



PSCU326 DIALOGUES ON DIFFERENCE
IES Abroad Barcelona

DESCRIPTION: In an age marked by an increased polarization about a host of social and political issues, with the on-and off-campus debates about “free speech versus safe spaces”, the need for empathic understanding and the capacity for dialogue becomes all the more important. This course will examine a series of contemporary social issues of local, national, and international importance from multiple perspectives with the goal of a better overall understanding of both the issues at hand as well as the ways in which we engage with them, with the goal of increasing our capacity to engage in meaningful, constructive, and productive dialogue. Because dialogue is the central tool of engagement, we will also engage in a dialogue about dialogue, as it were, exploring different models as well as critiques. This perhaps more important part of the course will involve applying theory and research that can shed light on how it is that we come to adopt the particular positions that we take, with the goal of developing greater agility.

The format of the course will involve two parts. Time will be dedicated to understanding the relevant positions on the social issue in question, and then models of dialogue will be applied. The class will explore a series of core issues such as nationalism, race relations, gender issues, and immigration. In addition, each semester, specific issues will be covered in conjunction with current events and student interests. Various models of dialogue will be explored and in the process, the very notion of dialogue be excavated, drawing from research on decision making, epistemology, and mentalization. The end goal will be to have students develop the capacity to more effectively engage with issues, themselves, and others in relation to contemporary social and political issues.

CREDITS: 3

CONTACT HOURS: 45 hours

LANGUAGE OF PRESENTATION: English

PREREQUISITES: None

ADDITIONAL COST: None

METHOD OF PRESENTATION:

- Lectures: Lectures provide the students with an opportunity to gain an overview of the course content and to clarify issues.
- Class discussion: The aim of class discussions is to facilitate the students’ ability to apply the theoretical material to lived experience. They also offer the student the opportunity to argue their views and hear the perspective of other students on selected topics.
- Experiential activities: Participation in experiential activities allows for the lived experience the “reality” of dialogue applied to difference.
- Small group discussions: Engaging in directed small group discussions allows for participation of each student in the dialogical process as well greater participation in classroom discussions. The group format also allows for a safer context in which to observe the play of dialogue and difference.
- Dialogue paper: Students will craft a paper in which they develop their own approach to dialogue and apply it to a specific conflict.
- Reader: The reader is compiled of a selection of key academic readings, chosen with the aim of providing a general understanding of the subject matter.
- Reading guides: These are provided, where appropriate, to aid the student in focusing on the most relevant information.
- Journals: Students keep “journals” in which they describe and analyze key experiences relevant to the course material. The journals provide students with a means by which to reflect upon and explore their reactions to the material being covered in a more personal manner and receive feedback from the instructor regarding their responses as well as their command of the material.

REQUIRED WORK AND FORM OF ASSESSMENT:

- Active participation and class preparation -10%

Global brilliance begins here.®

Institute for the International Education of Students
Africa | Asia Pacific | Europe | Latin America



- Co-lead a class discussion - 5%
- Reflective Journal -30%
- Midterm -25%
- Dialogue paper -30%
 - Dialogue -10%
 - Dialogue paper -20%

Active Participation and class preparation

Because this seminar is based in dialogue, student participation is critical to individual and group learning. In dialogue, we are all teachers and learners, and therefore have a responsibility to both share our experiences, values, and beliefs, and to listen to others. As such, student participation in class is highly valued and essential to success in the course. Our class will be a collaboration in which our efforts will depend on the exploration of a number of perspectives and viewpoints.

Class participation therefore includes a variety of ways to contribute to the course development, including meaningful contribution to class discussions, small group work, oral and written reflections, and the like. Moreover, students should always come to class prepared through close readings of the required texts beforehand.

Regarding class dialogue, each person in this course has unique prior experiences and a distinctive viewpoint to share. Moreover, the observations and interactions you will have during your experience abroad will be unique as well and framed by prior experience. This offers a great opportunity for us to learn from each other. Though disagreement and even conflict may occur, we expect your cooperation in maintaining an atmosphere of mutual respect through recognition of each other's humanity and intelligence as well as open mindedness toward the communities observed as part of your study abroad experience.

Co-lead a class discussion

Each student will co-lead a class discussion on one of the dialogue topics. Specifically, the task of the student is to facilitate a class dialogue, applying the technique or strategy of their choice.

Reflective Journal

Students will submit reflective journal entries each week. These journals are intended to provide them with the space to reflect on the assigned readings, observations, and enduring questions throughout the seminar. They should incorporate references to key points from the assigned readings and reflections related to dialogue experiences with peers. Rather than identifying the events of class (summarizing) or detailing how they went (describing), students are expected to write about how they experienced the class, pertinent communities, and activities. Reflective writing is a personal response to information, events, and situations – a way for students to process new ways of thinking and learning.

Journal entries must be at least 250 words long each and recommended focus questions will be provided for each journal.

Midterm exam: The midterm exam will consist of a series of short questions related to the dialogues covered, in which the students will be required to identify the specific dialogical positions and challenges in 2 concrete cases and propose possible responses to the difference.

Dialogue paper: For the dialogue itself, in groups, students will prepare for and participate in a dialogue following guidelines based in negotiation and dialogue theory (10%). Students will then write a 2000-word (12 pt., double spaced) paper in which they analyse the dialogue that occurred applying the relevant class concepts (20%).

LEARNING OUTCOMES:

By the end of the course students will be able to:

- Critically interpret theory and research on diversity, culture, identity, and intergroup dialogue.
- Describe and critique popular concepts, beliefs, and perspectives related to contemporary social and political issues
- Compare and contrast on an informed level the different perspectives on key issues, showing an understanding of how these perspectives are developed.

- Analyze different models of dialogue, and the ability to articulate their benefits and limitations.
- Display increased levels of intergroup understanding (e.g., increased levels of perspective taking and social identity awareness) and improved quality of intergroup relationships (e.g., increased levels of comfort in communication with others).
- Explain the basis of perceptions/attitudes toward diversity education opportunities through advocacy and leadership.
- Define the similarities and difference in experiences across social group memberships.
- Work with others through differences, disagreements, and conflicts as opportunities for deeper understanding and transformation.

ATTENDANCE POLICY:

As a member of our class community, you are expected to be present and on time every day. Attending class has an impact on your learning and academic success. For this reason, attendance is required for all IES Barcelona classes, including course-related excursions. If a student misses more than three classes in any course without justification, 3 percentage points will be deducted from the final grade for every additional absence. Seven unjustified absences in any course will result in a failing grade. Absences will only be justified, and assessed work, including exams, tests and presentations rescheduled, in cases of documented medical or family emergencies.

CONTENT:

Session	Content	Required Reading
Session 1 Introduction	Introduction to the course	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buber, M. (2010). <i>I and Thou</i> (pp. 1-10). Clark. • Mayer, B. S. (2010). The dynamics of conflict resolution: A practitioner's guide. John Wiley & Sons. • Lederach, J. P., & Hampson, F. O. (1998). Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies. <i>International Journal</i>, 53(4), 799.
Session 2	Dialogues and difference	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nussbaum, M. (2007). Cultivating Humanity and World Citizenship. <i>Futures</i>, 37–40. • Neil, R. (2017). The Critique of Racial Liberalism: An Interview with Charles W. Mills. Black Perspectives. https://www.aaihs.org/the-critique-of-racial-liberalism-an-interview-with-charles-w-mills/ • Zerilli, L. M. G. (n.d.). Feminist critiques of liberalism. <i>The Cambridge Companion to Liberalism</i> (pp-355-380). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139942478

Session 3	Free speech and safe spaces	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Callan, E. (2016). Education in Safe and Unsafe Spaces. <i>Philosophical Inquiry in Education</i>, 24(1), 64–78. • Garton Ash, T. (2016). Safe spaces are not the only threat to free speech. <i>The Guardian</i> • Mchangama, J. (2018). How censorship crosses borders. <i>Cato Unbound: A Journal of Debate</i>. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2018/06/11/jacob-mchangama/how-censorship-crosses-borders/ • Leaker, A. (2018). Against "free speech". <i>Cato Unbound: A Journal of Debate</i>. https://www.cato-unbound.org/2018/06/13/anthony-leaker/against-free-speech/ • Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2015, 09). The Coddling of the American Mind. <i>The Atlantic Monthly</i>, 316, 42-52.
Session 4	First dialogue: Nationalism: An overview	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Arias-Maldonado, M. (2020). A Genealogy for Post-Truth Democracies: Philosophy, Affects, Technology. <i>Communication & Society</i>, 33(2), 65-78. • Kaufmann, E. (2017). Complexity and nationalism. <i>Nations and Nationalism</i>, 23(1), 6–25. https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12270
Session 5	First dialogue continued: Catalan nationalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oller, J. , Satorra, A. and Tobeña, A. (2019) Secessionists vs. Unionists in Catalonia: Mood, Emotional Profiles and Beliefs about Secession Perspectives in Two Confronted Communities. <i>Psychology</i>, 10, 336-357 • Jaráiz, E., Cazorla, Á., & Rivera, J. M. (2019). The New Components of Catalan Nationalism. <i>Open Journal of Political Science</i>, 9, 163-188. • Barrio, Barberà, O., & Rodríguez-Teruel, J. (2018). "Spain steals from us!" The "populist drift" of Catalan regionalism. <i>Comparative European Politics (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England)</i>, 16(6), 993–1011. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41295-018-0140-3

Session 6	Guest speaker on Catalan nationalism	
Session 7	Truth and Explanations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feldman Barrett, L. (2020). Your brain predicts (almost) everything you do. Mindful. https://www.mindful.org/your-brain-predicts-almost-everything-you-do/ Bardon, A. (2020). Humans are hardwired to dismiss facts that don't fit their worldview. <i>The Conversation</i>. https://theconversation.com/humans-are-hardwired-to-dismiss-facts-that-dont-fit-their-worldview-127168 Mercier, H., & Landemore, H. (2012). Reasoning Is for Arguing: Understanding the Successes and Failures of Deliberation. <i>Political Psychology</i>, 33 (2), 243-258. McIntyre, L. (2018). What is post-truth?. In McIntyre, L. Post-truth (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: MIT Press
Session 8	Second dialogue: Race and racism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yancy, G. (2021). No, Black People Can't be "Racist". Truthout. https://truthout.org/articles/no-black-people-cant-be-racists/ Heath, J. (2021). Why Are Racial Problems in the United States So Intractable? <i>American Affairs</i>, 5(3), 157–84. Horowitz, D., & Perazzo, J. (2013). Black skin privilege and the American dream. <i>Frontpage Magazine</i>. Sherman Oaks, CA: David Horowitz Freedom Center.
Session 9	Second dialogue: Race and racism: Whose privilege?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> McWhorter, J. (2020). The Dehumanizing Condensation of White Fragility. <i>The Atlantic</i>. https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/07/dehumanizing-condensation-white-fragility/614146/ DiAngelo, R. (2011). White fragility. <i>International Journal of Critical Pedagogy</i>, 3 (3), 54-70.

Session 10	Dialogue and self-awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lacewing, M. (2005). Emotional self-awareness and ethical deliberation. <i>Ratio</i>, 18(1), 65–81. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9329.2005.00271.x Lagos, C. M. (2007). The theory of thinking and the capacity to mentalize: a comparison of Fonagy's and Bion's models. <i>The Spanish Journal of Psychology</i>, 10(1), 189–198.
Session 11	Third dialogue: Gender: Mars, Venus, Earth	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zell, E., Strickhouser, J. E., Lane, T. N., & Teeter, S. R. (2016). Mars, Venus, or Earth? Sexism and the Exaggeration of Psychological Gender Differences. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 75(7–8), 287–300. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0622-1 Reis, H. T., & Carothers, B. J. (2014). Black, White, or Shades of Gray: Are Gender Differences Categorical or Dimensional? <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>, 23(1), 19–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2008.09.001 Gray, J. (1992). <i>Men are from Mars, women are from Venus : a practical guide for improving communication and getting what you want in your relationships</i>. New York, NY :HarperCollins.
Session 12	Third dialogue: Gender dynamics on college campuses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feldman Barrett, L. (2018). Why Men Need to Stop Relying on Non-Verbal Consent, According to a Neuroscientist. <i>Time</i> https://time.com/5274505/metoo-verbal-nonverbal-consent-cosby-schneiderman/ Kipnis, L. (2018). <i>Unwanted advances: Sexual paranoia comes to campus</i>. Verso Books. Muehlenhard, C. L., Peterson, Z. D., Humphreys, T. P., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2017). Evaluating the One-in-Five Statistic: Women's Risk of Sexual Assault While in College. <i>The Journal of Sex Research</i>, 0(0), 1–28. Gittos, L. (2018). #MeToo and the dangers of blind belief. <i>Spiked</i>. https://www.spiked-online.com/2018/08/24/metoo-and-the-dangers-of-blind-belief/ Stiebert, J. (2018). Denying rape culture: A response to Luke Gittos. <i>Women's Studies Journal</i>, 32(1), 63-72. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1295014

Session 13	Truth and explanations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lombrozo, T. (2016). Explanatory Preferences Shape Learning and Inference. <i>Trends in Cognitive Sciences</i>, 20(10), 748–759. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.08.001
Session 14	Midterm preparation	
Session 15	Climate change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maslin, M. (2019). The Five Corrupt Pillars of Climate Change Denial. <i>The Conversation</i>. https://theconversation.com/the-five-corrupt-pillars-of-climate-change-denial-122893 Rapier, R. (2018). Indisputable facts on climate change. <i>Forbes</i>. https://www.forbes.com/sites/rrapier/2018/11/29/indisputable-facts-on-climate-change/#21de78663d05 Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate change (NIPCC) (2009). Climate Change Reconsidered. https://www.heartland.org/template-assets/documents/CCR/CCR-I-Executive-Summary.pdf Kotkin, J. (2019). Common Sense versus Climate Hysteria. <i>New Geography</i>. https://www.newgeography.com/content/006405-common-sense-versus-climate-hysteria Hornsey, M. J., Harris, E. A., Bain, P. G., & Fielding, K. S. (2016). Meta-analyses of the determinants and outcomes of belief in climate change. <i>Nature Climate Change</i>, 6(6), 622–626. doi:10.1038/nclimate2943

Session 16	Reproductive rights	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Freed, A. F. (2015). Pro-choice and pro-life. The International Encyclopedia of Human Sexuality, 861–1042. • Shermer, M. (2018). Abortion is a problem to be solved, not a moral one. Scientific American. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/abortion-is-a-problem-to-be-solved-not-a-moral-issue/?utm_source=facebook&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=sa-editorial-social&utm_content&utm_term=health_opinion_text • Weinberg, J. (2019). Philosophers on the ethics and politics of abortion. <i>Daily Nous</i>. https://dailynous.com/2019/06/10/philosophers-on-ethics-politics-abortion/
Session 17	Veganism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Patel, S. (2017) Ethical Perspectives of Veganism. DIALOGUES@ RU, 227. • Dickstein, J. (2017). Rethink your understanding of veganism. Medium. https://jonathandickstein.medium.com/rethink-your-understanding-of-veganism-39413185742 • Clark, M.A., Springman, M., Hill, J., & Tilman, D. (2019). Multiple health and environmental impacts of foods. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences Nov 2019, 116 (46) 23357-23362; DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1906908116 • Holler, S., Cramer, H., Liebscher, D., Jeitler, M., Schumann, D., Murthy, V., Michalsen, A., & Kessler, C. S. (2021). Differences Between Omnivores and Vegetarians in Personality Profiles, Values, and Empathy: A Systematic Review. <i>Frontiers in psychology</i>, 12, 579700. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.579700
Session 18	When dialogue does not work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keshen, R. (2010). The Strains of Dialogue. In N. A. Davis, R. Keshen, & J. McMahan (Eds.), <i>Ethics and Humanity: Themes from the Philosophy of Jonathan Glover</i>. Oxford: Oxford Scholarship Online. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof • Roncáková, T. (2015). Reconciling conservatives and liberals: Mission impossible? <i>Revista Româna De Jurnalism Si Comunicare</i>, 10(4), 28-40. • Mahrouse, G. (2010). “Reasonable accommodation” in Quebec: the limits of

		<p>participation and dialogue. <i>Race & Class</i>, 52(1), 85–96.</p>
Session 19	Decolonization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2020). Decolonization is not a metaphor. <i>Tabula Rasa</i>, (38), 61-111. • Garba, T. and Sorentino, S.-M. (2020), Slavery is a Metaphor: A Critical Commentary on Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang's "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor". <i>Antipode</i>, 52: 764-782.
Session 20	Socialism vs capitalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gilabert, P. & O'Neill, M. (2019). Socialism. In Zalta, E. N. (ed.) <i>The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i> https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/socialism/ • Almås, I., Cappelen, A. W., & Tungodden, B. (2020). Cutthroat Capitalism versus Cuddly Socialism. <i>The Journal of Political Economy</i>, 128(5). https://doi.org/10.1086/705551 • Moss W.G. (2020). Capitalism Versus Socialism: Did Capitalism Really Win? History News Network. https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/173969
Session 21	Immigration: Us versus them	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eshbaugh-Soha, M., & Juenke, E. G. (2022). The Politics of the President's Immigration Rhetoric. <i>American Politics Research</i>, 50(1), 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X211042283 • Pérez-Escobar, M. & Noguera-Vivo, J.M. (2021). Anti-immigrant hate speech as propaganda: A comparison between Donald Trump and Santiago Abascal on Twitter. In <i>Hate Speech and Polarization in Participatory Society</i> (pp. 147-162). Routledge.

Session 22	Political ideology: Divided States of America	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yengar, S. (2016). Editorial foreword: E Pluribus Pluribus, or divided we stand. <i>Public Opinion Quarterly</i>, 80(Specialissue1), 219–224. https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfv084 Raskin, J. D. (2022). Using context-centered and person-centered therapies to unite a divided nation. <i>The Humanistic Psychologist</i>, https://doi.org/10.1037/hum0000276
Session 23	Political Ideology: Perspectival bases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sloman, S. A., & Rabb, N. (2016). Your Understanding Is My Understanding. <i>Psychological Science</i>, 27(11), 1451–1460. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616662271 Brandt, M. J., Reyna, C., Chambers, J. R., Crawford, J. T., & Wetherell, G. (2014). The Ideological-Conflict Hypothesis. <i>Current Directions in Psychological Science</i>, 23(1), 27–34. https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413510932
Session 24	<p>The Magic of Dialogue</p> <p>Wrap up and final review</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yankelovich, D. (2001). <i>The Magic of Dialogue</i>. New York: Simon and Schuster.

REQUIRED READINGS:

- Abu-lughod, L. (2002). Do Muslim Women Really Need Saving? Anthropological Reflections on Cultural Relativism and Its Others. *American Anthropologist*, 104(3), 783–790.
- Almås, I., Cappelen, A. W., & Tungodden, B. (2020). Cutthroat Capitalism versus Cuddly Socialism. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 128(5). <https://doi.org/10.1086/705551>
- Arias-Maldonado, M. (2020). A Genealogy for Post-Truth Democracies: Philosophy, Affects, Technology. *Communication & Society*, 33(2), 65–78.
- Bardon, A. (2020). Humans are hardwired to dismiss facts that don't fit their worldview. *The Conversation*. <https://theconversation.com/humans-are-hardwired-to-dismiss-facts-that-dont-fit-their-worldview-127168>
- Barrio, Barberà, O., & Rodríguez-Teruel, J. (2018). "Spain steals from us!" The "populist drift" of Catalan regionalism. *Comparative European Politics (Houndmills, Basingstoke, England)*, 16(6), 993–1011. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41295-018-0140-3>
- Boxell, L., Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2017). Is the Internet Causing Political Polarization? Evidence from Demographics. Retrieved from <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23258> <http://www.nber.org/papers/w23258.ack>
- Brandt, M. J., Reyna, C., Chambers, J. R., Crawford, J. T., & Wetherell, G. (2014). The Ideological-Conflict Hypothesis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(1), 27–34. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721413510932>
- Buber, M. (2010). *I and Thou* (pp. 1-10). Clark.
- Callan, E. (2016). Education in Safe and Unsafe Spaces. *Philosophical Inquiry in Education*, 24(1), 64–78.
- Clark, M.A., Springman, M., Hill, J., & Tilman, D. (2019). Multiple health and environmental impacts of foods. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* Nov 2019, 116 (46) 23357–23362; DOI: [10.1073/pnas.1906908116](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1906908116)
- DiAngelo, R. (2011). White fragility. *International Journal of Critical Pedagogy*, 3 (3), 54-70.

- Dickstein, J. (2017). Rethink your understanding of veganism. Medium. <https://jonathandickstein.medium.com/rethink-your-understanding-of-veganism-39413185742>
- Eshbaugh-Soha, M., & Juenke, E. G. (2022). The Politics of the President's Immigration Rhetoric. *American Politics Research*, 50(1), 117–130. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1532673X211042283>
- Feldman Barrett, L. (2020). Your brain predicts (almost) everything you do. Mindful. <https://www.mindful.org/your-brain-predicts-almost-everything-you-do/>
- Feldman Barrett, L. (2018). Why Men Need to Stop Relying on Non-Verbal Consent, According to a Neuroscientist. Time <https://time.com/5274505/metoo-verbal-nonverbal-consent-cosby-schneiderman/>
- Freed, A. F. (2015). Pro-choice and pro-life. *The International Encyclopedia of Human Sexuality*, 861–1042.
- Garba, T. and Sorentino, S.-M. (2020), Slavery is a Metaphor: A Critical Commentary on Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang's "Decolonization is Not a Metaphor". *Antipode*, 52: 764–782
- Garton Ash, T. (2016). Safe spaces are not the only threat to free speech. *The Guardian*
- Gilabert, P. & O'Neill, M. (2019). Socialism. In Zalta, E. N. (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2019/entries/socialism/>
- Gittos, L. (2018). #MeToo and the dangers of blind belief. *Spiked*. <https://www.spiked-online.com/2018/08/24/metoo-and-the-dangers-of-blind-belief/>
- Gray, J. (1992). *Men are from Mars, women are from Venus: a practical guide for improving communication and getting what you want in your relationships*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.
- Heath, J. (2021). Why Are Racial Problems in the United States So Intractable? *American Affairs*, 5(3), 157–84.
- Holler, S., Cramer, H., Liebscher, D., Jeitler, M., Schumann, D., Murthy, V., Michalsen, A., & Kessler, C. S. (2021). Differences Between Omnivores and Vegetarians in Personality Profiles, Values, and Empathy: A Systematic Review. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 579700. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.579700>
- Hornsey, M. J., Harris, E. A., Bain, P. G., & Fielding, K. S. (2016). Meta-analyses of the determinants and outcomes of belief in climate change. *Nature Climate Change*, 6(6), 622–626. [doi:10.1038/nclimate2943](https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2943)
- Horowitz, D., & Perazzo, J. (2013). Black skin privilege and the American dream. *Frontpage Magazine*. Sherman Oaks, CA: David Horowitz Freedom Center.
- Iyengar, S. (2016). Editorial foreword: E Pluribus Pluribus, or divided we stand. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(SpecialIssue1), 219–224. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfv084>
- Jaráiz, E., Cazorla, Á., & Rivera, J. M. (2019). The New Components of Catalan Nationalism. *Open Journal of Political Science*, 9, 163–188.
- Kaufmann, E. (2017). Complexity and nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, 23(1), 6–25. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nana.12270>
- Keshen, R. (2010). The Strains of Dialogue. In N. A. Davis, R. Keshen, & J. McMahan (Eds.), *Ethics and Humanity: Themes from the Philosophy of Jonathan Glover*. Oxford: Oxford Scholarship Online. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof>
- Kipnis, L. (2018). *Unwanted advances: Sexual paranoia comes to campus*. Verso Books.
- Kotkin, J. (2019). Common Sense versus Climate Hysteria. *New Geography*. <https://www.newgeography.com/content/006405-common-sense-versus-climate-hysteria>
- Lacewing, M. (2005). Emotional self-awareness and ethical deliberation. *Ratio*, 18(1), 65–81. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9329.2005.00271.x>
- Lagos, C. M. (2007). The theory of thinking and the capacity to mentalize: a comparison of Fonagy's and Bion's models. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 10(1), 189–198
- Lanford, Anna (2017) "Sex Education, Rape Culture, and Sexual Assault: the Vicious Cycle," *Furman Humanities Review*: Vol.
- Leaker, A. (2018). Against "free speech". *Cato Unbound: A Journal of Debate*. <https://www.cato-unbound.org/2018/06/13/anthony-leaker/against-free-speech/>
- Lederach, J. P., & Hampson, F. O. (1998). Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies. *International Journal*, 53(4), 799.
- Lombrozo, T. (2016). Explanatory Preferences Shape Learning and Inference. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 20(10), 748–759. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.08.001>
- Lukianoff, G., & Haidt, J. (2015, 09). The Coddling of the American Mind. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 316, 42–52.
- Mahrouse, G. (2010). "Reasonable accommodation" in Quebec: the limits of participation and dialogue. *Race & Class*, 52(1), 85–96.

- Maslin, M. (2019). The Five Corrupt Pillars of Climate Change Denial. The Conversation. <https://theconversation.com/the-five-corrupt-pillars-of-climate-change-denial-122893>
- Mayer, B. S. (2010). The dynamics of conflict resolution: A practitioner's guide. John Wiley & Sons.
- McCall, L. (2005). The Complexity of Intersectionality. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 30(3), 1771–1800.
- Mchangama, J. (2018). How censorship crosses borders. Cato Unbound: A Journal of Debate. <https://www.cato-unbound.org/2018/06/11/jacob-mchangama/how-censorship-crosses-borders/>
- McIntyre, L. (2018). What is post-truth?. In McIntyre, L. Post-truth (pp. 1-15). Cambridge: MIT Press
- McWhorter, J. (2020). The Dehumanizing Condescension of White Fragility. *The Atlantic*. <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/07/dehumanizing-condescension-white-fragility/614146/>
- Mercier, H., & Landmore, H. (2012). Reasoning Is for Arguing: Understanding the Successes and Failures of Deliberation. *Political Psychology*, 33 (2), 243-258.
- Moss W.G. (2020). Capitalism Versus Socialism: Did Capitalism Really Win? History News Network. <https://historynewsnetwork.org/article/173969>
- Muehlenhard, C. L., Peterson, Z. D., Humphreys, T. P., & Jozkowski, K. N. (2017). Evaluating the One-in-Five Statistic: Women's Risk of Sexual Assault While in College. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 0(0), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1295014>
- Na Nash, J. (2008). re-thinking intersectionality. *Feminist Review*, 89, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1057/fr.2008.4>
- Neil, R. (2017). The Critique of Racial Liberalism: An Interview with Charles W. Mills. *Black Perspectives*. <https://www.aaihs.org/the-critique-of-racial-liberalism-an-interview-with-charles-w-mills/>
- Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate change (NIPCC) (2009). Climate Change Reconsidered. <https://www.heartland.org/template-assets/documents/CCR/CCR-I-Executive-Summary.pdf>
- Nussbaum, M. (2007). Cultivating Humanity and World Citizenship. *Futures*, 37–40.
- Oller, J., Satorra, A. and Tobeña, A. (2019) Secessionists vs. Unionists in Catalonia: Mood, Emotional Profiles and Beliefs about Secession Perspectives in Two Confronted Communities. *Psychology*, 10, 336-357
- Patel, S. (2017) Ethical Perspectives of Veganism. *DIALOGUES@ RU*, 227.
- Pérez-Escobar, M. & Noguera-Vivo, J.M. (2021). Anti-immigrant hate speech as propaganda: A comparison between Donald Trump and Santiago Abascal on Twitter. In *Hate Speech and Polarization in Participatory Society* (pp. 147-162). Routledge.
- Rapier, R. (2018). Indisputable facts on climate change. *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/rrapier/2018/11/29/indisputable-facts-on-climate-change/#21de78663d05>
- Raskin, J. D. (2022). Using context-centered and person-centered therapies to unite a divided nation. *The Humanistic Psychologist*, <https://doi.org/10.1037/hum0000276>
- Reis, H. T., & Carothers, B. J. (2014). Black, White, or Shades of Gray: Are Gender Differences Categorical or Dimensional? *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 23(1), 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijrobp.2008.09.001>
- Rockhill, G. (2017) Free Speech is not the Issue; Intellectual Power is. *Counterpunch* (available online at: <https://www.counterpunch.org/2017/04/05/free-speech-is-not-the-issue-intellectual-power-is/>)
- Roncáková, T. (2015). Reconciling conservatives and liberals: Mission impossible? *Revista Română De Jurnalism Si Comunicare*, 10(4), 28-40.
- Rorty, R. (1986). On ethnocentrism: A reply to Clifford Geertz. *Michigan Quarterly Review*, 25(3), 525–534.
- Shermer, M. (2018). Abortion is a problem to be solved, not a moral one. *Scientific American*. https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/abortion-is-a-problem-to-be-solved-not-a-moral-issue/?utm_source=facebook&utm_medium=social&utm_campaign=sa-editorial-social&utm_content&utm_term=health_opinion_text
- Sloman, S. A., & Rabb, N. (2016). Your Understanding Is My Understanding. *Psychological Science*, 27(11), 1451–1460. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616662271>
- Stiebert, J. (2018). Denying rape culture: A response to Luke Gittos. *Women's Studies Journal*, 32(1), 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2017.1295014>
- Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2021). Decolonization is not a metaphor. *Tabula Rasa*, (38), 61-111.
- Weinberg, J. (2019). Philosophers on the ethics and politics of abortion. *Daily Nous*. <https://dailynous.com/2019/06/10/philosophers-on-ethics-politics-abortion/>
- Yancy, G. (2021). No, Black People Can't be "Racist". *Truthout*. <https://truthout.org/articles/no-black-people-cant-be-racists/>

- Yankelovich, D. (2001). *The Magic of Dialogue*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Yengar, S. (2016). Editorial foreword: E Pluribus Pluribus, or divided we stand. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 80(Specialissue1), 219–224. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfv084>
- Zell, E., Strickhouser, J. E., Lane, T. N., & Teeter, S. R. (2016). Mars, Venus, or Earth? Sexism and the Exaggeration of Psychological Gender Differences. *Sex Roles*, 75(7–8), 287–300. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-016-0622-1>
- Zerilli, L. M. G. (n.d.). Feminist critiques of liberalism. *The Cambridge Companion to Liberalism* (pp-355-380). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139942478>

RECOMMENDED READINGS:

- Adams, M., W. J. Blumenfeld, C. Castaneda, H. W. Hackman, M. L. Peters, & X. Zuniga (Eds.). *Readings for diversity and social justice*. New York: Routledge, 2013.
- Agenor, Pierre Richard and Canuto, O, “Gender Equality and Economic Growth in Brazil”, WorldBank, 2013.
- Araújo, Ana Lúcia. *African Heritage and Memories of Slavery in Brazil and the South Atlantic World*. New York: Cambria Press, 2015.
- Bar-On, Dan. *Bridging the Gap: Storytelling as a Way to Work through Political and Collective Hostilities*. Hamburg: Koerber Stiftung, 2000.
- Boxell, L., Gentzkow, M., & Shapiro, J. M. (2017). Is the Internet Causing Political Polarization? Evidence from Demographics.
- Bruneau, Thomas. *The Church in Brazil: Politics of Religion*. University of Texas Press, 1982.
- Buarque de Holanda, Sergio. *Roots of Brazil*. University of Notre Dame Press, 2012.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Dessen, M. A., & Torres, C. V. “Family and socialization factors in Brazil: An Overview”. In W. J. Lonner, D. L. Dinnel, S. A. Hayes, & D. N. Sattler (Eds.), *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture* (Unit 13, Chapter 2). 2002. <http://www.wvu.edu/culture/DennenTorres.htm>
- Fredrikson, George. *Racism: A Short History*. Princeton University Press, 2003.
- Freyre, Gilberto. *The Masters and the Slaves*. New York: Knopf, 1946.
- Gates Jr, Henry Louis. *Black in Latin America*. New York University Press, 2011.
- Laymon, K. *Our Kind of Ridiculous: You, Me, and Blackness as Probable Cause* (2013). <http://gawker.com/5990859/our-kind-of-ridiculous-you-me-and-blackness-as-probable-cause>
- Lederach, John Paul. *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washington: U.S. Institute of Peace Press, 1997.
- Mayer, Bernard. *The Dynamics of Conflict Resolution: A Practitioner’s Guide*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.
- Mlekoday, M. *Via Negativa: Poetic Notes on White Boy Privilege*. (2013) <http://gawker.com/via-negativa-poetic-notes-on-white-boy-privilege-675311425>
- Richards, Sam *A radical experiment in empathy*. 2010
- Sivers, D. (2010) First Follower: Leadership Lessons from the Dancing Guy. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fW8amMCVAJQ>
- Stephens, B. (2017). Leave Your Safe Spaces: The 2017 Commencement Address at Hampden-Sydney College. *New York Times*
- Tankle, L. (2012). The Only Thing We Have to Fear is Fear Itself: Islamophobia and the Recently Proposed Unconstitutional and Unnecessary Anti-religion Laws. *The William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 21(1), 273-302.
- Telles, Edward. *Race in Another America: The Significance of Skin Color in Brazil*. Princeton University Press, 2005.
- Tuvel, R. (2017). In Defense of Transracialism. *Hypatia*, 32(2), 263–278. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hypa.12327>