

THE STUDY OF WAR, PEACE AND RELIGION IN THE HISTORY CLASSROOM

Lessons Developed by Participants
in the Seminar Series

“War and Peace in
Judaism, Christianity and Islam”

at

SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY

2008 -2009

Funded by the
National Endowment for the Humanities

WAR, PEACE AND RELIGION IN THE HISTORY CLASSROOM

Preface

Religion – the cause of war, or a voice for peace? School textbooks and state curriculum standards often leave the impression that religion and war go hand-in-hand. But historically, the influence of religious thought on both war and peace is more complex than our textbooks – and news media – would have us believe.

In 2008-2009, the National Endowment for the Humanities funded a seminar series, “War and Peace in Judaism, Christianity and Islam: The Influence of Texts and Commentaries Throughout History” co-sponsored by ISTEP, the Department of Religious Studies and the Center for Islamic and Arabic Studies at San Diego State University. Throughout the year, middle and high school teachers met with SDSU faculty on a regular basis to discuss readings drawn from each of the religious traditions, and explore approaches for translating those discussions into the classroom. The lessons in this unit represent the combined outcome of those efforts.

We would like to acknowledge all of the participants for their collaborative efforts in developing classroom materials. Special recognition is due to Danielle Perkio, Mesa Verde Middle School, for her input on critical examination of textbook language; Dana Mejias and Stacy Tinsley, Correia Middle School, for their contributions to the lessons on Just War, technology applications, and language usage in contemporary media; and Susan Mitchell, Jefferson Middle School, for her approach to using Just War as a theme throughout the year.

Finally, we wish to thank our lead faculty from the SDSU Department of Religious Studies: Rebecca Moore, Department Chair, covering Christianity; Khaleel Mohammed, covering Islamic Studies; and Rabbi Scott Meltzer, covering Judaic Studies. ISTEP Director, Elsie Begler, facilitated discussions of classroom adaptations and development of new curriculum, and was responsible for final editing and compilation of the materials.

ISTEP
2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Setting the Context - The Academic Study of Sacred Texts and Commentaries

Lesson 1: Religious vs. Devotional Study of Religious Texts

Lesson 2: The Bible as a Primary Source Document for Learning about the Ancient Hebrews

II. Defining War, Exploring the Meaning of Peace

Lesson 3: The Meaning(s) of War and Peace

Part I: Words and Meanings (an “Into” Activity)

Part II: Defining War

Part III: Exploring the Meaning of Peace

Lesson 4: The Lexicon of War and Peace in Textbooks

Part I: The Lexicon of War

Part II: The Causes of War

Part III: Peace

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...

IV. Language and Faith

Lesson 8: Language and Faith

Part I: The Political Lexicon of Our Times

Part II: Revolutionaries or Terrorists?

I.
SETTING THE CONTEXT -
The Academic Study of
Sacred Texts and Commentaries

Lesson 1: Religious vs. Devotional Study of
Religious Texts

Lesson 2: The Bible as a Primary Source Document
for Learning about the Ancient Hebrews

Lesson 1:

Religious vs. Devotional Study of Religious Texts

It is impossible to study history without encountering religion, not as a simple by-product of human culture, but as a major factor in shaping behavior and influencing the trajectory of major events. World History is anemic and often incomprehensible without the study of the major world religions, and the academic content standards in History/Social Sciences in many states require it. However, the teacher *and* the students (and their parents) must be clear that “teaching religion” and “teaching *about* religion” are two very different things.

The PowerPoint presentation used in this lesson¹ makes clear the distinctions between devotional study and academic study of religious texts. It is best used at the beginning of the year, and referred back to as needed.

Objectives:

- Students will understand that the way in which they study religion in school is very different from the way they might learn about their own particular religion at home, in places of worship or in religious school.
- Students will be able to articulate some of the key differences between academic and devotional study of religious texts.

Materials: The PowerPoint presentation that accompanies this lesson.¹ (Outline attached.)

<u>Vocabulary:</u>	devotional	sacred
	confessional	sectarian
	premise	divine/divinely
	experiential	accessible
	practitioners	neutral
	attribution	

Procedure:

1. Explain to students that while studying history, they will also be learning about different religions and their influence on past events. Before beginning that study, it is important to understand what it means to learn *about* religion in an academic context.
2. Have students draw a line down the middle of a piece of paper. Label one column “Religious” and the other “Academic.” Starting with slide 3, they should write down two to three key words or phrases from each slide in the corresponding column.
3. Show the PowerPoint presentation, clarifying vocabulary as needed. Note: The last two slides are intended for use in presentations to teachers and other adults. They can be used with students

¹ The PowerPoint presentation was developed by Professor Rebecca Moore, Chair of the Department of Religious Studies at San Diego State University

at the teacher's discretion, explaining that they describe the approach your students should expect from you.

4. Pair students and have them quickly share with each other what they have written in each column. Using two or more of the words/phrases they have recorded, they should construct a single sentence that contrasts one aspect of the academic and devotional study of religion.

5. Have students share their sentences. Alternatively, have them post their sentences on a classroom or electronic bulletin board.

For PowerPoint Preview, see next page.

Academic vs Devotional Study of Religious Texts

by
Rebecca Moore, Chair
Department of Religious Studies
San Diego State University

There is a difference between the academic or scholarly study of religion and sacred texts (Religious Studies)...



...and the devotional study of religion and sacred texts (confessional, sectarian)



What is the difference between religious studies and devotional studies?

They start from different premises
They ask different questions
They use different vocabulary

Different Premises : Religious Studies

Religion and its texts are products of culture
Religion can be investigated like any other subject e.g. nature, history, psychology
Religion can be understood comparatively by outsiders and non-believers
Religious texts have human authors whose motives and historical contexts can be studied

Different Premises : Devotional Study

Religion is divinely given
Religious texts have human authors who have been divinely inspired and cannot be questioned
Religious texts are understood through experiential knowing, not necessarily accessible to outsiders
Religion can only truly be understood by its practitioners

Different Questions : Religious Studies
(especially about sacred texts)

What is the historical context?
Who wrote the text and why?
Which text is oldest, most accurate?
How did original readers understand the text?
Who tends to participate in the religion?
What are its beliefs and practices?

Different Questions : Devotional Study

What does my religion say about the divine plan for my life?
What does it say about my destiny?
What does it say about how should I live?
What does my religion say I should believe?
How do I know if my beliefs are true?

Different Vocabulary : Religious Studies

Scholars use neutral language
They use descriptive language
They use a technical language
They avoid "we-they" language
They provide attribution to scholarly sources and primary texts

Different Vocabulary : Devotional Study

Believers use confessional language
They speak in the first-person
They discuss religion as insiders
They provide attribution to a sacred authority
They tend not to question the text or its interpretation

Religious Studies
teaches **what**
people believe

Devotional study
teaches what
people **should**
believe (or what
the faith teaches)



Four principles of Religious Studies

1. De-familiarize : use scholarly and neutral language
2. Historicize : put subject into its historical context
3. Analyze : compare similarities and differences between texts
4. Exemplify : Model behavior that indicates critical thinking skills



Remember!

While teaching about religion presents unique challenges it's best to treat it like other academic subjects, modeling appropriate behavior and attitudes

Lesson 2:

The Bible as a Primary Source Document for Learning About the Ancient Hebrews¹

By examining passages from the Bible for information about the culture of the ancient Hebrew people, students gain a clear understanding of what “academic” study of religious texts is like.

Prior Knowledge: Students should know who the ancient Hebrews were. They should know that the Bible recounts the ancient history, laws, and beliefs of the Jewish people. They should be familiar with the names of the five books, and the technique of citation – i.e., Book, Chapter, Verse.

Objectives:

- Students will experience one technique for studying religious texts from an academic perspective.
- Students will use selected passages from the Bible to extract and interpret information to draw conclusions about ancient Hebrew life.

Materials:

1. Card sets: Use different colors of paper for card sets A and B. Make enough sets of A for ¼ of your class, and enough of B for ¼ of the class. Combined, there should be 1 card set for every two students in your class, divided equally in two different colors.
2. Enough worksheets for each pair of students, plus each group of four students.
3. One vocabulary sheet for each pair of students.

Procedure:

1. Introduction: Explain to the class that the Bible is a guide to faith for Jews, Christians and Muslims, and is used in devotional study by practitioners of each of those faiths to gain religious insight. When approached from an academic, rather than devotional, perspective, the Bible is also an important source of information about history. Combined with archaeological discoveries, it can be used to learn about ancient Hebrew life and culture.

While we can't use the Bible to *scientifically prove* that the specific people in the stories really lived and did the things told, we can use the Bible to provide information about the way of life of people living in that region at about the same time as when the stories are set.

We are going to search for as many “facts” as we can find about the lifestyle of the ancient Hebrews, using excerpts from the first five books of the Bible (called the Torah by Jewish people.)

2. Have students work in pairs. Give each pair a set of cards, a worksheet and a vocabulary page. Half the class should have cards from A and half from B. The vocabulary words are referenced by number on the cards.

¹ Adapted from a lesson by Margaret Hill based on material from the Skirball Museum at Hebrew Union College. Hill's lesson is available at: http://score.rims.k12.ca.us/score_lessons/torah_tells/index.html

Instructions: You and your partner have a set of cards with quotes from the Torah. The references at the bottom of the cards indicate the name of the book (e.g., Genesis), the chapter and the verse number where you can find the quote. Use the vocabulary page to help you with words you don't understand. Working with your partner, read the text on each of your cards, and use the worksheet to record the information.

3. Create groups of four by combining two pairs that share the same set of cards. Give these groups a new worksheet. Instruct them to compare their answers, discuss and resolve any disagreements, and fill out the new worksheet based on common agreement.
4. As a whole class, go over the worksheets, and record the answers on the board. Since there are two sets of cards with different quotations, the final compilation will be a combination of the information contained in each set. Check student answers against the Teacher Answer Key.
5. Discuss: What have we been able to learn about the lifestyle of the ancient Hebrews from these quotes? Point out that the quotes used do not cover everything we could learn about the lifestyle of the ancient Hebrews from reading the entire Torah. And if we were to examine other books of the Bible (e.g., Kings, the Prophets) we could learn even more.
6. Have each student write one or two paragraphs summarizing what they have learned about life among the ancient Hebrews. If they wish, they may illustrate their writing.

Quotations are drawn from the *Tanakh - New JPS English Translation*.

Clues to the Life of the Ancient Hebrews

1. What can you say about the economy of the ancient Hebrews?

- How did they make a living? *farming; herding; maybe: as craftsmen (e.g., working copper); as merchants*
- What kinds of foods did the ancient Hebrews eat? *meat; milk; wheat, barley, figs, pomegranates, olive oil, honey, wine, cakes made from flour*

How did they get their food? *they raised livestock, farmed, bought food with money*

- What kinds of animals did they have? What did they use them for? *goats, sheep (ewes and rams), camels, cows, asses (donkeys); they used cows and camels for milk; cows to eat; camels for transportation and carrying things
maybe: goats for meat and milk; sheep for wool and meat; asses for transportation.*
- What kinds of things did they make, and what did they use to make them? *cooking utensils from copper; wine; cakes from flour; yarns; linen cloth; screens*
- Did they buy, sell or trade things? What? *food, water, land, slaves, gum, balm, labdanum*

Were there any rules about selling things? *you couldn't cheat people with false measures (weights, rulers, etc.); you had to let slaves go free after six years.*

- Were there differences in wealth (how much people had)? How do you know? *Yes. Abraham was rich with cattle, gold and silver; the rule that you had to leave some of the harvest for the poor; there were slaves and slave-owners.*

2. Where did people live? What did they live in? *some people lived in cities; tents*

maybe: houses because some lived in cities.

3. Can you say anything about the geography of the land? What kinds of natural resources were important? *it was a mild climate (palm trees); water was important (people would sometimes pay for it); there was good farm land*

What aspects of nature might make life difficult? *farmers could have a hard time with insects*

4. What can we tell about the courts of law? How did someone get to be a judge? *judges were appointed*

Were there any rules that judges had to follow? *they couldn't take bribes; there had to be at least two witnesses to judge someone guilty*

5. Did the ancient Hebrews own slaves? Yes.

Could they do whatever they wanted with their slaves? How do you know? *No. If they seriously hurt a slave (e.g., blinded him) they had to let him go free; they had to let slaves go free after six years.*

6. What were some ways the ancient Hebrews gave *Tzedakah* (help to the poor)? *they left fruit and grain in their fields for the poor; when they set slaves free they gave them animals, flour and wine*

7. Is there anything else you can say about how the ancient Hebrews related to one another or to people from other groups? *groups would make peace treaties to avoid conflict*
maybe: they were nice to strangers (left food in the fields for them); they were generous (gave gifts, served food to visitors); men gave the orders;

Clues to the Life of the Ancient Hebrews

The Torah (the first five books of the Bible) gives us clues about how the ancient Hebrews lived before they settled in Palestine. Working with your partner(s), use the quotations on the cards to answer the following questions. Write down the source (citation at bottom of the card) for your answers.

Note: You may not be able to answer all of the questions using the clues you have. Record the *facts* that are actually provided in your quotes. If you *think* that something might be true based on what you read, write it on the *back* of the sheet under the heading: Maybe, and say why you think this might be true.

1. What can you say about the economy of the ancient Hebrews?
 - How did they make a living?
 - What kinds of foods did the ancient Hebrews eat? How did they get their food?
 - What kinds of animals did they have? What did they use them for?
 - What kinds of things did they make, and what did they use to make them?
 - Did they buy, sell or trade things? What? Were there any rules about selling things?
 - Were there differences in wealth (how much people had)? How do you know?
2. Where did people live? What did they live in?
3. Can you say anything about the geography of the land? What kinds of natural resources were important? What aspects of nature might make life difficult?
4. What can you say about courts of law? How did someone get to be a judge? Were there any rules that judges had to follow?
5. Did the ancient Hebrews own slaves? Could they do whatever they wanted with their slaves? How do you know?
6. What was one way the ancient Hebrews gave *Tzedakah* (help to the poor)?
7. Is there anything else you can say about how the ancient Hebrews related to one another or to people from other groups?

CARD SET A.

<p>Looking up, they saw a caravan of Ismalites coming from Gilead, their camels bearing gum, balm², and labdanum³ to be taken to Egypt.</p> <p>Genesis 37:25</p>	<p>He made all the utensil of the later – the pails, the scrapers, the basins, the flesh hooks, and the fire pans; he made all these utensils with copper...</p> <p>Exodus 38:3</p>
<p>Abraham hastened into the tent to Sarah and said, "Quick, three <i>seahs</i>⁴ of choice flour! Knead and make cakes!"</p> <p>Genesis 18:6</p>	<p>You shall not make false measures of length, weight or capacity⁵. You shall have an honest balance.</p> <p>Leviticus 19:35-36</p>
<p>A single witness may not validate⁶ against a person any guilt or blame for any offense that may be committed; a case can be valid only on the testimony of two witnesses or more.... and the magistrates⁷ shall make a thorough investigation.</p> <p>Deuteronomy 19:15; 18</p>	<p>If a fellow Hebrew, man or woman, is sold to you, he shall serve you six years and in the seventh you shall set him free. When you set him free, do not let him go empty handed. Furnish him out of the flock, threshing floor and vat⁸.</p> <p>Deuteronomy 15:12-14</p>
<p>What food you eat you shall procure from them for money; even the water you drink you shall procure from them with money.</p> <p>Deuteronomy 2:6</p>	<p>The Lord your God is bringing you into a good land... a land of wheat and barley, of vines, figs, and pomegranates, a land of olive oil and honey.</p> <p>Deuteronomy 8:7-8</p>
<p>.... he ran from the entrance of the tent to greet them. " ...If it please you, do not go on past... bath your feet and recline under the tree..." Then Abraham... took a calf, tender and choice, and gave it to a servant-boy, who hastened to prepare it. He took curds and milk and the calf that had been prepared and set these before them...</p> <p>Genesis 18:4-8</p>	<p>Though you take much seed out to the field, you shall gather in little, for the locust shall consume it. Though you plant vineyards and till them, you shall have no wine to drink or store, for the worm shall devour them... The cricket shall take over all the trees and produce of your land.</p> <p>Deuteronomy 28:38-42</p>

CARD SET B.

<p>And they came to Elim, where there were twelve springs of water and seventy palm trees; and they encamped there beside the water.</p> <p>Exodus 15:27</p>	<p>You shall appoint magistrates⁹ and officials for your tribes... and they shall govern the people with due justice.</p> <p>Deuteronomy 16:8</p>
<p>Now Abram was very rich in cattle, silver and gold.</p> <p>Genesis 13:2</p>	<p>You shall not judge unfairly... you shall not take bribes, for bribes blind the eyes of the discerning¹⁰ and upset the plea of the just.</p> <p>Deuteronomy 16:8</p>
<p>Jacob arrived safe in the city... and he encamped before the city. The parcel of land where he pitched his tent he purchased from the children of Hamor, Schechem's father, for a hundred <i>kesitahs</i>¹¹.</p> <p>Genesis 33:18-19</p>	<p>Let there be sworn treaty between our two parties, between you and us. Let us make a pact with you that you will do us no harm, just as we have not molested you but have always dealt kindly with you and sent you away in peace.</p> <p>Genesis 26:28-29</p>
<p>.... he selected from what was at hand these presents for his brother Esau: 200 she-goats and 20 he-goats; 200 ewes and 20 rams; 30 milch¹² camels and their colts; 40 cows and 10 bulls; 20 she-asses and 10 he-asses.</p> <p>Genesis 32:15</p>	<p>When you reap the harvest of your land, you shall not reap all the way to the edges of your field... you shall not pick your vineyard bare or gather the fallen fruit in your vineyard; you shall leave them for the poor and the stranger.</p> <p>Leviticus 19:9-10</p>
<p>When a man strikes the eye of his slave, male or female, and destroys it, he shall let him go free on account of the eye.</p> <p>Exodus 21:26</p>	<p>You shall make a screen for the entrance to the tent, of blue, purple, and red yarns, and fine twisted linen, done in embroidery.</p> <p>Exodus 26:36</p>

VOCABULARY

- ² balm – fragrant resin or leaves from evergreen trees
- ³ labdanum – a resin made from rock roses used in making perfumes
- ⁴ seahs – a unit of measure or weight
- ⁵ capacity - volume
- ⁶ validate - be enough to back up a claim
- ⁷ magistrates - judges
- ⁸ vat – for wine storage
- ⁹ magistrates - judges
- ¹⁰ discerning - perceptive
- ¹¹ kesitahs – a unit of money
- ¹² milch – milk

II.

DEFINING WAR, EXPLORING THE MEANING OF PEACE

Lesson 3: The Meaning(s) of War and Peace

Part I: Words and Meanings (An “Into”
Activity)

Part II: Defining War

Part III: Exploring the Meaning of Peace

Lesson 4: The Lexicon of War and Peace in Textbooks

Part I: The Lexicon of War

Part II: The Causes of War

Part III: Peace

Lesson 3:

The Meaning(s) of War and Peace

While war is a frequent topic in history classes, literature and discussions of contemporary issues, we seldom pause to consider precisely what we mean when we use the word. The same can be said for peace. This lesson engages students in critically examining the different meanings of both words.

Objectives:

- ✧ Students will develop their academic literacy by engaging in critical examination of the meanings of words commonly used in history;
- ✧ Students will appreciate the complexities of developing precise definitions to use when discussing war and peace in historical and contemporary contexts.

Materials: A copy of the graphic organizer “War/Peace Is/Is Not” for each student.

A large Is/Is Not chart to use for class feedback (this can be on the board.)

If desired, copies of the “Various Attempts at a Definition” for both War and Peace.

Procedure: Before beginning the discussion, have the “structure” sentences, but not the suggested answers (see below) written on the board.

PART I: WORDS AND MEANINGS (an “into” activity)

1. Tell students that in the course of studying history, literature, or just talking about contemporary affairs, they will inevitably encounter the topics of war and peace. The purpose of this activity is to become more aware of how we and others think about these terms.

Hand out the graphic organizer, “War/Peace Is/Is Not.” Instruct students to write down their ideas.

2. Take class feedback, using the Is/Is Not chart to record student responses. Discuss the results. Did everyone agree? Is every “conflict” a “war”? Which of the terms did they find harder to define, war or peace? Why do they think this is?

3. Explain that often it is hard to define a word because it has a variety of related, but different meanings.

Direct their attention to the following sentences (on the board):

He needed to structure his thoughts more clearly. (organize)

After the storm only two structures were left standing. (building)

The structure of the atom has a nucleus at the center. (design/arrangement)

The child had no structure in his life. (organization/routine)

The current economic structure isn’t working very well. (arrangement)

Have them work with a partner to brainstorm words they can use to replace “structure” without changing the meaning of each sentence. Possibilities are suggested in parentheses.

4. Take feedback, writing the replacement words next to each sentence. Ask for reactions. Can they identify an underlying meaning that all of the different uses of “structure” have? (The idea of organizing different parts – How would that apply to *buildings*?) Be sure students can articulate that the same word can have related, but different meanings depending on how it is used.

PART II: DEFINING WAR

5. Explain that the word “war” is like “structure”, only even more complicated. Write the following phrases on the board:

at war with himself	(intrapersonal conflict)
a war of words	(conflict or competition re: an idea)
the War on Drugs	(attempt to eradicate a particular kind of behavior)
warring factions	(competing)
the Vietnam War	(political entities engaged in violent conflict)

In this case, there is not a single word that can replace “war” in each of the phrases, but the meanings are not exactly the same. Give them a few minutes to work with their partner to try to articulate what the meaning of “war” is in each of these phrases. Possibilities are suggested in parentheses.

6. Take class feedback and work to clarify and distinguish the different meanings. Have them refer back to the Is/Is Not chart. Which of the meanings of “war” did they have in mind when they made the chart?

7. Tell students that scholars who study war often disagree on the specific details of the definition of war, but in general, the wars that we most often study in history can be roughly defined as follows:

“War is large-scale violent conflict between organized groups that are governments or that aim to establish a governments” (in control of a given land area.)

- R. Glossop, *Confronting War: And Examination of Humanity’s Most Pressing Problem*, Jefferson: McFarland and Company, Inc, (1994: 9)

Have students consider: Under this definition

- Would the American Revolution qualify as war? (Yes, because England was a government, and the Americans were trying to set up a separate government.)
- Would gang warfare qualify as war? (No, because neither gang is trying to establish a government, although they may be trying to control territory for special uses.)
- Would the conflicts with the Native Americans qualify as war? (Most of the time, because the U.S. government was trying to take control of the land occupied by Native Americans.)
- Would the police busting up a local drug ring qualify as war? (No, because it isn’t large-scale.)

Extension activity for more advanced students:

Handout and have students read “War – Various Attempts at a Definition.” Conduct a Socratic Seminar based on the handout (see below.)

Socratic Seminar:

1. In quote #1, John Vasquez implies that “war” should be a verb, not a noun. Why does he think treating “war” as a noun is misleading? Do you agree?
2. Quincy Wright (quote #4) argues that war is a “legal condition.” Can you find support for this idea in any of the other quotes? Do you think he is right?
3. Do you think there are any significant differences between the definitions of war offered by Glossop (#2), Wright (#3) and Bull (#4)? Can you think of any instances where one of the definitions might apply but another not?
4. Clausewitz’s comment that “War is a mere continuation of policy by other means” is very famous. It is also a focus of contentious debate. What do you think he meant? Why might people feel strongly about this comment?
5. Why do you think scholars have struggle to develop a satisfactory definition of war?

PART III: EXPLORING THE MEANING OF PEACE

8. Students need the “War/Peace Is/Is Not” page they filled out in Part I. Place students in small groups. Handout the “Peace Is... Group Worksheet.” Go over the instructions to make sure they understand the assignment.
9. Share out. As one student group describes a “meaning cluster”, list the words they included on the board and ask if any other groups have a similar cluster. If there are words they have that were not included by the first group, add them to the list on the board. Have a different group share a *different* cluster, repeating the procedure until all of the results are recorded. There will probably be some discussion and disagreement on exactly where a particular word belongs, and/or what the different clusters should be.
10. Handout the worksheet “What Is Peace?” Discuss: How well do the different definitions match up with the clusters of meaning developed by the class? Individually, students complete the worksheet, writing a sentence containing the word “peace” that expresses each of the different meanings.
11. Conclude by pointing out that scholars who study peace have even more trouble agreeing on a single definition than do scholars who study war. In fact,

“....some ‘peace thinkers’³ have abandoned any single and all-encompassing definition of peace. Rather, they promote the idea of many peaces.... peace does not necessarily have to be something humans might achieve “some day.” They contend that peace exists in the present, we can create and expand it in small ways in our everyday lives, and peace changes constantly.

<http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peace>

³ E.g. Wolfgang Dietrich, Wolfgang Sützl, and the Innsbruck School of Peace Studies

WAR	
IS	IS NOT
PEACE	
IS	IS NOT

“WAR”– Various Attempts at a Definition

1. “An emphasis on the fighting and killing in war makes it clear that war is an activity, not an object with its own ontological existence. The tendency of English ... to describe activities by nouns rather than verbs fundamentally distorts the world we are trying to understand. Instead of seeing war as something mechanically caused by certain factors, it might be more illuminating to see war as an action to which states resort when faced with certain situations...”

“...Above all, war consists of fighting and killing. It is one of the most salient features of war that killing, which is generally frowned upon, if not prohibited, within a group, is encouraged and honored in war.”

- John A Vasquez, *The War Puzzle*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, pp. 38, 40

2. “War is large-scale violent conflict between organized groups that are governments or that aim to establish governments.”

- R. Glossop, *Confronting War: And Examination of Humanity’s Most Pressing Problem*, Jefferson: McFarland and Company, Inc, (1994: 9)

3. War is “the *legal condition* which *equally* permits two or more *hostile groups* to carry on a *conflict by armed force*” (italics in original)

- Quincy Wright, 1965:8

4. The following definitions are commented on by John A Vasquez in *The War Puzzle*, pp. 22-39:

“War is organized violence carried on by political units against each other.”

- Hedley Bull, 1977:184

“War is a mere continuation of policy by other means.”

“War therefore is an act of violence intended to compel our opponent to fulfill our will.”

- Clausewitz, 1832, Book I, ch 1, sections 2 and 24, J.J. Graham translation.

Vasquez (pp. 24-25) comments that Hedley Bull’s definition has three implications: First,

“...war is an organized activity with rules and customs... Second,

“...war is not random violence, but focused and directed.” and third,

“...it is organized in the sense that it is collective and social, not individual.”

Vasquez (p. 39) comments that Clausewitz’s discussion implies that

“...war is a *political instrument of force*. It is political in that it is more frequently... associated with political activity than any other... It is an instrument in that those who wage war attempt, at some point, to use it as a calculated ‘rational’ means to an end. It is force in that it is a means that attempts to compel opponents to do something they will not do freely.”

PEACE IS....

Instructions:

1. Using your “War/Peace Is/Is Not” worksheets, list all of the *different* words or phrases that the members of your group used to describe what peace is in the left column. If more than one of you have used the same word or phrase, list it only once.
2. Do some of the words or phrases have very similar meanings? (For example, “a treaty to end a war” and “an agreement between nations to stop fighting” are very similar) Working together, try to form 4 – 6 clusters of words/phrases that generally mean the same thing.

Rewrite the list on the left in the right column, this time clustering them by meaning. Make sure all of the words listed on the left are included on the right (even if a word ends up being its own cluster!) Underline a word in each cluster that you feel best represents the meaning of the cluster overall.

PEACE IS ...	MEANING CLUSTERS

WHAT IS PEACE?

- 1. an agreement between those who have been at war to end hostilities or fighting
- 2. a period of time during which there is no war
- 3. a state of security or public order within a community
- 4. harmony in personal relationships
- 5. freedom from upsetting thoughts or emotions
- 6. a state of tranquility or quiet

Can you write a sentence that expresses each of the meanings of peace? For example:

1. The Seminole are the only tribe of Native Americans that never signed a peace treaty with the U.S. government.

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

6. _____

Lesson 4:

THE LEXICON OF WAR AND PEACE IN TEXTBOOKS

Impressions about the nature of and reasons for military conflicts are generally developed second-hand by American school children. History textbooks provide one of the primary sources for students' formation of concepts concerning war and other types of armed conflicts as students study the wide variety of armed conflicts that have occurred in history. Yet as teachers, we rarely ask our students to critically examine and think about the ways that different conflicts are described in their texts, and how those descriptions might influence their perceptions.

Orienting Questions:

1. What words are used in our textbooks to indicate that physical or armed conflict occurred between two groups of people?
2. What determines the use of the different words or phrases?
3. Do our textbooks provide any guidelines for distinguishing war from other kinds of conflicts?
4. What explanations do our textbooks give for the causes of physical/armed conflict?
5. What do our textbooks have to say about peace?
6. Based upon what they read in textbooks, what conclusions might students draw about the nature of war and peace?

Objectives:

- To reinforce student learning about different conflicts in history.
- To develop students' critical reading skills through attention to word usage and meaning;
- To develop students' skills in critically evaluating underlying values and/or biases of a text;
- To engage students in thinking about the meanings of the range of terms used to refer to armed conflict in history textbooks;
- To develop students' critical thinking skills through reflection about the ways in which textbook descriptions help shape their own attitudes and impressions of different historic events.

How/When to Use: Grades 5 – 12. There a number of different ways to use this activity.

- The activity can be introduced at the beginning of the year as an exercise accompanying each new unit of study. At the end of the year a cumulative comparison can be done.
- Alternatively, the activity can be assigned three to four times throughout the year as part of a combined review of several units of study. At the end of the year a cumulative comparison can be done.

PART II: THE CAUSES OF WAR

7. In their groups, have students examine the causes given by the textbook of each of the conflicts they found. (Refer back to their individual worksheets.) Be prepared to report out on:

- the different *kinds* of causes mentioned by the textbook; and,
- any relationships or patterns they see between the causes cited and
 - a. the parties to the conflict
 - b. the importance of the conflict
 - c. who won the conflict
 - d. any other relationships or patterns they may observe

8. Discuss with the class:

- What different kinds of explanations did the textbook provide for the causes of different conflicts? (In some cases, the text may have provided no explanation at all.)
- What patterns did they observe between the types of causes mentioned by the text and other factors?
- Based on their textbooks, what conclusions might they draw about the causes of war?
- Overall, do they think their textbooks do a good job explaining different kinds of armed conflict and their causes? Why or why not?

PART III: PEACE

This can be used as a year-long monitoring exercise, or it may be done as a cumulative review activity at the end of the year.

9. Tell students that the class will be monitoring what our textbooks have to say about peace. Each time they come across a discussion of peace or the use of the word, they will add it to the chart. Periodically, and at the end of the year, we will compare how our textbooks discuss peace to their treatment of war.

10. *Either* post a bulletin board in the room (or use an electronic bulletin board) using the format on Student Worksheet #2, or give each student their own copy of Worksheet #2 to keep in their notebooks as a year-long recording device. If using the latter approach, remind students periodically to record the information on their worksheets.

11. At the end of the year, or periodically when enough references to peace have occurred in the text to provide a basis for comparison and generalization, engage the students in the following Socratic Seminar. (Note: Peace is mentioned far less frequently than conflict or war, so it will take a while to compile a sufficient numbers of instances.)

Socratic Seminar

1. Is peace a common topic in our textbooks? When does it get discussed? Why do you think that is?
2. How is peace described in our textbooks? What other words or descriptions are used to indicate peace? How does this compare with words used in the textbook to indicate war? Why do you think this difference exists?
3. Does the textbook pay more attention to peace or to war? What about periods when there is no war – are they described as peaceful? In your opinion, are periods between wars always peaceful? Why?
4. What does the textbook have to say about the causes of peace? We often say that people or nations “go to war” or “make war.” Do you believe people can “go to peace” or “make peace?”

NAME: _____

Geographic Region, Culture or Time Period: _____

Look for instances of armed conflict in the assigned section of your textbook. How do you know it is an armed conflict? What words are used that suggest this? (examples: "attacked" "revolt" "invade" "captured" etc.) Use additional worksheets if needed to cover all the conflicts.

1. <u>Conflict</u> (chapter & page #):		1. <u>Conflict</u> (chapter & page #):	
2. List all words or phrases that indicate that a conflict took place.	3. Who were the parties to the conflict?	2. List all words or phrases that indicate that a conflict took place.	3. Who were the parties to the conflict?
4. Was this a major conflict? Yes _____ No _____ Explain your answer.		4. Was this a major conflict? Yes _____ No _____ Explain your answer.	
5. Was this a war? Yes _____ No _____ Explain your answer.		5. Was this a war? Yes _____ No _____ Explain your answer.	
6. According to the textbook, what were the causes of this conflict?		6. According to the textbook, what were the causes of this conflict?	

Group Instructions

Use the group worksheet “Comparing Textbook Descriptions of Conflict” to record the requested information for four different conflicts identified by group members.

1. Enter the name of the conflict.
2. List the parties involved in the column for each conflict.
3. List the words used in the textbook to describe that conflict by comparing the lists of words different people have recorded for each conflict (box #2 on individual worksheets.) Some people may have listed different words used to describe the same conflict. If so, verify (by going back to the text) that all of the words listed are correct.

Discuss: Are there differences in the kinds of words or phrases used to describe different conflicts? If so, why do you think that might be?

4. For each of the conflicts on the group worksheet, compare how group members answered the questions in box #4 on their individual worksheets.

Discuss: Does everyone agree? Why? If not, discuss the differences in your responses, listening carefully to each others’ perspectives, and respectfully debating any differences of opinion.

Be prepared to report out to the class on your discussions.

GROUP WORKSHEET

COMPARING TEXTBOOK DESCRIPTIONS OF CONFLICT

Conflict Name	Conflict Name	Conflict Name	Conflict Name
Parties to Conflict	Parties to Conflict	Parties to Conflict	Parties to Conflict
Conflict Words	Conflict Words	Conflict Words	Conflict Words
Important? A war?	Important? A war?	Important? A war?	Important? A war?

DISCUSSIONS OF PEACE IN OUR TEXTBOOK
(an example is provided)

Time Period/ Date	Page # in book	Topic	What the textbook says	Other words used to indicate peace
27 BC - 250 CE	23	<i>Roman Empire at its height</i>	<i>"Because Rome was strong, the empire was peaceful and stable."</i>	<i>stable, well-fed, strong, wealthy</i>

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) 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?

	Yes	No
• 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>.

Vocabulary:	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://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://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.”⁴ 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 pacifist⁵ point of view that killing is always wrong, or from a *realpolitik*⁶ position that force is just another strategy for pursuing national interests.

⁴ [Mark Rigstad](http://www.justwartheory.com), Associate Professor of Philosophy, Oakland University; <http://www.justwartheory.com>

⁵ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pacifist>

⁶ <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Realpolitik>

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

Although it was the 20th 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 13th 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.

Thomas Aquinas – Three Requirements for Just War	Augustine’s discussions of war (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: 7th- 11th 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://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

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

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

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

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. 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.</p>	
<p>15. Proper authority: A war is just only if waged by a legitimate authority.</p>	
<p>16. Last resort: 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. Probability of success: There must be a reasonable chance of success; deaths and injury that result from a hopeless cause cannot be morally justified.</p>	
<p>18. Beneficial outcome: The outcome of the war must be better than the situation that would exist had the war not taken place.</p>	
<p>19. Proportionality: The violence and destruction must be proportional to the injury suffered.</p>	

IV.

LANGUAGE AND FAITH

Lesson 8: Language and Faith

Part I: The Political Lexicon of Our Times

Part II: Revolutionaries or Terrorists?

Lesson 8: Language and Faith

The activities in Lesson 8 are designed to explore the role of language as it is specifically used for and interpreted by mass audiences in contemporary times. While in most cases, language's intrinsic purpose is to clarify meaning, often the role of language referencing religion and war is reversed to one which results in confusion, misinterpretation and misunderstanding.

Objectives:

- Students will identify traditional and contemporary interpretations of key religious concepts.
- Students will analyze, interpret, compare and contrast primary and secondary sources.
- Students will analyze religious concepts as interpreted by the media and other public mediums of interpretation.
- Students will examine the use of language describing and categorizing armed conflict by different parties to the conflict.

Grade Level/Subject: History. Originally used in 7th (World History) and 8th (American History) grade classrooms, 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 in which religion played a role.

Note: The lessons in this unit were originally developed for use with digital classroom networking software that allows teachers to post assignments, and students to post work as well as engage in on-line discussion with each other. It can easily be used in any classroom where students can access the internet to listen to/read the NPR and PBS materials upon which it is based.

Materials:

Part I: NPR's series, "Exploring the Language of Post-Sept. 11 U.S. Policy" *Part I: The War on the Word Jihad* and *Part III: Defining the War on Terror*

"The impact of Sept. 11, 2001, forced America to engage in a kind of national "cramming session." Within weeks, such terms as "jihadist" and "war on terror" entered the American English lexicon. It wasn't long before Islamic extremists became "Islamofascists," and within months, America's publicly-stated Middle East policy became one of "democracy promotion."

"Every political generation spawns a new set of terms -- ideas, words, rhetoric to help explain, simplify, advance or destroy a cause. In a five-part series, Guy Raz explores the political language of our times. Below, political thinkers comment on some of the terms explored in our stories.."

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6406405>

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6392989>

<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6416780>

Part II: The reading, "Revolutionaries or Terrorists?" from the PBS Online NewsHour
<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/extra/teachers/lessonplans/terrorism/terrorism2.html>
Text of reading is attached for teacher's information.

PART I. THE POLITICAL LEXICON OF OUR TIMES

Procedure:

1. Explain to students that they will be examining the different ways words that have religious associations are utilized for political purposes during times of conflict. Specifically, we will be examining the way some of these words have been used in the United States following the events of September 11, 2001, using a series produced by National Public Radio.
2. Assign *Part 1. The War on the Word 'Jihad.'*
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6392989>

Options:

- Students access the site as homework; *or*,
- Teacher provides print-outs of the transcript so students may read along as they listen to the broadcast in class.

Part 1. The War on the Word 'Jihad'

Khaled Abou el Fadl teaches Islamic law at UCLA and is the author of *The Great Theft: Wrestling Islam from Extremists*. He argues that using the term "jihad" to describe al-Qaida extremists "slanders" the theological concept of jihad and alienates many Muslims.

- Using the information and ideas presented, students create a "plus – minus" chart on the positive and negative meanings/connotations of the word 'jihad.'
- Students discuss the results on-line, or in class.

Task: Create a +/- chart on the term Jihad

Positive	Negative

2. Assign *Part 3. Defining the War on Terror.*
<http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6416780>

Options:

- Students access the site as homework; *or*,
- Teacher provides print-outs of the transcript so students may read along as they listen to the broadcast in class.

Part 3. Defining the War on Terror:

Richard Perle, former Pentagon adviser and a neoconservative who advocated for regime change in Iraq, says "war" is the appropriate term to use in the struggle against Islamic extremists.

- Conduct a Socratic Seminar based on this segment. (see next page)

Socratic Seminar:

1. Examine the following definition of war. Does it seem a reasonable definition of the term war? Would you add to this definition? Would you delete something from it?

WAR:

- a. A state of open, armed, often prolonged conflict carried on between nations, states, or parties.
 - b. The period of such conflict.
 - c. The techniques and procedures of war; military science.
 - d. A condition of active antagonism or contention: *a war of words; a price war.*
 - e. A concerted effort or campaign to combat or put an end to something considered injurious: *the war against acid rain.*
2. Historically, how has the interpretation of the meaning of the term "war" served leaders and/or certain groups?
 3. How would you define the war on terror?
 4. According to the author, what is problematic about the term "war on terror"?

Optional: The following segments can be used when studying the topics of Fascism and World War II, Imperialism, and the Cold War to help students connect past with present.

Part 2. Islamofascism: <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6412169> Paul Berman, a prominent liberal intellectual and senior fellow at the World Policy Institute, is the author of *Terror and Liberalism*. He says that radical Islamists have something in common with fascist movements of the past.

Part 4. Imperialism: <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=6423000> Historian Niall Ferguson, of Harvard and Oxford, is the author of *The War of the World: Twentieth-Century Conflict and the Descent Of The West*. He says Americans don't like to acknowledge it, but the United States has become an empire "despite its own best wishes."

Part 5. Democracy: Francis Fukuyama, an academic and author of *America at the Crossroads*, became famous for his idea that the end of the Cold War marked the triumph of liberal democracy. That philosophy helped underpin neoconservative arguments for a U.S. policy aimed at spreading democracy across the Mideast. But Fukuyama says he's been misunderstood.

PART II. REVOLUTIONARIES OR TERRORISTS?
PBS Online NewsHour

Materials: The reading, “Revolutionaries or Terrorists?” from the PBS Online NewsHour
<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/extra/teachers/lessonplans/terrorism/terrorism2.html>

Text of reading is attached for teacher’s information.

1. Assign the readings, directing students to take Cornell Notes organized around the following topics:
 - Just War
 - International Law
 - Geneva Conventions
 - Proportionality
 - Freedom Fighters vs. Terrorists

2. Questions for Discussion:
 - When is force justified?
 - Is there a difference between a terrorist and a freedom fighter?
 - Who decides?



<http://www.pbs.org/newshour/extra/teachers/lessonplans/terrorism/terrorism2.html>

Revolutionaries or Terrorists?

Throughout history, the world has known political violence and war. For centuries political and religious thinkers from many traditions have wrestled with two key questions. When is the use of force acceptable? What principles govern how force that may be used? These two questions are central to something known as "just war" theory.

These two questions and the concepts of just war theory may also be useful in considering terrorism. In past debates about terrorism, some have suggested that one person's terrorist is another's freedom fighter. Are these terms merely labels that have to do with whether one agrees or disagrees with the cause? Or is the distinction based on more concrete and objective grounds?

Today, just war theory underlies much of accepted international law concerning the use of force by states. International law is explicit about when states may use force. For example, states may use force in self-defense against an armed attack. International law also addresses how force may be used. For example, force may not be used against non-combatants. Despite these laws and norms, there are those who oppose the use of violence under any circumstances. For example, this commitment to non-violence led Mohandas Gandhi to build a movement of national liberation in India organized around the practice of non-violent resistance.

Over the years, the international community has been working to better define the rules of war. The [Geneva Conventions](#) established in the aftermath of World War II introduced new internationally accepted regulations on the conduct of war between states. These rules protect non-combatants, govern the treatment of prisoners of war, prohibit hostage-taking, and respect diplomatic immunity.

In addition, the concept of proportionality-long a part of just war theory-has gained new importance as the weapons of war have become increasingly destructive. Proportionality argues that it is wrong to use more force than is necessary to achieve success.

After the Second World War, the use of violence in struggles for self-determination and national liberation fueled a new aspect of the debate on legitimate use of force-the differences between freedom fighters and terrorists. For example, newly independent Third World nations and Soviet bloc nations argued that any who fought against the colonial powers or the dominance of the West should be considered freedom fighters, while their opponents often labeled them terrorists.

Following the violence at the [1972 Munich Olympics](#), U.N. Secretary General Kurt Waldheim called on the General Assembly to discuss measures to prevent

State Terror?

During the U.N. debates on terrorism, some argued that the methods of violence used by states can be morally reprehensible and a form a terrorism.

"...the methods of combat used by national liberation movements could not be declared illegal while the policy of terrorism unleashed against certain peoples [by the armed forces of established states] was declared legitimate."

-Cuban Representative to the U.N.

terrorism.

Waldheim's suggestion provoked furious debate over the nature of terrorism and the role of armed struggle in national liberation.

"...all liberation movements are described as terrorists by those who have reduced them to slavery. ...[The term] terrorist [can] hardly be held to persons who were denied the most elementary human rights, dignity, freedom and independence, and whose countries objected to foreign occupation."

- U.N. Ambassador from Mauritania Moulaye el-Hassan

Critics countered that this argument was misleading because it failed to consider the issue in its entirety. What mattered was not the justness of the cause (something that would always be subject to debate) but the legitimacy of the methods used. The ends, they argued, could not be used to justify the means.

By the late 1970s, significant portions of the international community (though not the United States) had decided to extend the protection of the Geneva Convention to include groups participating in armed struggle against colonial domination, alien occupation, or racist regimes; and to those exercising their right of self-determination. The significance of this change is that it seemed to extend legitimacy to the use of force by groups other than states.

The events of September 11 and the subsequent war on terrorism have led us to consider important questions concerning the use of force. When is force justified? What is a terrorist? How does a terrorist differ from a freedom-fighter? Who decides?

This lesson is excerpted from [Responding to Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy](#) (© August 2002, [Choices for the 21st Century Education Program](#), Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University. All rights reserved.)