

# III.

## JUST WAR

Lesson 5: Introducing the Principles of Just War

Part I: Surveying Student Attitudes Towards War

Part II: Just War Theory

Part III: Augustine de Hippo and Thomas Aquinas  
on Just War

Lesson 6: Just War Theory in the History Classroom I:  
What Leaders Have Said

Lesson 7: Just War Theory in the History Classroom II:  
You Decide...

## Lesson 5: Introducing the Principles of Just War Theory

### **Background:**

In the Western cultural tradition, discussions of justifiable reasons for going to war and proper conduct during war go back to the Greek and Roman philosophers Aristotle and Cicero. They are also discussed in the Hebrew Bible and in the Koran. What is now called “Just War Theory” was developed by early Christian philosophers/theologians as they attempted to reconcile two conflicting propositions:

- purposeful taking of human life is wrong
- states have a duty to defend their citizens and promote justice.

The theory attempts to lay out the conditions under which states can justifiably go to war. While primarily Christian in origin, the basic principals of Just War theory provide useful touchstones for people of any faith or none.

As philosopher Mark Rigstad points out, “Just war theory is not a settled doctrine. It is a field of critical ethical reflection. That’s why there are as many just war theories as there are just war theorists.” ([www.justwartheory.com](http://www.justwartheory.com)) There are also many who reject the whole concept of “just war,” arguing either from a pacifist point of view that killing is always wrong, or from a realpolitik position that force is just another strategy for pursuing national interests.

In addition to introducing students to Just War Theory, the lessons in the lessons in the Just War unit (Lessons 5, 6 and 7) engage them in examining the ways in which leaders have justified war at different times in history. Students are encouraged to explore their own beliefs about the circumstances under which war is justified, if ever, by examining the applicability of just war principles to various conflicts studied throughout their history curriculum.

**Grade Level/Subject:** History/Social Sciences. The lessons in this unit can be used at the middle or high school level in any history or social science class that includes study of specific wars or conflicts.

### **Objectives:**

- Students will examine the principles of Just War Theory, and consider both their historic and contemporary applications.
- Students will analyze, interpret, compare and contrast primary and secondary sources.
- Students will reflect on their own beliefs about when war is or is not justified.

### **Materials:**

Part I: Student Survey posted online, or paper copy for each student

Part II: Student Handout #1 – Just War Theory, one per student

Student Handout #2 – Ideas of *jus in bello* in Early Judaism and Islam, one per student

Part III: Student Handout #3 – Augustine de Hippo, one per student

Student Handout #4 – Thomas Aquinas, one per student

Student Handout #5 – Augustine and Aquinas Compared, one per student

## PART I. SURVEYING STUDENT ATTITUDES TOWARDS WAR

### **Procedure:**

1. Set the frame: Conflict and war are recurring occurrences in history. Many people who strongly believe that killing is wrong have struggled with the question of whether war can every be right. We are going to be studying what different historic figures have to say about this issue, but first let's find out what you think.
2. Assign the student survey for homework. Note: The survey can be sent home on paper and tallied the next day. Alternatively it can be posted on line and tallied automatically. <http://www.surveymonkey.com> is a site that allows you to easily construct on-line surveys to use with your students.

### **Is there a justification for acts of war?**

What do *you* think?

	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>
• in self-defense		
• to protect innocent life		
• to protect human rights		
• to overcome other kinds of evil		
• only if you will probably win		
• only as a last resort, after all peaceful alternatives have been exhausted		
• acts of war can never be justified		

3. Talley the results and share with the class.

Take the opportunity to discuss the value of listening to different perspectives and engaging in respectful debate with people of different viewpoints, even when you feel strongly that they are wrong. They probably feel just as strongly that you are wrong. *Listen* as carefully as you would like to be heard.

## PART II: JUST WAR THEORY

### **Vocabulary:**

Abrahamic  
propositions  
synthesized  
doctrine  
strategy  
critical ethical reflection

reconcile  
theology/theologians  
proportional  
theorist  
criteria

**Materials:** Student Worksheet #1 “Just War Theory” for each student.  
Student Worksheet #2 “Ideas of *jus in bello*...” for each student

### **Procedure:**

1. Handout the reading “Just War Theory.” Have students read through once on their own, highlighting or underlying words they don’t understand. If needed, add additional words to the vocabulary list.
2. Discuss the reading with the class using a Socratic Seminar format:

#### **Socratic Seminar**

1. What is Just War Theory?
2. Why did early Christians feel they had to justify war? Who else feels the need to justify war? Why?
3. Why do some people totally reject the idea of just war? What do you think?

3. Assign the Student Worksheet #2 reading on *jus in bello* in early Judaism and Islam.
4. Use the Socratic Seminar approach to discuss the following:

#### **Socratic Seminar**

1. Why do you think all three religions, Judaism, Christianity and Islam, are concerned about how to behave in war?
2. Do you think people should be concerned about *jus in bello* (justice during a war)? Why? What are some examples of *jus in bello*?
3. What does *jus post bellum* (justice at the end of a war) mean in practice? Why might it be important?

## PART III: AUGUSTINE DE HIPPO AND THOMAS AQUINAS ON JUST WAR

Augustine de Hippo (354-430 CE) and Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274 CE) are credited with the origination of Just War theory in Western Christianity. Augustine, one of the most important figures in the early development of Christian theology, wrote extensively on many topics. His discussions on war are scattered throughout his writings. Thomas Aquinas, a priest in the Dominican Order of the Roman Catholic Church and father of the Thomistic school of philosophy and theology, had a profound influence on Western thought and modern philosophy, particularly in the areas of ethics, natural law and political theory. He was the first person to compile and organize earlier discussions about war and peace into a set of principles supporting the concept of just war, which he laid out in *The Summa Theologica*.

Full documents of Augustine de Hippo can be found at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02089a.htm>  
The section on war from Aquinas' *Summa Theologica* (Part II, Question 40) is available at:  
<http://faculty.cua.edu/pennington/Law111/AquinasJustWar.htm>.

<b>Vocabulary:</b>	extensively	formation
	theology/theologian	lament
	compel	moderate
	procure	monarch
	advisable	make amends
	seized	inflicted
	perish	contrary
	precept	virtue

### **Materials:**

Student Worksheet #3: Augustine of Hippo, one per student  
Student Worksheet #4: Thomas Aquinas, one per student  
Student Worksheet #5: Augustine/Aquinas Compared, one for every two students

### **Procedure:**

1. Assign the Augustine reading (worksheet #1.) In class, go over vocabulary, phrases or sentence structures students may find difficult to understand.
2. Have students label a sheet of paper, "In My Own Words – Augustine de Hippo on Just War." **Instructions:** In one or two "regular English" sentences, summarize what Augustine is saying in each quote.
3. Assign the Thomas Aquinas reading. In class, go over vocabulary, phrases or sentence structures students may find difficult to understand.
4. Have students label a sheet of paper, "In My Own Words – Thomas Aquinas on Just War." **Instructions:** Using your own words, rewrite/summarize the three objections to war and the three requirements for just war.
5. Group students in pairs. Have them share with each other how they interpreted and rewrote the Augustine/Aquinas readings.

6. Handout student worksheet #3 (Augustine and Aquinas on Just War, Compared), one per pair. Have them work together to complete worksheet #3. Discuss the results with the whole class.
7. Conduct a Socratic Seminar.

### **Socratic Seminar**

1. Augustine argues that the purpose of war is peace. Do you agree?
2. According to Aquinas, the main Christian objections to war are based on the belief that war is contrary to God's wishes and is always sinful. Are there non-religious reasons to object to war?
3. Consider each of Aquinas' requirements for just war. Do you agree or disagree? Is just one of these sufficient to justify war, or do all three need to be present?
4. Are there other things you would add to his list of just war principles?

### **Extension:**

- Form small groups to discuss Just War Theory. Do they agree with all six of the principles on the modern list (Worksheet #1)? Would they add additional *jus ad bellum* principles to the list? How about *jus post bello* principles? Have the groups report out.
- Have students research: How do the principles your group offered compared to those proposed by modern writers?

Some starting places for research:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Just\\_war#Jus\\_in\\_bello](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Just_war#Jus_in_bello)  
[http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/jus\\_in\\_bello/?nid=1021](http://www.beyondintractability.org/essay/jus_in_bello/?nid=1021)  
<http://www.economicexpert.com/a/Laws:of:war.htm>  
[http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Just-war#Jus\\_in\\_bello](http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Just-war#Jus_in_bello)  
[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Islamic\\_military\\_jurisprudence](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Islamic_military_jurisprudence)

## JUST WAR THEORY

In the Western cultural tradition, discussions of justifiable reasons for going to war and proper conduct during war go back to the Greek and Roman philosophers Aristotle and Cicero, and can be found in the founding texts of all three of the Abrahamic religions (Judaism, Christianity and Islam.) Today, philosophical discussions around these topics are referred to as “Just War Theory.” Some modern writers talk about three different kinds of just war principles:

- 1) *jus ad bellum* (justice to war) having to do with going to war in the first place;
- 2) *jus in bello* (justice in war) addressing how one should act while at war; and,
- 3) *jus post bellum* (justice after war) concerning just terms at the close of a war.

### Justification for Going to War – *jus ad bellum*

A clear set of principles regarding *jus ad bellum* (justifiable reasons for going to war) was first developed by early Christian philosophers/theologians as they attempted to reconcile two conflicting propositions:

- purposeful taking of human life is wrong
- states have a duty to defend their citizens and promote justice.

Very early Christians believed that killing was absolutely forbidden. But as more and more Romans converted to Christianity, the question arose whether it was possible to be a Roman soldier and a Christian at the same time. This question was discussed by the early Christian theologian Augustine of Hippo (354 – 430 B.C.E.) in many of his writings and sermons. Later, the Roman Catholic priest St. Thomas Aquinas (c.1225 – 1274) synthesized Augustine’s arguments regarding justifiable warfare into a clear set of principles.

Today, the principles most often used for determining whether going to war is justified (*jus ad bellum*) are:

1. **Just cause/right intention:** A just war must be fought only for purposes of self-defense against armed attack or to right a serious wrong.
2. **Proper authority:** A war is just only if waged by a legitimate authority.
3. **Last resort:** A just war must be the last resort; all peaceful options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified.
4. **Probability of success:** There must be a reasonable chance of success; deaths and injury that result from a hopeless cause cannot be morally justified.
5. **Beneficial outcome:** The outcome of the war must be better than the situation that would exist had the war not taken place.
6. **Proportionality:** The violence and destruction must be proportional to the injury suffered.

As Professor Mark Rigstad points out, “Just war theory is not a settled doctrine. It is a field of critical ethical reflection. That’s why there are as many just war theories as there are just war theorists.”<sup>1</sup> Different people will include different principles on their lists, or interpret the same principle in different ways. We should also remember that the concept of a “just war” is totally rejected by many people who argue either from a pacifist<sup>2</sup> point of view that killing is always wrong, or from a realpolitik<sup>3</sup> position that force is just another strategy for pursuing national interests.

<sup>1</sup> [Mark Rigstad](http://www.justwartheory.com), Associate Professor of Philosophy, Oakland University; <http://www.justwartheory.com>

<sup>2</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pacifist>

<sup>3</sup> <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Realpolitik>

### Ideas of *jus in bello* in Early Judaism and Islam

Although it was the 20<sup>th</sup> Century before the Latin phrase *jus in bello* (justice in war) began to be used to refer to rules of correct conduct in war, the idea can be found among the early Hebrews and was well developed by Islamic scholars by the time of the Crusades.

\*\*\*\*\*

In the Hebrew Bible, the Israelites are commanded:

*When you lay siege to a city for a long time, fighting against it to capture it, do not destroy its trees by putting an ax to them, because you can eat their fruit. Do not cut them down. Are the trees of the field people, that you should besiege them? However, you may cut down trees that you know are not fruit trees and use them to build siege works until the city at war with you falls.* -- Deuteronomy 20:19-20

During the 13<sup>th</sup> century, the Jewish scholar Nachmanides (1194-1270) wrote,

*God commanded us that when we lay siege to a city that we leave one of the sides without a siege so as to give them a place to flee to. It is from this commandment that we learn to deal with compassion even with our enemies even at time of war...*

- Supplement by Nachmanides to Maimonides Book of Commandments Positive Commandment #4

\*\*\*\*\*

Islam also provided rules for conducting war:

*And if you have to respond to an attack, respond only to the extent of the attack leveled against you...* -- Qur'an, 16:126

In the early 7th century, the first Caliph, Abu Bakr, while instructing his Muslim army, laid down the following rules concerning warfare:

*Stop, O people, that I may give you ten rules for your guidance in the battlefield. Do not commit treachery or deviate from the right path. You must not mutilate dead bodies. Neither kill a child, nor a woman, nor an aged man. Bring no harm to the trees, nor burn them with fire, especially those which are fruitful. Slay not any of the enemy's flock, save for your food. You are likely to pass by people who have devoted their lives to monastic services; leave them alone.*

From the 9th century onwards, Islamic essays on international law covered the treatment of hostages, refugees and prisoners of war in Islam; the right of asylum; conduct on the battlefield; protection of women, children and non-combatant civilians; the use of poisonous weapons; and devastation of enemy territory.

During the Crusades, these laws were put into practice by Muslim armies, most notably by Saladin and Sultan al-Kamil. After defeat of the Franks by al-Kamil, Oliverus Scholasticus praised the Islamic laws of war, commenting on how al-Kamil supplied the defeated Frankish army with food:

Who could doubt that such goodness, friendship and charity come from God? Men whose parents, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, had died in agony at our hands, whose lands we took, whom we drove naked from their homes, revived us with their own food when we were dying of hunger and showered us with kindness even when we were in their power.

**Augustine of Hippo**  
(354-430 CE)

*Augustine is one of the most important figures in the development of Western Christianity. He wrote extensively on many topics and played an important role in the early formation of Christian theology. His discussions on war are scattered throughout his writings. Below are some of the things he had to say about war.*

Full documents can be found at: <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/02089a.htm>

**1.**

....the wise man will wage just wars. As if he would not all the rather lament the necessity of just wars, if he remembers that he is a man; for if they were not just he would not wage them, and would therefore be delivered from all wars. For it is the wrongdoing of the opposing party which compels the wise man to wage just wars;....

*City of God Book 19, chapter 7*

**2.**

Whoever gives even moderate attention to human affairs and to our common nature, will recognize that if there is no man who does not wish to be joyful, neither is there any one who does not wish to have peace. For even they who make war desire nothing but victory—desire, that is to say, to attain to peace with glory. For what else is victory than the conquest of those who resist us? And when this is done there is peace. It is therefore with the desire for peace that wars are waged, even by those who take pleasure in exercising their warlike nature in command and battle. And hence it is obvious that peace is the end sought for by war. For every man seeks peace by waging war, but no man seeks war by making peace.

*City of God Book 19, chapter 12*

**3.**

But it is a higher glory still to stay war itself with a word, than to slay men with the sword, and to procure or maintain peace by peace, not by war. For those who fight, if they are good men, doubtless seek for peace; nevertheless it is through blood. Your mission, however, is to prevent the shedding of blood.

*Letter 229.2*

**4.**

A great deal depends on the causes for which men undertake wars, and on the authority they have for doing so; for the natural order which seeks the peace of mankind, ordains that the monarch should have the power of undertaking war if he thinks it advisable, and that the soldiers should perform their military duties in behalf of the peace and safety of the community.

*Contra Faust xxii, 75*

**5.**

A just war is wont to be described as one that avenges wrongs, when a nation or state has to be punished, for refusing to make amends for the wrongs inflicted by its subjects, or to restore what it has seized unjustly.

*Questions Helpt, qu.x*

## Thomas Aquinas (1225 – 1274 CE)

*Thomas Aquinas was a priest in the Dominican Order of the Roman Catholic Church, and was a very extremely important philosopher and theologian. He was the father of the Thomistic school of philosophy and theology, and a proponent of natural theology. He had a profound influence on Western thought and modern philosophy, particularly in the areas of ethics, natural law and political theory.*

*He was the first person to organize earlier discussions about war and peace into a set of principles supporting the concept of just war, which he laid out in The Summa Theologica.*

*Below are summaries of some highlights of his discussion. The entire section on war (Part II, Question 40) is available at: <http://faculty.cua.edu/pennington/Law111/AquinasJustWar.htm>*

### OF WAR

We must now consider war, under which head there are four points of inquiry:

1. Whether some kind of war is lawful?
2. Whether it is lawful for clerics to fight?
3. Whether it is lawful for belligerents to lay ambushes?
4. Whether it is lawful to fight on holy days?

Whether it is always sinful to wage war?

Aquinas begins his discussion by listing the different objections that many Christians at the time had to war. These include the following arguments against war:

*Objection 1:* Punishment is only inflicted for sin, and since “all that take the sword shall perish with the sword,” (Matthew. 26:52) war must be sinful.

*Objection 2:* War is contrary to “a Divine precept” (“But I say to you not to resist evil” – Matthew 5:39) and therefore is sinful.

*Objection 3:* Sin is the opposite of virtue. Peace is a virtue and war is contrary to peace. Therefore war is always a sin.

Aquinas responds to these objections by arguing that “...in order for a war to be just, three things are necessary.”

First, the war must be commanded by a proper authority. Those in authority are supposed to protect the people. It is lawful for them to use weapons or force to keep peace and order inside their city/country and to punish people who break the laws and do evil. In the same way, those in authority are responsible for defending the community against external enemies, and can therefore use force against enemies.

Second, there must be a just cause for the war. “... those who are attacked, should be attacked because they deserve it on account of some fault.”

Third, those fighting must “have a rightful intention, so that they intend the advancement of good, or the avoidance of evil.”

**Augustine and Aquinas on Just War, Compared**

Thomas Aquinas relied heavily on the writings of Augustine de Hippo to back up his arguments about the requirements for just war. Working together, identify the quotes from Augustine could be used to support each of Aquinas' three requirements for just war.

<b>Thomas Aquinas – Three Requirements for Just War</b>	<b>Augustine’s discussions of war</b> (Indicate the number of the quotes)
<u>First</u> , the war must be commanded by a proper authority.	
<u>Second</u> , there must be a just cause for the war.	
<u>Third</u> , those fighting must “have a rightful intention	

## Lesson 6:

### Just War Theory in the History Classroom I: What Leaders Have Said

Using hindsight and, usually, a particular perspective, our classroom history texts offer one narrative version of the reasons why different wars have taken place. But how did different people involved at the time think about and justify engaging in war? What role did the principles of just war play in the reasons that leaders offered to their followers when seeking their support for a decision to go to war? How valid were those justifications? What role, if any, did religion play in supporting the justifications for war?

In Lesson 6, students read speeches and declarations given by a variety of leaders throughout history to garner support for a war effort. They analyze the speeches for the degree to which, and the ways in which just war principles were reference in rallying support for a war, and whether and in what ways religion was also used to support the war.

Examples used include the speech by Pope Urban II urging participation in the First Crusade; the sermon by Samuel Davies urging colonist to support the French-Indian War; a Declaration by Representatives of the United Colonies at the outset of the American War for Independence; and President Johnson' Message to Congress following the Tonkin Gulf incident in Vietnam, but the same procedures can be applied to other examples.

#### **Objectives:**

- Using primary source materials, students will analyze what past leaders have said about the reasons for going to war, and determine whether they used any of the Just War principles to support their case.
- Students will consider to what extent, and in what ways, religious beliefs were referenced in support of the war effort.

**Grade Level/Subject:** 7<sup>th</sup>- 11<sup>th</sup> grade World and American History

#### **Prior Knowledge:**

- Students should have spent some time exploring the meanings of “war” and “peace.”
- Students should be familiar with the history, and basic principles of Just War Theory.

#### **Materials:**

Student Handout #1 – Just War Principles, one per student

Student Handout #2 – Justification of War – What Leaders Have Said

One of more of the following, to be selected by teacher:

Student Handout #3A or #3B - Pope Urban II - Speech at Council of Clermont, 1066

Student Handout #4 – Samuel Davies, French-Indian War, 1755

Student Handout #5 – Declaration by Representatives of the United Colonies, July 6, 1775

Student Handout #6 – President Johnson’s Message to Congress, August 5, 1964

## Procedure:

1. Have students read the textbook section dealing with the war this exercise focuses on.
2. Provide each student with a copy of the speech to be studied. (Brief background on each speech is provided below.) If necessary, cover vocabulary with which students may not be familiar beforehand.
3. Instruct students to highlight or underline words and/or phrases used by the speaker to justify why the war should be supported. For example:

To protect your Brethren from the most bloody Barbarities--to defend the territories of the best of Kings against the Oppression and Tyranny of Arbitrary Power to secure the inestimable Blessings of Liberty, British Liberty, from the Chains of French slavery--to preserve your estates, for which you have sweat and toiled, from falling prey to greedy Vultures, Indians, Priests, French, and hungry Gallic Slaves, or not-more-devouring Flames--to guard your Religion, the pure Religion of Jesus, streaming uncorrupted from the sacred fountain of the Scriptures; the most excellent, rational and divine religion that ever was made known to the sons of Men; to guard such a precious Religion (my heart grows warm while I mention it) against Ignorance, Superstition, Idolatry, Tyranny over Conscience, Massacre, Fire, and Sword, and all the Mischiefs, beyond Expression, with which Popery is Pregnant--to keep from the cruel Hands of Barbarians and Papists your Wives, your Children, your Parents, your Friends--to secure the Liberties conveyed to you by your brave Fore-Fathers, and bought with their blood, that you may transmit them uncurtailed to your Posterity--these are the Blessings you contend for; all these will be torn from your eager Grasp, if this Colony [Virginia] should become a province of France. And Virginians! Britons! Christians! Protestants! if these Names have any import or Energy, will you not strike home in such a Cause?...

4. Give each student a copy of Handout #1 (Just War Principles) and Handout #2 (Justification of War – What Leaders Have Said). Have them match their highlighted phrases with the appropriate just war principle.
5. Pair students, and have them compare, discuss and modify (if they wish) their results.
6. With the whole class, work through the Just War Principles, identifying and discussing the words and phrases students felt gave support to each principle. It is quite probably that the speaker will not rely on all of the principles. E.g., in the example above, no reference is made to proper authority, last resort or probability of success.

Optional: Have students analyze the speech to identify different *rhetorical devices* used. Discuss the differences between use of rhetorical devices (which have no *inherent* reference to specific facts, opinions or ethical/moral principles) and reliance on concrete reasons in making an argument. An argument may sound terrific, but does it make any sense?

7. Conduct a Socratic Seminar (see below):

### **Socratic Seminar**

1. Are there any just war principles the speaker did not use? Why do you think that might be?
2. Does the speaker refer to religion in the speech? What role does religion play? Does it provide a basis for arguing just cause (our religious beliefs are threatened)? right intention (we are doing this for religious reasons)? proper authority (God/our religion requires it)? probability of success (God is on our side)?
3. Do you think the people listening at the time found the speaker's argument convincing? How do you think people on the other side might justify this war?
4. Are the reasons given by the textbook for this war the same as the reasons given by the speaker? Why do you think they differ?

### Speeches provided in this lesson:

**Pope Urban II - Speech at Council of Clermont, 1095.** Excerpts from the versions by Fulcher of Chartres and Robert the Monk.

In 1094 or 1095, Alexios I Komnenos, the Byzantine emperor, sent a message to the pope, Urban II, asking for help in the war against the Seljuq Turks, who taken nearly all of Asia Minor from him. At the council of Clermont in November, 1095, attended by approximately 300 clerics and nobility, Urban urged all to go to the aid of the Greeks and to recover Palestine from the rule of the Muslims.

There are six main sources of information about this portion of the council: 1. the anonymous *Gesta Francorum* ("The Deeds of the Franks" dated c. 1102), which influenced all versions of the speech except that by Fulcher; Fulcher of Chartres, who was present at the council; Robert the Monk, who may have been present; Baldric, the archbishop of Dol and Guibert de Nogent, who were not present at the council. All of these accounts were written down quite a bit later than the council, and all differ widely from one another. Finally, there is a short "letter of instruction" written by Urban II himself to members of the church in Flanders. are used in this lesson.

References:

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council\\_of\\_Clermont;](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Council_of_Clermont;)

<http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/urban2-5vers.html>

**Samuel Davies, Religion and Patriotism the Constituents of a Good Soldier - Sermon on the French-Indian War, 1755.** excerpts.

Samuel Davies was a Presbyterian preacher and president of the College at Princeton. In this excerpt from a sermon preached in Virginia, Davies rallies his listeners to arms against the French in the Ohio country. His suggestion that Virginia may have come under control of France was characteristic of Davies' rhetoric. One of Davies' most fond disciples was Patrick Henry, who stated that he learned his oratory skills from listening to Davies. Excerpts are used here.

Reference: <http://www.constitution.org/primarysources/davies.html>

**A Declaration by the Representatives of the United Colonies of North-America, Now Met in Congress at Philadelphia, Setting Forth the Causes and Necessity of Their Taking Up Arms, July 6, 1775.** excerpts

Primarily the work of Thomas Jefferson and John Dickinson.p.168 Morison, Samuel Eliot and Henry Steele Commager, William E. Leuchtenburg. *The Growth of the American Republic : Volume 1.* Seventh Edition. New York : Oxford University Press; 1980.

Reference: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/arms.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/arms.asp)

**President Johnson's Message to Congress August 5, 1964.** excerpts.

The day after the Gulf of Tonkin incident off the coast of (North) Vietnam, President Lyndon Johnson informed the public of his reasons for seeking a Joint Resolution from Congress supporting U.S. military interventions in the Vietnam civil war.

Reference: [http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/tonkin-g.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/tonkin-g.asp)

**President Obama's Noble Peace Prize Acceptance Speech December 10, 2009.**

In accepting the Noble Peace Prize, President Obama discusses the concept of just war, and his views on when war is justified. The speech is not reproduced here, but a full transcript is available at:

<http://www.nytimes.com/2009/12/11/world/europe/11prexy.text.html>

## JUST WAR PRINCIPLES

Today, the principles most often used for determining whether going to war is justified (*jus ad bellum*) are:

1. **Just cause/right intention:** A just war must be fought only for purposes of self-defense against armed attack or to right a serious wrong.
2. **Proper authority:** A war is just only if waged by a legitimate authority.
3. **Last resort:** A just war must be the last resort; all peaceful options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified.
4. **Probability of success:** There must be a reasonable chance of success; deaths and injury that result from a hopeless cause cannot be morally justified.
5. **Beneficial outcome:** The outcome of the war must be better than the situation that would exist had the war not taken place.
6. **Proportionality:** The violence and destruction must be proportional to the injury suffered.

**NAME:**

**JUSTIFICATION OF WAR – WHAT LEADERS HAVE SAID**

- Instructions:* 1. As you read the assigned speech, highlight or underline words and phrases used by the speaker to demonstrate reasons why the war should be supported.
2. Fill out the table by matching your highlighted words and phrases with a just war principle. It is possible that some of the rows may remain blank. If you have highlighted phrases that don't match a just war principle, record it under "Other reason."

**NAME OF LEADER & WAR:**

Principle	Words and Phrases Used
7. Just cause/right intention:	
8. Proper authority:	
9. Last resort:	
10. Probability of success:	
11. Beneficial outcome:	
12. Proportionality:	
13. Other reason:	

## Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095

### From the Version by Fulcher of Chartres

*This is part of the speech as recorded by Fulcher of Chartres, who was at Clermont.*

"...you must apply the strength of your righteousness to another matter which concerns you as well as God. For your brethren who live in the east are in urgent need of your help, and you must hasten to give them the aid which has often been promised them. For, as the most of you have heard, the Turks and Arabs have attacked them and have conquered the territory of Romania [the Greek empire] as far west as the shore of the Mediterranean and the Hellespont, which is called the Arm of St. George. They have occupied more and more of the lands of those Christians, and have overcome them in seven battles. They have killed and captured many, and have destroyed the churches and devastated the empire. If you permit them to continue thus for awhile with impurity, the faithful of God will be much more widely attacked by them. On this account I, or rather the Lord, beseech you as Christ's heralds to publish this everywhere and to persuade all people of whatever rank, foot-soldiers and knights, poor and rich, to carry aid promptly to those Christians and to destroy that vile race from the lands of our friends. I say this to those who are present, it meant also for those who are absent. Moreover, Christ commands it...

"All who die by the way, whether by land or by sea, or in battle against the pagans, shall have immediate remission of sins. This I grant them through the power of God with which I am invested. O what a disgrace if such a despised and base race, which worships demons, should conquer a people which has the faith of omnipotent God and is made glorious with the name of Christ!... Let those who have been accustomed unjustly to wage private warfare against the faithful now go against the infidels and end with victory this war which should have been begun long ago.

Source: Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, 1, pp. 382 f., trans in Oliver J. Thatcher, and Edgar Holmes McNeal, eds., *A Source Book for Medieval History*, (New York: Scribners, 1905), 513-17

## Speech of Pope Urban II at Clermont, 1095

From the version by Robert the Monk

*This is part of the speech, as recorded by Robert the Monk, who may have been present at the council, but did not write until 25 years later.*

From the confines of Jerusalem and the city of Constantinople a horrible tale has gone forth and very frequently has been brought to our ears, namely, that a race from the kingdom of the Persians, an accursed race, a race utterly alienated from God, a generation forsooth which has not directed its heart and has not entrusted its spirit to God, has invaded the lands of those Christians and has depopulated them by the sword, pillage and fire; it has led away a part of the captives into its own country, and a part it has destroyed by cruel tortures; it has either entirely destroyed the churches of God or appropriated them for the rites of its own religion.... The kingdom of the Greeks is now dismembered by them and deprived of territory so vast in extent that it can not be traversed in a march of two months. On whom therefore is the labor of avenging these wrongs and of recovering this territory incumbent, if not upon you? You, upon whom above other nations God has conferred remarkable glory in arms, great courage, bodily activity, and strength to humble the hairy scalp of those who resist you.

... Enter upon the road to the Holy Sepulcher; wrest that land from the wicked race, and subject it to yourselves. ... This royal city, therefore, situated at the centre of the world, is now held captive by His enemies, and is in subjection to those who do not know God, to the worship of the heathens. She seeks therefore and desires to be liberated, and does not cease to implore you to come to her aid.

...Let this then be your war-cry in combats, because this word is given to you by God. When an armed attack is made upon the enemy, let this one cry be raised by all the soldiers of God: It is the will of God! It is the will of God!

**Source:** Dana C. Munro, "Urban and the Crusaders", *Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of European History*, Vol 1:2, (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1895), 5-8

## **Religion and Patriotism the Constituents of a Good Soldier**

### **Sermon given by Samuel Davies to rally Virginia colonists to fight on the side of the British in the French-Indian War. (1755)**

To protect your Brethren from the most bloody Barbarities--to defend the territories of the best of Kings against the Oppression and Tyranny of Arbitrary Power to secure the inestimable Blessings of Liberty, British Liberty, from the Chains of French slavery--to preserve your estates, for which you have sweat and toiled, from falling prey to greedy Vultures, Indians, Priests, French, and hungry Gallic Slaves, or not-more-devouring Flames--to guard your Religion, the pure Religion of Jesus, streaming uncorrupted from the sacred fountain of the Scriptures; the most excellent, rational and divine religion that ever was made known to the sons of Men; to guard such a precious Religion (my heart grows warm while I mention it) against Ignorance, Superstition, Idolatry, Tyranny, over Conscience, Massacre, Fire, and Sword, and all the Mischiefs, beyond Expression, with which Popery is Pregnant--to keep from the cruel Hands of Barbarians and Papists your Wives, your Children, your Parents, your Friends--to secure the Liberties conveyed to you by your brave Fore-Fathers, and bought with their blood, that you may transmit them uncurtailed to you Posterity--these are the Blessings you contend for; all these will be torn from your eager Grasp, if this Colony [Virginia] should become a province of France. And Virginians! Britons! Christians! Protestants! if these Names have any import or Energy, will you not strike home is such a Cause?...

<http://www.constitution.org/primarysources/davies.html>

**A Declaration by the Representatives of the United Colonies of North-America,  
Now Met in Congress at Philadelphia,  
Setting Forth the Causes and Necessity of Their Taking Up Arms, July 6, 1775**

... By one statute it is declared, that parliament can "*of right make laws to bind us in all cases whatsoever.*" What is to defend us against so enormous, so unlimited a power? Not a single man of those who assume it, is chosen by us; or is subject to our control or influence;... We for ten years incessantly and ineffectually besieged the throne as supplicants; we reasoned, we remonstrated with parliament, in the most mild and decent language.

... Soon after, the commercial intercourse of whole colonies, with foreign countries, and with each other, was cut off by an act of parliament; by another several of them were entirely prohibited from the fisheries in the seas near their coasts, on which they always depended for their sustenance; ...

Parliament adopted... a perpetual auction of taxations where colony should bid against colony,... and thus to extort from us, at the point of the bayonet, the unknown sums...

Soon after... general Gage,... sent out from that place [Boston] a large detachment of his army, who made an unprovoked assault on the inhabitants of the said province, at the town of Lexington,... murdered eight of the inhabitants, and wounded many others. From thence the troops proceeded in warlike array to the town of Concord, where they set upon another party of the inhabitants of the same province, killing several and wounding more, until compelled to retreat by the country people suddenly assembled to repel this cruel aggression. Hostilities, thus commenced by the British troops, have been since prosecuted by them without regard to faith or reputation...

... We are reduced to the alternative of choosing an unconditional submission to the tyranny of irritated ministers, or resistance by force. -- The latter is our choice. -- We have counted the cost of this contest, and find nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery....

Our cause is just. Our union is perfect. Our internal resources are great, and, if necessary, foreign assistance is undoubtedly attainable. -- We gratefully acknowledge, as signal instances of the Divine favor towards us, that his Providence would not permit us to be called into this severe controversy, until we were grown up to our present strength,... and possessed of the means of defending ourselves. With hearts fortified with these animating reflections, we most solemnly, before God and the world, declare, that, ...the arms we have been compelled by our enemies to assume, we will,... employ for the preservation of our liberties; being with one mind resolved to die freemen rather than to live slaves....

Primarily the work of Thomas Jefferson and John Dickinson.p.168 Morison, Samuel Eliot and Henry Steele Commager, William E. Leuchtenburg. *The Growth of the American Republic : Volume 1*. Seventh Edition. New York : Oxford University Press; 1980.

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th\\_century/arms.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/arms.asp)

## President Johnson's Message to Congress August 5, 1964

Last night I announced to the American people that the North Vietnamese regime had conducted further deliberate attacks against U.S. naval vessels operating in international waters, and I had therefore directed air action against gunboats and supporting facilities used in these hostile operations. This air action has now been carried out with substantial damage to the boats and facilities. Two U.S. aircraft were lost in the action.

After consultation with the leaders of both parties in the Congress, I further announced a decision to ask the Congress for a resolution expressing the unity and determination of the United States in supporting freedom and in protecting peace in southeast Asia.

These latest actions of the North Vietnamese regime has given a new and grave turn to the already serious situation in southeast Asia. Our commitments in that area are well known to the Congress. They were first made in 1954 by President Eisenhower. They were further defined in the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty approved by the Senate in February 1955.

This treaty with its accompanying protocol obligates the United States and other members to act in accordance with their constitutional processes to meet Communist aggression against any of the parties or protocol states.

Our policy in southeast Asia has been consistent and unchanged since 1954. I summarized it on June 2 in four simple propositions:

America keeps her word. Here as elsewhere, we must and shall honor our commitments.

The issue is the future of southeast Asia as a whole. A threat to any nation in that region is a threat to all, and a threat to us.

Our purpose is peace. We have no military, political, or territorial ambitions in the area.

This is not just a jungle war, but a struggle for freedom on every front of human activity. Our military and economic assistance to South Vietnam and Laos in particular has the purpose of helping these countries to repel aggression and strengthen their independence.

The threat to the free nations of southeast Asia has long been clear. The North Vietnamese regime has constantly sought to take over South Vietnam and Laos. This Communist regime has violated the Geneva accords for Vietnam. It has systematically conducted a campaign of subversion, which includes the direction, training, and supply of personnel and arms for the conduct of guerrilla warfare in South Vietnamese territory. In Laos, the North Vietnamese regime has maintained military forces, used Laotian territory for infiltration into South Vietnam, and most recently carried out combat operations - all in direct violation of the Geneva Agreements of 1962.

In recent months, the actions of the North Vietnamese regime have become steadily more threatening...

As President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress, on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom.

As I have repeatedly made clear, the United States intends no rashness, and seeks no wider war. We must make it clear to all that the United States is united in its determination to bring about the end of Communist subversion and aggression in the area. We seek the full and effective restoration of the international agreements signed in Geneva in 1954, with respect to South Vietnam, and again in Geneva in 1962, with respect to Laos...

[http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/tonkin-g.asp](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/tonkin-g.asp)

## Lesson 7:

### Just War Theory in the History Classroom II: You Decide ...

Lesson 7 provides teachers with a template they can use throughout the year to engage students in applying critical thinking and analytic skills to reach their own conclusions about the justifiability of a particular war being studied.

#### **Objectives:**

- Students will analyze specific wars in U.S. (or World) History, and decide if they were “just” according to the fundamental principles of just war theory. They will reflect on whether they themselves believe the war was justified.

#### **Prior Knowledge:**

- Students should have spent some time exploring the meanings of “war” and “peace.”
- Students should be familiar with the history, and basic principles of Just War Theory.

**Materials:** Student Worksheet #1: Just War Principles, one per student  
Student Worksheet #2: Justification of War Case Study Matrix, one per student for each war

**Procedure:** The procedure is laid out referencing U.S. History, but is essentially the same for world history.

While studying a specific war:

1. Think-pair-share: Students read the textbook section on the war being studied. Using the think-pair-share strategy, students discuss the events leading up to this war. Students answer the question: Why did the United States fight this war?
2. Applying Just War Principles: Divide students into groups of two to four. Assign each group one of the just war principles. Direct students to discuss and analyze the war being studied in light of the principle(s) they have been assigned. Their task is to decide if the war was “just” under the requirements of *that* principle, using historical evidence to support their decision.

Example: Principle Three - Last Resort: Using historical evidence, students must decide if all peaceful options were exhausted before the war began. What were those options? What was done? What else might have been done?

3. Handout the “Justification of War Case Study Matrix”. Students should use this to take notes during the “Share Out” by the groups.
4. Working through the principles one by one, each group shares their deliberations. They discuss their analysis of the war in light of the principle they were assigned, and present their argument citing historical evidence. The class takes notes using the matrix.
5. Discuss: After all the groups have presented, engage the class in a discussion of the results, again, working through the principles one by one. Keep students focused on the principle under discussion and avoiding bird-walking to other principles. Does everyone agree with the group’s

conclusions regarding that principle? Some groups assigned the same principle may have reached different conclusions.

6. After a thorough discussion of all of the principles, move to a discussion of the war over-all. Do they think it was just? Why or why not? Does a war need to meet every principle in order to be a just war? Make intellectual room for those students who generally reject the notion of applying just war principles to decide whether a war is right.
7. Students write a persuasive essay:

According to the Just War principles, was this a just war?

Begin your essay by summarizing the war (when, where, who, why, and outcomes.)

Using the just war principles, present your opinion on whether the war was, or was not just *according to the principles of just war theory*. Cite evidence to support your argument.

Whatever your conclusion (was just, was not just according to the theory), indicate whether you personally do or do not agree with the conclusion. If you do not agree, you may present your own conclusion explaining why it differs from the one based on just war principles.

***Extension Activities::***

- As additional wars are studied throughout the year, the same procedure is followed, and students compare and contrast different wars in terms of whether they met the just war criteria or not.

## JUST WAR PRINCIPLES

Today, the principles most often used for determining whether going to war is justified (*jus ad bellum*) are:

7. **Just cause/right intention:** A just war must be fought only for purposes of self-defense against armed attack or to right a serious wrong.
8. **Proper authority:** A war is just only if waged by a legitimate authority.
9. **Last resort:** A just war must be the last resort; all peaceful options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified.
10. **Probability of success:** There must be a reasonable chance of success; deaths and injury that result from a hopeless cause cannot be morally justified.
11. **Beneficial outcome:** The outcome of the war must be better than the situation that would exist had the war not taken place.
12. **Proportionality:** The violence and destruction must be proportional to the injury suffered.

## JUSTIFICATION OF WAR CASE STUDY MATRIX

**NAME OF WAR:**

**NAME OF STUDENT:**

Principle	Evidence to Support Opinion
<p>14. <b>Just cause/right intention:</b> A just war must be fought only for purposes of self-defense against armed attack or to right a serious wrong.</p>	
<p>15. <b>Proper authority:</b> A war is just only if waged by a legitimate authority.</p>	
<p>16. <b>Last resort:</b> A just war must be the last resort; all peaceful options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified.</p>	
<p>17. <b>Probability of success:</b> There must be a reasonable chance of success; deaths and injury that result from a hopeless cause cannot be morally justified.</p>	
<p>18. <b>Beneficial outcome:</b> The outcome of the war must be better than the situation that would exist had the war not taken place.</p>	
<p>19. <b>Proportionality:</b> The violence and destruction must be proportional to the injury suffered.</p>	