



## **Identifying the “Other”: Exploration of Ethics and the Other with Case Studies from South Africa and Yugoslavia**

*Katie M. Willett, 2015 CTI Fellow  
Independence High School*

This curriculum unit is recommended for:  
World History, 9<sup>th</sup> grade  
American History I or American History II, 11<sup>th</sup> grade  
AP US History, 11<sup>th</sup> grade

**Keywords:** Ethics, nationalism, South Africa, Yugoslavia, Other

**Teaching Standards:** See [Appendix 1](#) for teaching standards addressed in this unit.  
**Synopsis:** This curriculum unit is designed to have students study how the concept of nationalism can create the sense of an “other.” Students will be presented with case studies of the former Yugoslavia and South Africa’s development of nationalism and will be directed to create connections to their own nationalism and treatment of the “other.”

*I plan to teach this unit during the coming year to approximately 80 students in the Academy of International Studies World History and American History courses*

*I give permission for the Charlotte Teacher’s Institute to publish my curriculum unit in print and online. I understand that I will be credited as the author of my work*

## Identifying the “Other”: Exploration of Ethics and the Other with Case Studies from South Africa and Yugoslavia

*Katie M. Willett*

### Unit Introduction

In 1945 the world made a commitment that “Never Again” would an atrocity such as the German Holocaust occur. And yet, there have been instances of “ethnic cleansing” in places such as Rwanda, the Balkans, and Darfur—just to mention a few larger areas—in the years since World War II. In each of these instances, the “cleansing” was prompted by something or someone who was trying to define what was “good” about a group of people and what was “bad” about a group of people in an effort to create a more perfect society. They were classic instances of identifying someone as the “other.”

Throughout my teaching career, I have been horrified by my students’ fascination with the atrocities of the Holocaust. My students tend to be severely disappointed when I tell them that we don’t cover the Holocaust in depth, as the lens we use to focus our analysis requires a survey of the issues that impacted America and the timetable just doesn’t allow for an in-depth study of a single world event. However, their curiosity got me wondering: Why in the world are they fascinated with the horror of genocide? Are the stories sensationalized, appealing to our human emotions? Are we far enough removed from that time period in history that the fingers don’t turn back and point at us? And why don’t students beg me to go over the Rwandan genocide or the Darfur genocide, or even indeed the “ethnic cleansing” of the Balkans? Is it because they don’t know about those? Or is the Holocaust an easy way to talk about Hitler and his megalomania and leadership?

I found that I had more questions than answers when it came to my students’ seeming obsession. And my reflection led me to have a discussion with students about the reasons I teach history and the passion I have for it. I told them that teaching history helps me to analyze issues from different perspectives to try to get a clearer picture of the whole puzzle. That I cannot guarantee were I in that time and space that I wouldn’t be someone who willingly turned over an “undesirable” to an SS Officer. And I told them that through my studies I am able to better prepare myself to understand the “other” and myself better so as not to immediately assume that the “other” is bad.

Ultimately, I decided that a key to understanding the Holocaust is understanding the process by which differences among people – the recognition of groups as “others” – are magnified and exploited in ways that lead to violence, even genocide. For many of my students their first encounter with the “other” happens early in childhood, though they may not realize the implications of it. This may include meeting someone who has a different hair color, sense of style, or religion. It is always a little difficult to know what to do when encountering differences and in many cases the result is bullying or the

isolation of oneself. Schools and parents can easily recognize these encounters with the “other” and take steps to correct the behavior (and hopefully the thinking) of the child. Students at the high school level still come in to contact with peers and faculty who may be different from them, but many will have found coping mechanisms. For example, a student may ascribe to a certain social group – I am a nerd and my friends are nerds. Though society has “declared war” on bullying, schools are still dealing with instances of bullying and singling out of the “other” although now the platform has moved on to social media, which unfortunately has a much wider audience with sometimes faster and longer impact.

How my students handle the “other” and how societies have handled their perceived “others” lie on a continuum. I do not mean to suggest that a student who is bullying or being bullied has any similarity to a participant or victim of the Holocaust, but in both cases there has been a definition created that identifies someone as an “undesirable” or as having “undesirable characteristics” who therefore cannot be a member of the group. Indeed, the study of history often includes analyzing the transfer of power from one group to another. So what can my students learn from history to help them understand their world?

I teach in the Academy of International Studies, a school within a school model, that has at its core a desire to empower students with skills to become effective global citizens. One of the key elements of the school is to provide students with different perspectives across various disciplines to help them understand their world better. I am proposing that my curriculum unit help to meet these goals through a case study analysis of instances in which a society has identified an “other.” The unit looks at the results of that identification for the society and at leaders who have sought to help to create the division – heal the nation.

The case studies I intend to investigate in my curriculum unit are South Africa and the former Yugoslavia. In each of these countries there was a distinct separation between “us” and “them” that led to armed conflict and an attempt to extinguish the group identified as the “other.” In both countries there was a sense of nationalism, a definition of what it meant to be South African or Yugoslavian. The people of these areas intended to rid their nations of peoples who did not fit what they wanted the nation to be. In that sense, they believed that they were making their nation better. In Yugoslavia the distinctive characteristics that made one unacceptable were bound within religion and beliefs, and could easily be hidden from others. Yet in South Africa, the distinguishing characteristics couldn’t be hidden; it was literally one’s skin color. So why did South Africa survive as a nation while Yugoslavia disintegrated?

Throughout this curriculum unit, I want my students to be able to understand the process for defining the “other,” and the consequences it entails. I want these two case

studies to lead them towards understanding that identity is important, but it is also important to consider different perspectives.

### **What Makes A Nation A Nation?—Seminar Influence**

Prior to 2004 if someone had asked me to define my identity, I would never have used “American” as a part of my answer. In 2004 I had the opportunity to live and work in the United Kingdom and quickly discovered that I was quickly labeled as an “American” – sometimes before people had even met me. Even though I was in a country that spoke the same language I did, I quickly found out that I was very much an outsider. I did things and said things that weren’t quite “right” for the place I was living. The people I met were kind and didn’t point out the differences in my rhythm of speech or my odd habits, but I could feel that I was outsider. It was the looks that I got as I crossed the path without staying on the sidewalk, and as I laughed just a little too loudly or used the word “crap” when talking with an elder. There was no other way to describe how I felt or why I did the things I did, but to use the word “American.” I enjoyed my time in Britain, but felt as if I had found a new piece of my identity—I now knew what it meant to be an American. It went far deeper than eating hot dogs on the Fourth of July.

However, as I learned more about this part of my identity, I began to question what it actually meant to be American. Why did the borders I was born within determine a part of my identity? Are the characteristics I classify as American inherent or learned? Could I change my American identity? For example, if I moved to a different country, could I become British, or somehow lose my “Americanness?” These are questions that are not considered in the lives of every day Americans but as a history teacher I teach them nearly everyday.

As a teacher, I am constantly trying to help my students find and become comfortable with their identity—to know that the trying time of adolescence eventually ends. I do this while teaching them the identity of other peoples during different time periods and asking students to understand how events fit together and led to the world we have today. This is most evident when I’m teaching that prior to 1830, the majority of Americans wouldn’t have identified themselves as American. This is foreign for my students. How can someone who lives in America not consider herself American?

The students have also been conditioned to read maps and be able to identify a certain location. In school, students are mostly exposed to political maps, where the boundaries between countries are drawn in easily identifiable lines that help students locate countries. Rarely have I had a student who has questioned these boundaries. When shown a physical map, the students have a hard time understanding that those clearly-marked lines from the political map are nowhere to be found.

This lack of comprehension made teaching the events just before and after the Great War a little more difficult. Students had to understand that concept of nationalism was new, that there were some people who didn't identify with the governments that controlled the borders they lived within. It is also important for students to understand the motivation nationalism can provide, especially in some cases to define an "other," with all the consequences that entails.

This seminar helped to form this curriculum unit in that we were exploring major concepts in the development of nationalism. One of the most important and influential has been the Social Identity Theory—the need humans have to separate ourselves into groups – and how that relates to the development of nationalism.

### **School Information**

Independence High School is the flagship comprehensive secondary high school of the Mint Hill suburb of Charlotte, North Carolina and is a part of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg School system. CMS is the second largest school system in North Carolina and nineteenth in the United States. It has a rich tradition of community involvement, partnerships, rigorous course offerings and a diverse worldly population. The school serves students from 9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades and employs around 200 faculty and staff to serve the 2,500+ students.

Independence takes pride in providing public school students many options with which to tailor their education to meet their individual needs. As students enter in their 9<sup>th</sup> grade year they can choose to either join the Academy of International Studies (AIS), Academy of Engineering (AOE) or the Freshman Academy. In each of these academies, students are placed in to cohorts and each have a director to oversee the program. In addition to these academies, Independence provides rigorous courses including Career and Technical (CTE), College Board Advanced Placement (AP), English as a Second Language (ESL), Air Force Junior Reserve Officer Training (AF-JROTC), Exceptional Children (EC), Fine Arts, and an Online Learning Lab.

Independence has undergone significant changes in the last few years. The school was classified as a Title I school that served mostly minority and economically disadvantaged students in 2006. In 2004, Independence was identified as a "failing school, where less than 40% of students passed their End-Of-Course exams—the then measure of school success. With specific concentrated effort by Independence's principals and faculty, the school lost the "failing" status when the EOC pass rate moved to 80% in less than four years.

In 2010 CMS district redrew the boundaries and the demographics of Independence shifted to what it is today. While every school in the district had their

boundaries redrawn, this became a delicate transition, as Independence was welcoming families from its fierce rival, Butler High School. With the previous “failing school” stigma, it took leadership from the principal to navigate Independence through the transition. The result was more enhanced involvement from the community and a removal of the stigma of Independence from the community.

Today Independence High School is one of the most racially and ethnically diverse schools within the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools district. The demographics of the school break down as follows:

Asian: 6.3%  
Black: 31.7%  
Hispanic: 25%  
American Indian: .4%  
White: 37.7%  
More than one race: 8.7%

Female: 47.3%  
Male: 52.7%

Limited English Proficiency: 11.1%  
Free/Reduced Lunch: 55.2%  
Student With Disabilities: 8.8%

The diverse background of students enhances their education and most students tend to get along really well. There is a renewed sense of school spirit pervasive in the building and culture days are planned to help students understand the backgrounds of all students present.

Schools in North Carolina are now graded with letter grades and for the 2014-2015 school year Independence received a grade of a “B.” Independence also received accolades as being the number one school in North Carolina in terms of student growth. The faculty at Independence are divided up by departments based upon subjects and then are subdivided in to Professional Learning Communities (PLC) by specific content areas. Teachers use their PLCs to plan and differentiate curriculum and to design common assessment and then review data to drive instruction.

Independence along with all of CMS is moving towards a “bring-your-own-technology” initiative in order to help students learn skills necessary for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Technology use in the classroom can present some difficulties in terms of classroom management and so the policy at Independence is that the teachers regulate student use of technology during instructional time. In addition to students bringing their own technology, teachers are each equipped with an individual laptop. At least two desk top computers are in each classroom. The majority of teachers have either a Smart Board or

a Promethean Board, which are used to enhance teaching and learning opportunities. The school is also moving towards providing each classroom with Chrome Books and there are at least three computer labs that teachers may utilize during the instructional day. Technology is used throughout the school.

## **Rationale**

The Academy of International Studies operates as a small school-within-a-school at Independence High School. It was officially started with a grant from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation in partnership with the Asia Society in 2004, although there has been a strong focus on international education since Independence's inception. Prior to the Academy of International Studies there was an International Baccalaureate Program and an International Studies Program. Both were influential in getting the Bill and Melinda Gates grant.

The purpose and mission of the AIS Program is to provide students with the skills necessary to empower them to be global citizens in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. As a part of the program, students are required to complete all courses required for graduation by the State of North Carolina, enroll in AIS Seminar courses (Freshman, Sophomore, Junior and Senior) and complete at least 120 hours of service learning (80 Local; 40 International.)

AIS students are challenged to learn how to be leaders and how to think and consider different perspectives in order to make them ready to interact with people upon their graduation from the program. In order to do this, the AIS faculty aligns curriculum to the Common Core Standards, the North Carolina Essential Standards, and to the Global Competency standards. The AIS Seminar courses, one for each year of a student's enrollment, is designed to provide opportunities for students to explore the concepts of identity, community, perspective, communication that eventually will culminate in how to take action.

Adolescents tend to be focused on their own development that it can be difficult to encourage them to consider the perspective of the "other." There is a fear that if one considers a different perspective, that it might threaten the belief systems taught by a familial unit. The AIS Seminar courses are designed to help them do that.

This unit is designed for an AIS Seminar course to help them identify perspective and community and the implications therein. This curriculum unit could also be used in a history class as a supplement to learning about genocide or the Holocaust. It will require students to hone the skills of chronological thinking, historical comprehension, historical analysis and interpretation, and historical research.

## **Unit Objectives**

This unit will accomplish the following objectives:

1. Students will be able to explain what is meant by the term “other.”
2. Students will be able to identify specific historical instances where there has been an “us” and “them” mentality.
3. Students will be able to explain the concept of nationalism in connection to the theory of the “other.”

## **Historical Background and Content**

### *Nationalism*

Nationalism is a powerful motivator. In part, it helps us to form an identity and purpose in our lives. It gives us a sense of belonging, knowing almost subconsciously, that the people within the nation are the same. Nationalism also creates stark differences. Those who live outside my borders aren't me, and so therefore are not the same as me, and are therefore inferior, alien, or frightening. This can be reflected in something as mundane as food preparation preferences, or as serious as development of ethnocentrism.

What happens when a nation itself decides that portions of the people within its borders don't belong? How are these people identified? How does a person know if he or she is the “in” or “out” group? What happens to those people? Indeed, what happens to the country? Can it ever be “whole” again? What implications does this process have for the rest of the world?

Though many countries across the world identify those who belong and those who don't to varying degrees, there are two specific where the process of “othering” threatened the survival of the nation. In former Yugoslavia, the differences were slight and in some cases fabricated. In South Africa, the identifier was worn on the skin.

### *Former Yugoslavia*

The modern day countries of Serbia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Slovenia, Croatia, Montenegro and Macedonia together made up the former communist nation of Yugoslavia. These countries lie at the crossroads of ancient worlds, and their culture reflects the intersection of the Holy Roman Empire, Ottoman Empire and Slavic rule. The countryside is dotted with Catholic and Orthodox churches and Islamic mosques. In many ways it is a prime example of cultural diffusion.

Due to the strategic location of these countries, many wars have been fought over the territory. The Ottoman Turks, the Holy Roman Empire and the Russian Empire have at various times controlled it. In spite of, or perhaps due to, these cultural influences the

people of the region developed distinct identities. Just prior to 1914 a wave of nationalistic sentiment rolled through these regions as they wanted to either rule themselves or join a different ruler. The Great War (World War I) was sparked by of this unrest. (Though it should be noted that there are many different complex matters that also led to the Great War).

The end of World War I and the Versailles Treaty created the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, which was renamed the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1929. In early 1941, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was invaded by the Nazi regime. The French resistance movement did a lot to help free the country and so after the war the king of Yugoslavia recognized the Federal Democratic Yugoslavia, which had been inspired by the French resistance movement. The monarchy was officially dissolved in 1945 and the country was renamed Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia in 1946. The collection of communist Balkan states were united under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito who ruled the area as a president for life from 1963 until his death in 1980.

In 1963, Yugoslavia officially changed its name to Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Each individual republic and province had its own president, constitution and supreme court and prime minister. Communist party leaders for each of the areas were also influential.

The Federal President, Josip Tito and Communist Party rulers governed Yugoslavia in ways that aimed to squash overt nationalism. They believed it was important to unify the country because during World War II the Nazis and Fascists had encouraged and fanned the flames of difference between the regions. Pointing out the differences it made the regions fight against each other and helped the Nazis rule the country in a divide and conquer method. During the war, some Bosniak nationalists attacked Serbs allied with the Axis powers. The Serbs fired off attacks to the Bosniaks and Croats and the Nazis heartily endorsed the radical Croat nationalistic force of the Ustaste. Tito and party leaders wanted to focus on the whole rather than individual regions and nations.

Tito was able to keep control and to minimize regional nationalism through the use of his secret police. His political enemies tended to disappear, as did those of his advisors who were critical of him. He was supported by the West because he was not affiliated with the Soviet bloc and his style of communism wasn't Soviet style of communism. He encouraged the various regions within his country to identify as first with Yugoslavia and only secondarily with their ethnic region. Each area spoke the same language, though with minor differences in word choice and inflection, and each person was allowed to practice the religion of his or her choice. But Tito made sure that each area knew that they were Yugoslavian first and foremost. (Give an example here for how he did that.)

Even though they were all Yugoslavian, each of the regions developed distinctive characteristics that made it possible to identify the region people originated in. Sometimes language was the give-away, in the slang or the accent a person used. Other times it was in the person's name, or via a religious symbol the person wore. Yet if one remained quiet and did not wear any distinctive markings, then others might not be able to identify one's region of origin.

Tito didn't make plans for a successor until it was almost too late. He then decided to let each of the regions have their own president with the concept that each region's president would act on a council that would act together to make the best decisions for the whole of Yugoslavia.

The regions that made up Yugoslavia host a great deal of ethnic and religious diversity, which made uniting the republics difficult to say the least; ethnic tensions further intensified upon Tito's death in 1980. Agitation for separation began as early as 1981 in the province of Kosovo as the people there protested and demanded an autonomous Kosovo. Serbia, the largest province quickly suppressed this rebellion.

In 1986, Serbia, under the guidance of Slobodan Milosevic, sought to gain more control than had previously been granted Serbia. The Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts published *The Memorandum*, which did a great deal to spur on Serbian nationalism. The *Memorandum* listed nationalistic grievances and outlined some points of fear for Serbs to rally around. The language is as follows:

Except during the period of the NDH (the Independence State of Croatia, proclaimed in 1941 by the pro-Nazi Ustase), Serbs in Croatia have never been as endangered as they are today. The resolution of their national status must be a top priority political question. If a solution is not found, the consequences will be damaging on many levels, not only for relations within Croatia but also for all of Yugoslavia.<sup>1</sup>

While the document itself doesn't create nationalism, it expresses sentiments that many Serbs shared and it allowed those seeds of nationalism to increase. It also inspired many to follow the leadership of Milosevic. Milosevic sought to increase Serbia's authority – which had been greatly reduced by the 1974 Constitution – and through negotiations was able to strengthen Serbia's voting power in the Presidential Council.

Serbia's enhanced powers sparked riots from ethnic Albanian miners in Kosovo, which evolved in to a conflict between ethnic Albanians and non-ethnic Albanians. That, in turn, worsened already-strained ethnic relations. The province of Slovenia also indicated its support for the Albanians, which added to these tensions. Serbia responded by sending a brutal police force to the regions to quell the riots. This resulted in a mass emigration of Albanians from the Kosovo region. This incident showed that the

Yugoslavian republics were not in agreement as to how incidents should be handled and indicated that there was some work to be done to create a more unified Yugoslavia.

The League of Communists of Yugoslavia gathered in January of 1990 to determine the future of Yugoslavia. At the conference there was a wide disparity between the outcomes each of the provinces desired. Slovenia, with support from Croatia, supported reform, while Milosevic advocated for even more power for the Serbs. Tensions increased when the Croatian and Slovenian delegations left the conference, which resulted in the dissolution of the communist party in Yugoslavia.

The result of this conference was what we now term the Yugoslavian Wars. With the dissolution of communism, each of the provinces elected a different government with a different agenda. In Croatia and Slovenia, the communist party willingly gave up power and the two countries moved towards democracy. This angered Serbia, whose elections results in a communist Serbia whose parties tended to favor a more unified Yugoslavia.

Increasing tensions resulted in Croatia's decision to secede from Yugoslavia and form an independent Croatia, though this wouldn't be formally announced until 1991. The decision intensified ethnic tensions. There were ethnic Serbs who were living in Croatia who did not want to live in an independent Croatia because that would result in the demotion of their status. War broke out when Croatia tried to replace Federal Yugoslavian police with Croatian police. A war in Bosnia-Herzegovina broke out for similar reasons shortly after.

The wars lasted for different lengths of time for different reasons in the various provinces. The Slovene war was over within a week. The Bosnian and Croatian wars took much longer to conclude. In both Bosnia and Croatia, ethnic cleansing became a component of the war. Within provinces there were regions that boasted clusters of different ethnicities. Nationalist feelings stirred up by the war and political events drove the majority in each region to encourage the departure of one particular ethnicity.

The "other" defined in these situations were not determined by skin color but by language dialects, names, and religious symbols. Should one walk by another person and not speak it would be difficult to determine what his or her ethnicity was. Yet, the sides in this scenario "knew" who each other were. These diverse groups had intermingled for generations prior to this particular surge in nationalism. Leaders of Serbia and the other regions used nationalism as a dividing factor and when they redefined nationalism; they made it an exclusive identity that prevented others from joining. In addition, not only did this type of nationalism exclude certain people; it also encouraged its members to remove anyone who did not fit the nationalist ideal.

## *South Africa*

The modern day country of the Republic of South Africa first had contact with Europeans with the exploration voyages of the Portuguese. Both the Dutch Afrikaners and the British Empire were European powers that colonized South Africa. This colonization led to increasing tensions with the native Xhosa and other Sub-Saharan peoples and had some severe implications for the country of South Africa.

Moving to South Africa was a grim experience for many Afrikaners as the environment was very harsh and much different than the terrain they had left at home. As the Afrikaners encountered the natives of South Africa, they immediately assessed the local tribes as “bad” or (in our language) “other,” and put policies into effect to ensure that Xhosa or other Sub-Saharan ethnicities were synonymous with undesirable. In South Africa, the color of one’s skin would determine one’s class and status.

These decisions led to the disenfranchisement of South African Blacks for the majority of the country’s history; the treatment of South African Blacks was codified into law. The practice of apartheid was strict legal segregation in which the rights and movements of Blacks were monitored and restricted; it lasted from 1948 through 1994. South Africa became a republic in May of 1961 and the new government kept the policy of apartheid, even though there was significant international and pressure to desist from the policy.

There was strong resistance within the country as well that took the form of both violent and non-violent protests including marches, bombings, strikes and other means. The African National Congress (ANC) and the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) were some of the more active resistance organizations. International pressure continued to increase in the form of boycotts and sanctions and yet the policy still continued.

As the ANC and PAC worked to end apartheid their methods became more militant. There were numerous cases of protestors working for the ending of apartheid as the South African government worked to suppress these protests. One of the more famous protestors was Nelson Mandela, who after a series of arrests, finally was arrested for conspiracy to overthrow the government and sentenced to life in prison.

P.W. Botha, known as the Big Crocodile, was in significant leadership roles in South Africa from 1978 to 1989. During his tenure of leadership, he continued to support apartheid, though he did make some progressive measures such as legalizing interracial marriage. He also encouraged the government to start talks with Nelson Mandela, although he still refused to negotiate with the ANC or give political power to Blacks, and it is generally acknowledged that his response to activists against apartheid was the most brutal of any leader. He was known to have authorized state police to take out known activists to lessen their power and influence. Yet while he was ordering his police to

monitor the anti-apartheid forces, he was also moving Nelson Mandela to more comfortable accommodations and sending some of his closest advisors to talk with Mandela to see if there could be a way to make peace with the ANC.

As Botha was making moves to talk with Mandela, he suffered a stroke that resulted in F.W. de Klerk being named acting president. He subsequently was elected to his own five year term. During his presidency, de Klerk lifted the ban on the ANC and released major political prisoners, including Nelson Mandela.

The months after Mandela's release are perhaps the most important. Mandela, with his extraordinary ability to forgive and his relentless work ethic made it a priority to understand and form relationships with all the parties involved in making a more unified South Africa. In prison, Mandela had studied the Afrikaners and knew the motivations of the people who imprisoned him. As such, he was able to converse with some difficult men following his release, which helped to create important and necessary relationships. He talked to de Klerk and tried to assure him there would be a peaceful transition of power. He also tried to form a dialogue with Constand Vilojen who was leading a military force for an all-white South Africa. Mandela also opened conversation with militant black leaders who were in favor of an all-black South Africa. Though Mandela became the instrument that allowed these groups to slowly come to share power, it is the way that he redefined South African nationalism that created a lasting nation state.

Mandela's inauguration as the first Black president of South Africa resulted in mixed emotions from the people of South Africa. There were whites who assumed Mandela and his ANC would seek retribution and there were some in the ANC and PAC who were in favor of such a move. There were those in the Black community who advocated similar sentiments and wanted to completely suppress the white population with the same treatment inflicted upon them. By working with leaders of nearly every perspective, Mandela was able to prevent this from happening. Mandela's focus was on forgiveness and reconciliation.

One of his main areas of focus was on the Afrikaners' favorite past time, rugby. For years the international community had shunned the Springboks, the South African rugby team. Mandela encouraged the lifting of the bans and encouraged and even negotiated at times with the ANC for the Springboks' survival. Through an intentional campaign and under the leadership of Mandela and François Pienaar (the Springbok captain) the Springboks' success mirrored the sentiments of the newly coined Rainbow Nation.

There were other elements that encouraged this reconciliation. There was the adopted of the two national anthems, Die Stem van Suid Afrika and Nkosi Sikele Afrika. These served as co-national anthems until 1997 when the two were merged into one. Mandela also reached out to former leaders in the apartheid regime, even laying a wreath

at the statue of the Daniel Theron, a prominent leader in Afrikaner history. A new South African flag was created to represent the diverse people of South Africa.

The “other” in the history of South Africa was defined based on the color of one’s skin; it was taught from birth to its citizens. Though there was agitation from Blacks to overthrow the system and just as much resistance from the white population to keep the status quo, through the leadership and the willingness to forgive on both sides, the status of the “other” began – and continues – to evolve. The national identity of South Africa used to be one of apartheid; it has changed to that of the Rainbow Nation. It went from exclusive membership to inclusive membership.

### *Comparing the Nationalism of Yugoslavia to South Africa*

Strife and discord is a common theme in each of these countries’ histories. The ways in which each of these countries formed their ideas of nationalism influenced how the “other” was identified. In each of these histories there were a large number of players, only a few of whom are mentioned here, and a multitude of mitigating factors that resulted in the modern day outcomes.

There are a variety of ways that these histories can provide lessons for personal and national introspection. What is ethical in identifying someone as different? Is it what we do with the defined differences that determine the good or bad of the action? What actions should an individual take with regards to the nation? Should individuals listen to the leaders who rise? In the case of Yugoslavia, Milosevic was interested in unifying the country for the purpose of Serbian power, while Mandela was interested in redefining the sense of nationalism in the country. The following series of lessons will guide students through an investigation of these questions.

## **Teaching Strategies**

### Collaborative Groups

Students will be required to work in collaborative groups. This strategy reflects the 21<sup>st</sup> century skills, by requiring and encouraging students to collaborate to discuss a relevant solution to a hypothetical problem. Teachers should purposefully pair students with the intent to match their skills and abilities. This can happen in multiple ways with the students choosing their own partners or at the teacher’s discretion. Most generally, I like the strategy where the teacher assigns the groups. This ensures that all skills and abilities are matched appropriately. As students work through discussion they will demonstrate and explore global competency skills that require collaboration, effective speaking and writing skills to enhance communication through the entire group.

## Research

Students will also need to use their research skills in order to complete this unit. This will require students to use the Internet as well as some print sources to evaluate for accuracy and change this information into workable data to be used to understand the case studies. This is a strategy that will require teacher to ensure that students are able to evaluate web-based sources for their accuracy and authenticity. This strategy engages all students in the building of 21<sup>st</sup> century skills

## Think-Pair-Share

A strategy that allows students to create an individual thought and then turns and discusses their individual thoughts with a partner. The idea that the two partners come to an understanding of the concept directed to discuss by the instructor. Students should then share responses. This strategy allows students to talk and share even when the response is not directed specifically at the teacher.

## Argumentative Essay

To demonstrate their acquired knowledge, students will need to produce an argumentative essay on the topic of power with a social structure, economy and political arena. The essay will require students to utilize their knowledge learned from each of the case studies from Yugoslavia and South Africa. In argumentative writing, students are required to investigate a topic, generate and evaluate evidence to establish a position on the topic in a concise style of writing. Students will need to ensure they have a concise and clear thesis statement to hold together the essay and to prove the points they are trying to make within the paper. It is essential that students provide factual evidence to support the analysis derived from their research.

## Case Study Method

In the case study method, students will apply knowledge learned by examining a problem or issue through a different lens. Sometimes the case is a fictional account, other times the case is real. In this unit, the cases will be real and students will have to identify instances where there was an “other” and the ramifications from it.

## **Classroom Activities**

This unit is designed to encompass a two week time period. The curriculum may be condensed or expanded to meet the needs of the students.

Day 1—What is the “other?”

### *Purpose*

The teacher will lead the students through an exploration of what is the “other.”

### *Activities*

The teacher will instruct student to reflect on the word “other,” and then guide the students through the students’ responses. Anticipated responses would include students giving examples of choosing one item over another. Other student responses may include the theme of “different.” The teacher should guide students through the discussion to end up with all students understand that when someone refers to the “other” it is in reference to something that is inherently different than the subject talking about it. It should be made aware that students

The teacher should post the question, “How do you know when someone or something is the “other?” on the board. Then the teacher should ask the students to turn to their partners and discuss this prompt. The teacher should then circulate and hear the responses that the students are saying. After gathering the class back together, the teacher should call on students to report out what they heard someone else say. The goal of the discussion is for students to point out what are differences (skin color, clothing preferences, economic income, sexual orientation) and what are some of the responses people have to those differences.

The teacher should pass out a puzzle, named here as Puzzle #1 for clarity, that should already be in clear plastic bags for students. The teacher will then ask the students to put together the puzzle in pairs. Puzzle #1 will just be a series of squares, with no over laps. The students will have to put these pieces together with no spaces guiding them.

Some students may struggle with this activity, as there is no “right” way to put these squares together. There are no jutting out pieces, nothing to effectively connect the pieces together. When the students raise this concern, the teacher should direct students to use their best judgment. After most students have created some sort of shape, the teacher should move on to the next step.

The teacher should pass out a second puzzle, named here as Puzzle #2 for clarity, that should already be in clear plastic bags for students. The teacher will then ask the students to put together the puzzle in pairs. Puzzle #2 will look much more like a traditional jigsaw puzzle where the pieces are coordinated to interlock together.

Students will find this one much easier to “put together.” and may say so. Students will probably be able to put this puzzle together much more quickly. The teacher should wrap this part of the lesson up and move to the Reflective Writing Activity.

Once each pair of students have both of the puzzles “put together” they should leave them out in front of them on their desk, and answer the following questions on a separate sheet of paper.

- a. What was your experience putting Puzzle #1 together? What made it easy? What made it difficult?
- b. What was your experience putting Puzzle #2 together? What made it easy? What made it difficult?
- c. What are the similarities between Puzzle #1 and Puzzle #2?
- d. What are the differences between Puzzle #1 and Puzzle #2?
- e. Which puzzle represents how people interact with each other? Why do you think that puzzle does this?
- f. Which puzzle represents how countries interact with each other? Why do you think that puzzle does this?

The goal of the activity is that students are able to start to understand that countries and people are not “island” working separately to put pieces together and stay by themselves, but that people are always linked and there’s always something that overlaps between them. The teacher can lead the students through a discussion about the responses from this activity, making sure that students understand that countries and people consistently interact and connect.

Read Martin Neomoller’s poem, *First They Came for the Socialists*

Students should read this poem silently, by themselves. The teacher can lead students through the analysis and historical context of the poem to ensure understanding. Students should walk away with the understanding that at the beginning of the Holocaust, many Germans turned a blind eye because they didn’t want to be the one who was taken away.

The following questions need to be discussed:

- a. Who is the author of this poem?
- b. What happens in the poem?
- c. How do you think these people identified themselves as part of “them?” (I.e. How did they know that they wouldn’t be taken at the beginning?)
- d. Why do you think this man is lamenting at the end of the poem?
- e. What lessons should we learn from this poem?

Notes: The teacher should lead the students through notes that clearly explain and identify “identity, nationalism, ethics, other, us vs. them” concepts.

## Day 2—Nations protecting themselves

### *Purpose*

Students will understand the concept of nationalism and why nations wish to protect themselves.

### *Activities*

Students will reflect and write in a journal to the prompt: What is nationalism? How do you know that you are from the United States?

Pass out a physical map of the world, referred to here as Map #1 for clarity. Students should work in pairs to complete the following activity.

- a. On your map use a marker or crayon to identify the borders of these countries. Be sure to make sure that you label the name of the countries:
  - a. United States of America
  - b. Colombia
  - c. Afghanistan
  - d. United Kingdom
  - e. Slovenia
  - f. Italy
  - g. Argentina
  - h. Russia
  - i. China
  - j. Israel

The students should not use any cellphones or any texts to help them identify these countries. It is anticipated that students will find this activity difficult. The teacher should circulate and speak with different groups and prompt students to consider why this is a difficult task.

Once it is evident that all groups have identified as many countries on the maps as they can, the teacher should lead the students in a discussion. The teacher should ask students to identify why they found this task so difficult. It is anticipated that students will respond because they aren't looking at a political map (though they might not know the name of the map itself) and therefore the boundaries aren't clear. The teacher should then ask the students why it is important to know where each of the countries begin and end. Anticipated answers would be something like we need to know the boundaries of countries to tell where someone belongs. This should introduce the concept of "nationalism."

The teacher should then pass out a political map of the world, referenced here as Map #2, for clarity. Map #2 is a political map of the world. The teacher should then ask the

students to compare the map that the students drew their responses on to the actual physical map.

In pairs, students should talk about the following:

- a. How accurate were they at drawing the actual borders?
- b. Does it matter if the borders are accurately?
- c. How does someone know they belong to China?

The teacher should then ask students to think back to Puzzle #1 and Puzzle #2 from the previous day and ask the students, “Which puzzle most accurately represents nations?”

Students should be directed to use some of the things they talked about in the Think-Pair-Share. Some students may say that that the jigsaw puzzle (Puzzle #2) most accurately reflects that of nations because the borders all over the world intersect. Some students might say that nations are like the squares, (Puzzle #1) because even though they connect, they stay within themselves, or just want to be by themselves and even though they interact with other countries, doesn’t mean that they want to “be like” them.

How do we know that we are American?

The teacher should ask students to respond and write a list on the board. Some students may say that what makes us American is the Fourth of July, hot dogs, etc. The teacher should end the conversation asking if there are differences between Americans? After a few responses, the teacher should then ask, “How do you know there are differences between Americans?”

Read Mitch Albom’s Article “What’s in a Name? Ethnicity or Ego?”

Students should read this independently, and respond to the corresponding questions.

Day 3—Social Identity Theory—Us vs. Them

#### *Purpose*

Students will explore the concepts associated with the Social Identity Theory and the us v. them.

#### *Activities*

Students will reflect and write in a journal to the prompt: Do you follow a specific sports team? How do you know that someone else likes your team? Explain.

After the students write, the teacher should guide students through a discussion around this prompt. The teacher or a student may share a story like this: I am an ardent University of Michigan fan. I often wear apparel with the school colors of maize and blue and the iconic block “m.” As I am walking along, I sometimes hear the words, “Go Blue!” shouted at me. I enthusiastically respond with a “Go Blue.” If someone didn’t know that a cheer at Michigan games is, “Go Blue,” they might be very confused. And even though that person may or may not have been wearing any identifying apparel, I immediately know that he or she is a Michigan fan. If I see someone who is wearing the hated colors of scarlet and gray or the words, Ohio State, I know immediately that we are not the same and for one day a year, (the date of the Michigan-Ohio State game) we are enemies.

An example like this can easily introduce the concept of “us” vs. “them.”

Notes--Students should be guided through notes on the social identity theory that explain group identifier

Students should work individual on the worksheet where they will identify the “us” and “them.”

The teacher would guide students through a discussion: Is it okay to divide people in to “us” and “them?”

Students may respond positively to this and say, yes, it’s okay to identify with one group and not another. The teacher should ask for examples of how this plays out positively—for example, knowing who supports your athletic team. The teacher should then ask for examples for how this plays out negatively—for example racism.

Students may respond that dividing people is never a good idea because it always separates people, much like Puzzle #1 from a few days ago. The teacher should ask for positive and negative examples.

#### Day 4—Nationalism and the Other

##### *Purpose*

Students will examine the effects of nationalism and the identification of the other through the history of Yugoslavia and South Africa.

##### *Activities*

Students will reflect and write in a journal on the prompt: Does your nationality impact your personality?

The goal behind this prompt is for students to consider the impact nationalism has upon how they view themselves. It is also requiring students to activate prior knowledge from previous lessons. As the teacher leads the students in a discussion around this topic, it should be noted that often people cheer for the USA in the Olympics, and not necessarily wishing that everyone does well. The teacher should use the language of the us vs. them mentality and ask the students to consider the implications of the us vs. them.

### Introduction to Case Studies

The teacher will then make the connection between the prompt and the beginning of the case study method. In the case study method that students will analyze the histories of the former Yugoslavia and South Africa. The teacher should divide the students in to strategic pairs or collaborative groups and pass out the case study of Yugoslavia. Students should make predictions about the outcome of the country based on the information given. They then will analyze the instances of the other and solutions to it. The students should then do the same for the case study through the lens of South Africa

### Days 5, 6 and 7—Research

#### *Purpose*

The students will spend the next lessons doing their own research in to the two countries' histories to better understand.

#### *Activities*

The teacher will show the film *Invictus* and lead a discussion around the historical inaccuracies in the film as well as how much of the history is in the film. The teacher should then said aside two specific days that allows the students to research each country more fully. The teacher should divide the class so that half of the class researches Yugoslavia and the other half South Africa. The teacher will also allow students to view the two different South African anthems.

### Day 8—Comparison of Yugoslavia and South Africa

#### *Purpose*

The students will compare the histories of Yugoslavia and South Africa to create connections to modern day issues.

#### *Activities*

The teacher should engage students in a discussion of the Yugoslavian and South African histories from the previous lesson. The students should make a t-chart to compare the two. Students will then use this engage in a discussion that will allow the students to make accurate suppositions about ways Yugoslavia could have been “saved”

and South Africa could have removed apartheid earlier. The students should also make connections between what is available in the histories and modern days issues.

Day 9—What lessons should be learned from Yugoslavia and South Africa?

*Purpose*

Students will have the opportunity to demonstrate their learning by writing an argumentative paper on the lessons learned from Yugoslavia and South Africa.

*Activities*

The teacher will assign an argumentative paper that allows students to address the aforementioned prompt.

## **Appendix 1**

### Common Core State Standards

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RI.11-12.1--Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text, including determining where the text leaves matters uncertain.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RI.11-12.2--Determine two or more central ideas of a text and analyze their development over the course of the text, including how they interact and build on one another to provide a complex analysis; provide an objective summary of the text.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RI.11-12.3--Analyze a complex set of ideas or sequence of events and explain how specific individuals, ideas, or events interact and develop over the course of the text.

CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.RI.11-12.7--Integrate and evaluate multiple sources of information presented in different media or formats (e.g., visually, quantitatively) as well as in words in order to address a question or solve a problem.

### American History II—North Carolina Standards

AH2.H.1—Apply the four interconnected dimensions of historical thinking to the American History Essential Standards in order to understand the creation and development of the United States over time.

AH2.H.5—Understand how tensions between freedom, equality and power have shaped the political, economic and social development of the United States

## Standards Unit Addresses

### Global Competencies

1. Ability to collaborate effectively in diverse cultural situations (**Collaborate effectively**)
2. Capacity to analyze and evaluate global issues from multiple perspectives (**Develop multiple perspectives**)
3. Understanding of how international systems are interconnected and interdependent (**Understand interdependence of systems**)
4. Capability to make ethical decisions and responsible choices that contribute to the development of a more just, peaceful, and sustainable world (**Ethical decisions**)
5. Ability to identify, define and solve problems using critical and creative thinking strategies. (**Think critically and creatively**)
6. “Literacy for the 21<sup>st</sup> century” –Proficient in reading, writing, viewing, listening, and speaking in English and in one or more other world languages
7. Understanding of the complexity of global issues (**Understand complexity**)
8. Ability to identify, evaluate, and organize ongoing learning opportunities to live and work successfully in a global society. (**Manage learning**)
9. The use of digital media and technology to access relevant and credible information from around the world and to effectively communicate, synthesize and create new knowledge (**Communicate effectively**)
10. Achievement of expertise by researching, understanding and developing new knowledge about a world culture or internationally relevant issue (**Achieve expertise**)
11. Capability to make healthy decisions that enhance physical, mental and emotional well-being to thrive within a global environment (**Make healthy decisions**)

## Annotated Resources

The following resources were used when writing this unit. Teachers and students may find these useful.

Albom, Mitch. "What's in a Name? Ethnicity or Ego?" *Detroit Free Press*, October 11, 2015, Sports sec. Accessed November 22, 2015.

<http://www.freep.com/story/sports/columnists/mitch-albom/2015/10/10/raven-symone-black-name/73734706/>.

This article gives an interesting perspective on the names and judgments that are given based on someone's first name. In 2015 it is a contemporary look at the idea of creating an "other" before even realizing it.

Anderson, Benedict R. O. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Rev. and Extended ed. London: Verso, 1991. Print.

This book provides an interesting overview of the origins of nationalism and its effect.

Brookfield, Stephen, and Stephen Preskill. *Discussion as a Way of Teaching: Tools and Techniques for Democratic Classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1999. Print.

This is a resource to provide teachers tools to engage students in dialogue in the classroom. It gives several helpful strategies to both encourage and navigate difficult conversations as well as how to assess classroom discussions.

Carlin, John. *Invictus: Nelson Mandela and the Game That Made a Nation*. New York: Penguin, 2009. Print.

Originally published under a different title, this book gives an overview of the ways that South Africa became the "Rainbow Nation" through the lens of rugby.

*Invictus*. Directed by Clint Eastwood. Warner Bros. Pictures :, 2010. Film.

This film is based on the book by the same name, and provides

Isaacs, William. *Dialogue and the Art of Thinking Together: A Pioneering Approach to Communicating in Business and in Life*. New York: Currency, 1999. Print.

This text provides teachers tools on how to promote collaboration with students and discussion strategies.

"Martin Niemöller: "First They Came for the Socialists..." United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. August 18, 2015. Accessed November 22, 2015.  
<http://www.ushmm.org/wlc/en/article.php?ModuleId=10007392>.

This is a credible source for the poem that can at times be fluid in what the actual stanzas were. This poem identifies the others and the consequences that there were if one ignores the other.

Silber, Laura, and Allan Little. *The Death of Yugoslavia*. [Rev. ed. New York: Penguin Books, 1997.

The text is a reference for the demise of Yugoslavia as one nation and the break up in to different nations.

Wineburg, Samuel S. *Historical Thinking and Other Unnatural Acts: Charting the Future of Teaching the past*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2001. Print.

This resource proves teachers strategies on how to teach concepts and critical thinking in how to teach the subject of history beyond just a collection of facts.

---

<sup>1</sup> Silber, Laura, and Allan Little. *The Death of Yugoslavia*. [Rev. ed. New York: Penguin Books, 1997. 31-32.