lo Cicero, A. (2015). Youth must be prevented from joining terrorist groups. *Fair Observer*.
- Mythen, G. & Walklate, S. (2006). Communicating the terrorist risk: Harnessing a culture of fear? *Crime Media Culture*, 2, 123-142.
- Cohrs, J. C. Maes, J. Moschner, B. Kielmann, S. O. (2003). Patterns of justification of the United States' "war against terrorism" in Afghanistan. *Psicología Política*, 27, 105–117.
- Bourne, L.E., Healy, A.F., & Beer, F.A. (2003). Military conflict and terrorism: General psychology informs international relations. *Review of General Psychology*, 7, 189-202.
-

- Van Stekelenburg, J. (2013). The political psychology of protest: Sacrificing for a cause. *European Psychologist*, 18(4):224–234.
- Marsella, A.J. (2014, Oct 20). The paradoxical consequences of USA counter-terrorism programs. *Transend*.

Wed Oct 14 Conflict resolution

- *Marsella, A.J. (2005). Culture and conflict: Understanding, negotiating, and reconciling conflicting constructions of reality. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 651-673.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2000). From intractable conflict through conflict resolution to reconciliation: Psychological analysis. *Political Psychology*, 21, 351–366.
- Blight, J. G. & Lang, J. M. (2005). Lesson Number one: “Empathize with your enemy.” *Peace and Conflict*, 10, 349–368.
- Bonta, B. D. (1996). Conflict resolution among peaceful societies: The culture of peacefulness. *Journal of Peace Research*, 33, 403-420.
- Kaufman, S. J. (2006). Escaping the symbolic politics trap: Reconciliation initiatives and conflict resolution in ethnic wars. *Journal of Peace Research*, 43, 201–218.

Wed Oct 21 Culture of peace

- *Marsella, A.J. A culture of peace.
<http://www.humiliationstudies.org/documents/MarsellaCultureofPeaceChart.pdf>
- De Rivera, J. (2004). Assessing the basis for a culture of peace in contemporary societies. *Journal of Peace Research*, 41, 531-548.
- Brenes, A. (2001). Psychological contributions to building cultures of peace. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 7, 99–107.
- Fernández-Dols, J.M., Hurtado de Mendoza, A., & Jiménez de Lucas, I. (2004). Culture of peace: An alternative definition and its measurement. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 10, 117–124.
- Castanheira, C., Corgan, M. & Malley-Morrison, K. (2007, Fall/Winter). Is peace possible? Citizens’ views. *Peace Psychology*, 16(2) 8-9.
- Schwebel, M., (2001). Promoting the culture of peace in children. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 9, 235-257.
- Staub, E. (2013). A world without genocide: Prevention, reconciliation and the creation of peaceful societies. In Vollhardt, J. & Bilewicz, M. (eds). The aftermath of genocide: Psychological perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues*

Wed Oct 28 Protests, resistance, and activism

- *Schwebel, M. (2005). Peace activism and courage. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 11, 397-408.
- Bennet, W. L., Breunig, C., & Givens, T. (2008). Communication and political mobilization: Digital media and the organization of Anti-Iraq War demonstrations in the U.S. *Political Communication*, 25(3), 269-289.
- Dimitrova, Daniela V. & Strömbäck, Jesper (2005): ”Mission Accomplished? Framing of the Iraq War in the Elite Newspapers in Sweden and the United States”. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies* vol. 67(5), 399-417.
- Berg, D. N. (2011). Dissent: An intergroup perspective. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 63(1), 50-65.
- van Stekelenburg, J. The political psychology of protest: Sacrificing for a cause. *European Psychologist*, 18(4),
-

Staub, E. (2015). From heroic rescue to resistance in the prevention of mass violence: Active bystandership in extreme times and in building peaceful societies. In Schroeder, D.A., & Graziano, W.G. (Eds.). The Oxford handbook of prosocial behavior. New York: Oxford University Press.

Staub, E. (2014). Obeying, joining, following, resisting and other processes in the Milgram studies, and in the Holocaust and other genocides: Situations, personality, bystanders. In Miller, A. G., Haslam, S. A. & Reicher, S. (eds.). Milgram at 50: The enduring relevance of psychology's most famous studies. Journal of Social Issues, 70(3), 501-515

Wed Nov 4 Apology and forgiveness

*Ashy, M., Mercurio, A., & Malley-Morrison, K. (2010). Apology, forgiveness, and reconciliation: An ecological world view framework. *Individual Differences Psychology, 8*(10), 17-26.

Malley-Morrison, K., Schwartz, Z., & Cantrell, C. (2013). Selected characteristics of the non-violent character: Compassion, forgiveness, endorsing human rights, and transcending moral disengagement. In Vinod Kool (Ed.), *Non-violence*. Special issue of Gandhi Marg Journal. (Invited).

Staub, E. et al. Healing, reconciliation, forgiving and the prevention of violence after genocide or mass killing: An intervention and its experimental evaluation in Rwanda

Borris, E. R. (2005). Political forgiveness and international affairs. Presidential Address Peace Psychology Division. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association.

Staub, E. (2014). Reconciliation between groups: Preventing (new) violence and improving lives. In, Deutsch, M., & Coleman, P. *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice*. Third Edition. Jossey-Bass Publishers

Staub, E. (2007). Preventing violence and terrorism and promoting positive relations between Dutch and Muslim communities in Amsterdam. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 13*(3), 333-361.

Wed Nov 11 Reconciliation and rebuilding

*Bar-Tal, D. (2000). From intractable conflict through conflict resolution to reconciliation: Psychological analysis. *Political Psychology, 21*, 351–366.

Corgan, M., Malley-Morrison, K., & Castanheira, H. (2008). Peace restoration: An ecological formulation. *Peace Psychology, 16* (2), 8-9.

Gibson, J. L. (2006). Overcoming apartheid: Can truth reconcile a divided nation? *ANNALS, AAPSS, 603*, 82-110.

Staub, E. (2006). Reconciliation after genocide, mass killing, or intractable conflict: Understanding the roots of violence, psychological recovery, and steps toward a general theory. *Political Psychology, 27*, 867-894.

Staub, E., Pearlman, L.A., Weiss, G., & van Hoek, A. (). Public education through radio to prevent violence, promote trauma healing and reconciliation, and build peace in Rwanda and the Congo. (unpublished paper).

Schwebel, M. (2011). Victory over structural violence. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 17*, 85-99

Staub, E. (2005). The roots of goodness: The fulfillment of basic human needs and the development of caring, helping and nonaggression, inclusive caring, moral courage, active bystandership, and altruism born of suffering. In Carlo, G and Edwards, C. (Eds.) *Moral Motivation through the Life Span: Theory, Research,*

Applications. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Lincoln: Nebraska University Press.

Staub, E. (2007). Preventing violence and terrorism and promoting positive relations between Dutch and Muslim communities in Amsterdam. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 13*(3), 333-361.

For examples of a post from summer 2012 with many student comments and replies, see <http://engagingpeace.com/?p=4875>

Guidelines for grading comments and replies:

Criteria	Poor (C)	Good (B-, B, B+)	Excellent (A-, A)
Understanding of Reading	Unclear whether student did reading; citations lacking or unconnected with post	Student provides evidence that he/she has done reading; several citations to reading assignments in each comment	Student shows consistently good understanding of reading; has several citations to reading assignments in each comment
Contribution to course dialogue re: readings & issues	Student's contributions do not add any richness to the conversation, and may repeat what others have said. The contributions are not in student's own words, but merely copy information on sites.	Many of the student's postings are meaningful. In most cases, the contributions are well connected to the post and thread of conversation.	The majority of the student's posts are meaningful, integrated with the material in the posts and thread of discussion, and add to the learning experience. The student asks very good questions or makes important comments that generate good discussion in the class, either online or face-to-face. Student responds to posts, and incorporates or builds on the ideas of others.
Respect	Student does not show respect for other's opinions.	Student respects other student's opinions.	Student is clearly collaborative with others in the class in many situations (e.g., bringing in new information useful to others). Student is respectful of other student's opinions, even when disagreeing with them.