



Teaching Guide

on

The
Justification
of War

**National Peace
Essay Contest**



United States Institute of Peace

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction2

2002-2003 National Peace Essay Contest Question4

Five Lessons

I. Introducing the National Peace Essay Contest and the 2002-2003 Question to your Students (1/2 period)5

II. Understanding the Causes of War (1 period).....7

III. Applying the Principles of a Just War to Modern Conflicts and Introducing Bibliographic Resources (1-2 periods)12

IV. Utilizing Primary Sources to Learn How Leaders Justify Wars (1-2 periods)18

V. Developing an Editorial Position on the Justness of a Conflict (1period)23

Additional Materials

Supplemental Teaching Resource: Thinking About Conflict and Conflict Resolution29

Special Feature: Extension Activities.....32

Tips for Helping Students Write a Successful Peace Essay33

National Content Standards34

Additional Resources35

INTRODUCTION

Objectives of the Teaching Guide

- ❑ To increase students' understanding of war and peace.
- ❑ To increase students' understanding of the concept of a "just war" and the application of this concept to historic and contemporary conflicts.
- ❑ To develop analytical reading, writing, and research skills.
- ❑ To enable classroom teachers, students, and contest coordinators to:
 - Understand the overall theme of the National Peace Essay Contest (NPEC) topic
 - Define and understand concepts contained in the essay question
 - Apply specific principles of a just war to several international conflicts
 - Review bibliographic resources and select sources for their research
 - Use primary sources to discover and evaluate the manner in which leaders justify waging war
 - Analyze opposing viewpoints on the justification of war.
- ❑ To assist teachers in preparing students to write essays for submission to the National Peace Essay Contest (NPEC) by providing them with lesson plans, worksheets, bibliographic sources, and factual material.

Advance Preparation

1. Review this teaching guide and the NPEC guidebook.
2. Decide whether you will use these lessons as preparation for the NPEC or as a supplement to your curriculum.
3. If you will use the guide as preparation for the NPEC, decide:
 - ☞ Will this be a required, extra-credit, or extracurricular project for your students?
 - ☞ At what point in your course will you include the NPEC?
 - ☞ How many class hours can you devote to this project?
 - ☞ How will the class hours be scheduled among other assignments and activities?

4. For each student, make copies of the essay question, your schedule of assignments, and grading criteria. If you are submitting essays to the NPEC, you may also want to make copies of the Contest guidelines and judging criteria located on pages 5 and 6 of the NPEC guidebook. Please note that you can request copies of the guidebook for each student in your class by contacting the Institute at (202) 429-3854. Students can also access the guidebook on the NPEC web site.
5. Make copies of the worksheets, overhead transparencies, and reference materials for the lessons you have decided to use.

Teaching Materials

- ☞ Library Access
- ☞ Internet Access (if available)

NOTES:

- This Teaching Guide has been prepared to coincide with the 2002-2003 NPEC; however, the materials can be used at anytime, independent of the Contest.
- These lessons assume a 45-minute class period. If your school uses block scheduling, these lessons may be combined or may be used as a portion of one day's block. Several lessons are "expandable" depending on the amount of time you wish to give students for research, whether they work individually or in groups, and the method of presentation of their results (written or oral reports) which you select. The sequence of lessons is recommended but subject to teacher discretion.
- You may wish to confer with colleagues in other departments for substantive information or ideas to improve your students' essay-writing skills.

2002-2003 NATIONAL PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

QUESTION

The Justification of War

One of the age-old questions facing humankind is: when is war justified. Or, put another way, is there such a thing as a just war? Almost no leader will remain in power if he or she risks the lives of soldiers and civilians without assuring them that their mission is just and that of the enemy unjust. Some would argue, however, that many leaders use the language of just principles simply to justify wars they would fight in any case.

Many people believe in the concept of a just war, as defined by these fundamental principles:

- ❖ A just war must be a last resort; all peaceful options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified;
- ❖ A war is just only if waged by a legitimate authority;
- ❖ A just war must be fought only as self-defense against armed attack or to redress a wrong;
- ❖ There must be a reasonable chance of success; deaths and injury that result from a hopeless cause cannot be morally justified;
- ❖ The consequences of the war must be better than the situation that would exist had the war not taken place;
- ❖ The violence and destruction must be proportional to the injury suffered;
- ❖ Civilians must not be targets of the fighting and great care must be taken to avoid civilian casualties.

Others, however, would argue that the concept of a just war remains very subjective, and still others argue, usually for moral or religious reasons, that war can never be justified.

The principles themselves raise many issues. Are wars just only when fought in self-defense? Wars may be fought to redress an injury to a people or a society, yet it is unclear who determines that an injury has occurred. Also, upon what basis can one establish whether civilians were deliberately targeted or that the violence was proportional? Those who argue for "just wars" believe that the goal of a just war must be to bring about peace, a peace that is preferable to whatever situation would have existed in the absence of the war. How can this claim be substantiated, and who should determine whether peaceful options have been exhausted or the extent to which one party has been wronged?

In a 1500-word essay examine two wars, of which at least one must be after 1990. Using the principles of just war listed above, analyze the two cases by addressing these questions:

- ❖ How did the leaders justify these wars to their people and to the international community?
- ❖ One of the fundamental principles is that war must be waged only as a last resort after all non-violent options have been exhausted. In your opinion, what criteria determine when the point of last resort is reached? Did either war meet such a standard?
- ❖ Finally, do you agree with the above just war principles? How do the two wars you have cited support these principles, or do your cases lend themselves to other principles? If you think that war is never justified, how would you refute those who make the case for a just war?

Lesson I

Introducing the National Peace Essay Contest (NPEC) and the 2002-2003 Question to Your Students

(1/2 period)

Rationale: This lesson will introduce students to the topic of the 2002-2003 NPEC contest and will set the stage for the classes that follow.

Objectives:

Students will:

- Learn of the scholarships and educational opportunities available through the National Peace Essay Contest.
- Understand the purposes of the United States Institute of Peace.
- Read the 2002-2003 Essay Contest question.
- Review the NPEC and class guidelines for the peace essay assignment.

Materials:

- The essay contest question
- NPEC rules and guidelines
- Your schedule of due dates, grading policy or rubric, and guidelines for the project
- Copies of the Lesson II Handout Worksheet for the next assignment

Step 1

Introduce this project to your students and give them time to read over the information about the U.S. Institute of Peace, the essay contest, and the guidelines that you have prepared for them. Point out the objectives and benefits to them of entering this contest. Go over the schedule of lessons and assignments.

Step 2

Ask students to read the National Peace Essay Contest question. Ask students for their first impressions of the topic and the principles of a just war. Do they agree with the principles? Students may find it interesting to compare their opinion now with the conclusions they reach after writing the essay.

Step 3

Introduce Lesson II

- ☞ Introduce the concept of multiple causes for war. Ask students why they think people wage war. Use examples of wars you have studied in class to elicit responses from students.
- ☞ Distribute Lesson II Handout: “The Many Faces of War” and review the various categories of war.
- ☞ Distribute Lesson II Worksheet. Explain to students that they will work in pairs or groups and you will assign each group a certain number of conflicts taken from the list on the handout (you can assign one or more conflicts to each group). Their task is to complete the worksheet using these conflicts. Divide students into groups of 2 or 3 and assign them the conflicts they will analyze.

For students working independently

- Follow Steps 1 and 2

LESSON II, STUDENT HANDOUT

THE MANY FACES OF WAR

Humans have waged war in the name of many causes. Below is a list of 20th century conflicts followed by a second list of categories of war. On the worksheet that follows, apply one or more of the categories to the conflict(s) you have been assigned. Use library and Internet resources to help you complete the assignment. Because wars are often waged for a combination of reasons, in most cases there will be more than one category for a conflict.

Conflicts

1. World War I (1914-18)
2. World War II (1939-45)
 - a. British and French appeasement of Germany over Czechoslovakia (1938)
 - b. German attack on Poland
 - c. German attack on the Soviet Union
 - d. British resistance to Germany (and U.S. aid through Lend-Lease program)
 - e. Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor
 - f. British and American strategic bombing campaigns
 - g. Dropping of nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki
3. Korean War (1950-53)
4. Vietnam War (1964-73)
5. Arab-Israeli Six Day War (1967)
6. Arab-Israeli October or Yom Kippur War (1973)
7. Angolan War (1975-91)
8. Soviet Union-Afghanistan War (1979-89)
9. Iran-Iraq War (1980-88)
10. Falklands (Malvinas) War (1982)
11. Persian Gulf War (1990-91)
12. Civil Wars of the Former Yugoslavia (1991-1999)
13. Eritrea-Ethiopia War (1998-2000)
14. Northern Ireland (1969-1998)
15. War on Terrorism (2001-)

Categories of War

- A. Internal War
- B. International War
- C. War to overthrow a government
- D. War to change a political system
- E. War to preserve or gain power
- F. War to punish aggressors
- G. War of self-defense
- H. War to prevent attack
- I. War to redress an injury to a people or society
- J. War to exact revenge
- K. War to spread religion or ideology
- L. War for territorial gain
- M. War for economic gain

Lesson II

Understanding the Causes of War

(2 periods)

Rationale: This lesson will provide an opportunity for students to look at the causes of war and to think about the resulting wars in terms of justness. The lesson provides students with basic information about the nature of violent conflict.

Objectives:

Students will:

- Identify categories of war and relate them to 20th century conflicts.
- Understand that conflicts may possess attributes of more than one category of war.

Materials:

- Completed copies of the Lesson II Worksheet
- Lesson III Handout for the next assignment

Step 1

- ☞ Have the assigned groups meet for 10 minutes to prepare a summary of their findings and to discuss the following question:

Given the categories you have found for each of the wars you were assigned, would you characterize each war as just or unjust (based on the principles of a just war outlined in the NPEC question)?

- ☞ Have groups present the results of their research into the categories of war. As students listen, they can take notes on their worksheet, identifying the conflicts and the corresponding categories that were not part of their assignment.
- ☞ Discuss the examples of wars that had several categories and the reasons for this aspect of war.
 - Did the conflicts you analyzed fall into one category or more than one category?
 - Why do you think there are so many cases of war with multiple causes (categories)?
 - What does this tell you about the nature of war?

Step 2

Introduce Lesson III

- ☞ Distribute copies of the Lesson III Handout for the next lesson.

- ✎ Explain to students that they will work independently to research and analyze one of the principles on the handout. More than one student will be assigned each principle.
- ✎ Assign each student a principle to analyze.

For students working independently

- Complete Steps 1 and 2

**LESSON II, STUDENT WORKSHEET
THE MANY FACES OF WAR**

Directions: Apply one or more of the categories listed on Handout II to the conflicts you are assigned.

Conflict

Categories

Example: World War I (1914-18)

B, F, J, K

LESSON II, TEACHING SHEET THE MANY FACES OF WAR

Note: This sheet is intended to assist you in your discussion with students about the categories of conflict. Please note that the categories identified below do not represent a comprehensive analysis of each conflict and that scholars, historians, and teachers might categorize each war somewhat differently. Also, the nature and perspective of the war might differ in each warring country or party.

Conflict	Categories
Example: World War I (1914-18)	B, F, J, K
1. World War I (914-18)	
2. World War II (1939-45)	
a. British and French appeasement of Germany over Czechoslovakia (1938)	B, K, L, M
b. German attack on Poland	B, E, L, M
c. German attack on the Soviet Union	B, E, L
d. British resistance to Germany (and U.S. aid through Lend-Lease program)	B, F, H
e. Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor	B, E, L, M
f. British and American strategic bombing campaigns	B, F, H
g. Dropping of nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki	B, F, H
3. Korean War (1950-53)	A, B, F, L
4. Vietnam War (1964-73)	B, D, E, G, K
5. Arab-Israeli Six Day War (1967)	B, F, G, H, K
6. Arab-Israeli October or Yom Kippur War (1973)	B, E, F, G
7. Angolan War (1975-91; 92-94)	A, B, C, M
8. Soviet Union-Afghanistan War (1979-89)	A, B, D, K
9. Iran-Iraq War (1980-88)	B, K, M
10. Falklands (Malvinas) War (1982)	B, F, G
11. Persian Gulf War (1990-91)	B, F, M
12. Civil Wars of the Former Yugoslavia (1991-98)	A, B, K
13. Eritrea-Ethiopia War (1998-2000)	B, K, M
14. Northern Ireland (1969-1998)	A, I, K
15. War on Terrorism (2001- present)	B, G, H, I, J

Lesson III

Applying the Principles of a Just War to Modern Conflicts and Introducing Bibliographic Resources

(1- 2 periods)

Rationale: This lesson gives students the opportunity to look closely at the principles of a just war and to apply these principles to specific cases. The activity will help prepare students for the cases they will analyze in their essay for the NPEC.

Objectives:




Students will:

- Conduct research to determine how selected conflicts illustrate the concepts in the principles of a just war.
- Present a written or oral report on the results of their research.
- Review NPEC rules, guidelines, and suggestions for sources and bibliography.
- Understand the difference between primary and secondary sources.

Materials:

- Completed research for Lesson III Handout
- NPEC guidelines, and suggestions for sources and bibliography on p. 5 of the contest guidebook
- Lesson III Worksheet
- Lesson IV Handout and Worksheet for next assignment

Step 1

-  Have students get into groups according to the principle they were assigned. In these groups, have students discuss the findings of their research and prepare to summarize their discussion for the class.
-  Have each group present the highlights of their discussion to the rest of the class, including any differences in the results of their research. Use the Lesson III Teaching Sheet to help guide the discussion following each presentation.
-  If students had very different information on the same conflict, begin a conversation about the resources they used in their research and any differences that can be attributed to using primary versus secondary resources.

Step 2

- Review NPEC guidelines for sources and bibliography suggestions with students and answer questions they have at this point.

Emphasize that the bibliography should:

- include a variety of sources
 - adhere to the NPEC guidelines regarding encyclopedias, web sites, dictionaries
 - include material that is as up-to-date as possible
 - only include reliable on-line sources
- Distribute Lesson III Worksheet. Have students complete Part 1 individually.
 - Discuss the answers to Part 1 with the class. Have students complete Parts 2 and 3 of the worksheet for homework.
 - Present suggestions for sources, and, if needed, review techniques for periodical, newspaper, and on-line research.

Step 3

Introduce Lesson IV

- Distribute Lesson IV Handout and Worksheet.
- Explain to students that they will be using only primary resources to analyze how leaders justify war.
- Divide students into small groups (you may wish to keep students in their existing groups), and assign them one of the conflicts in question.

For students working independently

- Complete Step 1, read steps 2 and 3

LESSON III, STUDENT HANDOUT

THE JUST WAR PRINCIPLES AND MODERN CONFLICT

Directions: *The fundamental principles of a just war are listed below. Each concept is followed by a question. Prepare a report to present to the class, answering the question about the principle you are assigned. Be sure to cite specific facts and/or analyses.*

1. **Principle:** A just war must be a last resort; all peaceful options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of World War I and World War II?

2. **Principle:** A war is just only if waged by a legitimate authority.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the United States' role in Vietnam and Argentina's role in the Falklands War?

3. **Principle:** A just war must be fought only as self-defense against armed attack or to redress a wrong.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the Korean War and the 1956 British, French, and Israeli incursion into Sinai?

4. **Principle:** There must be a reasonable chance of success; deaths and injury that result from a hopeless cause cannot be morally justified.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the United States and its allies in the Gulf War against Iraq and Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union in World War II?

5. **Principle:** The consequences of the war must be better or preferable than the situation that would exist had the war not taken place.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the Spanish American War and Egypt's war against Israel, launched in 1973?

6. **Principle:** The violence and destruction must be proportional to the injury suffered.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the war between Iran and Iraq (1979-88) and the NATO bombing against Serb forces and targets in Kosovo and Serbia (1999)?

7. **Principle:** Civilians must not be targets of the fighting and great care must be taken to avoid civilian casualties.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the allies against Germany and Japan during World War II and the United States in Afghanistan fighting the war on terrorism?

LESSON III, TEACHING SHEET

THE JUST WAR PRINCIPLES AND MODERN CONFLICT

Note: *The statements below are intended to assist you in the discussion with your students following their presentations.*

- 1. Principle:** A just war must be a last resort; all peaceful options must be exhausted before the use of force can be justified.
Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of World War I and World War II?
Statement: A comparison of the two World Wars of the 20th century reveals that prior to the outbreak of war in 1914, few peaceful options were pursued. That was not the case in 1938 when England and France gave Hitler's Germany significant concessions in the hopes of securing "peace in our time." World War II followed efforts to exhaust peaceful options.
- 2. Principle:** A war is just only if waged by a legitimate authority.
Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the United States' role in Vietnam and Argentina's role in the Falklands War?
Statement: The United States' role in Vietnam is an example of a legitimate government waging war with questionably legitimate authority. Congress did not declare war and the President committed U.S. combat troops to Vietnam in a deceptive way so that the United States, in effect, found itself in a state of war. Argentina's role in the Falklands War is an example of a government of questionable legitimacy waging war because it was launched by a military junta that had just seized power in Argentina.
- 3. Principle:** A just war must be fought only as self-defense against armed attack or to redress a wrong.
Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the Korean War and the 1956 British, French, and Israeli incursion into Sinai?
Statement: The Korean War can be characterized as a war in self-defense prompted by the incursion by North Korea across the 38th parallel. It is more difficult to justify the 1956 British and French invasion of Sinai (along with their Israeli allies) on this ground, although both countries claimed to be wronged by the Egyptian seizure of the Suez Canal.
- 4. Principle:** There must be a reasonable chance of success; deaths and injury that result from a hopeless cause cannot be morally justified.
Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the United States and its allies in the Gulf War against Iraq and Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union in World War II?
Statement: There was a reasonable chance of success for the United States and its allies in the Gulf War against Iraq. Many question whether that was the case with Germany's invasion of the Soviet Union in World War II.
- 5. Principle:** The consequences of the war must be better than the situation that would exist had the war not taken place.
Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the Spanish American War and Egypt's war against Israel, launched in 1973?
Statement: The Spanish American War probably does not qualify as a just war under this concept. Egypt launched war against Israel in 1973 to preserve Egyptian honor, to shock Israel

out of the belief that it was invulnerable and had secured peace militarily, and to prevent it from settling the occupied Arab lands and retaining them permanently. Was this war justified if, ultimately, it helped set the stage for peace between Israel and Egypt five years later?

6. Principle: The violence and destruction must be proportional to the injury suffered.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the war between Iran and Iraq (1979-88) and the NATO bombing against Serb forces and targets in Kosovo and Serbia (1999)?

Statement: Proportionality is a subjective assessment and given the nature of modern technology and methods of waging war, limited warfare is almost impossible. Nevertheless, there was far greater disproportionate violence and destruction in the war between Iran and Iraq (1979-88) than in the NATO bombing against Serb forces and targets in Kosovo and Serbia (1999).

7. Principle: Civilians must not be targets of the fighting and great care must be taken to avoid civilian casualties.

Question: How would this principle apply in the cases of the allies against Germany and Japan during World War II and the United States in Afghanistan fighting the war on terrorism?

Statement: The Allies' policy of strategic bombing of German and Japanese cities in World War II resulted in high levels of civilian casualties. Would some of the methods for fighting the war undermine the belief that the United States and Britain were justified in the way they fought World War II? The United States recently in Afghanistan, and also Great Britain in the Falklands War, for the most part took care to avoid casualties among non-combatants.

LESSON III, STUDENT WORKSHEET

UNDERSTANDING PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SOURCES

Name _____ Date _____

Part 1

Directions: For each item below place a P in front of those which are Primary sources and a S in front of those which are Secondary sources

_____ Oslo Accord; September 13, 1993.

_____ Rothchild, David. "Successful Mediation: Lord Carrington and the Rhodesian Settlement," *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict*, eds. Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, with Pamela Aall (Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace Press, 1996).

_____ Filipovic, Zlata. *Zlata's Diary: A Child's Life in Sarajevo* (USA: Penguin [Paper], 1995).

_____ Stedman, Stephen John. *Peacemaking in Civil War* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1991).

Part 2

Directions: In the spaces provided, list four primary sources for this essay topic and four secondary sources. If you have chosen your examples for the essay, list specific potential sources. If not, describe sources in a more generic way.

Primary Sources

Secondary Sources

Part 3

Direction: In a short paragraph explain why a good essay should be based on both primary and secondary sources.

Lesson IV

Utilizing Primary Sources to Learn How Leaders Justify Wars (1 – 2 periods)

Rationale: This lesson presents various justifications given for war and asks students to critically analyze the nature and impact of these justifications. The lesson further prepares students for writing their essays by having them explore primary sources to evaluate the justifications.

Objectives:

Students will:

- Read speeches, quotations in media reports, memoirs, and other primary sources in which leaders justified wars.
- Reflect on the variety of justifications used, their audience, consistency, and success.

Materials:

- Completed Lesson III Worksheet
- Lesson IV Handout and Completed Lesson IV Worksheet
- Lesson V Handout and student role cards for the next assignment

Step 1

Go over Parts 2 and 3 of the Lesson III Worksheet, which students completed for homework.

Step 2

Have small groups or individual students present their answers to the Lesson IV Worksheet and the examples of speeches, memoirs, media quotations, or other primary source material in which leaders justified war. Have groups read the leaders' statements aloud. Lead a class discussion about these reports.

- Were you surprised by any of the statements made by leaders?
- What similarities did you see in the justifications for war?
- How essential is it that leaders justify war?

Step 4

Introduce Lesson V

- ✎ Explain to students that they will participate in a role play during the next class. If students have not participated in a role play before, discuss the process with them.

- ✎ Distribute Lesson V Handout, divide students into groups of 3 and give students the description of *their* role only. They should not see the other role descriptions.

For students working independently

- Follow steps 1,2, and 3

LESSON IV, STUDENT HANDOUT

IN THEIR OWN WORDS: HOW LEADERS JUSTIFY WAR

Leaders often feel the need and are expected to justify the wars they are waging, and they use a variety of explanations in order to do so. Listed below are several conflicts followed by quotes by leaders made when they held office or power.

World War I

"We have started this war on the assumption that our resources are so vast that we can do anything that occurs to us, that we will respond to every Ally that moves our pity, and to every enemy challenge that excites our pride."

Charles Trevelyan, Member of British Parliament speaking in House of Commons,
November 1915

World War II

"Having found the bomb we have used it. We used it against those who attacked us without warning at Pearl Harbor, against those who have starved and beaten and executed American prisoners of war, against those who have abandoned all pretext of obeying international laws of warfare. We have used it in order to shorten the agony of war, in order to save the lives of thousands and thousands of young Americans."

President Harry S. Truman, August 10, 1945

Six-Day War

"We have fought alone for our existence and our security, and are therefore justified in deciding for ourselves what are the genuine and indispensable interests of our state and how to guarantee our future. We shall never return to the conditions prevailing before."

Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol, June 1967

"The Gulf of Aqaba constitutes our Egyptian territorial waters. Under no circumstances will we allow the Israeli flag to pass through the [Straits of Tiran]. The Jews threatened war. We tell them you are welcome, we are ready for war....This water is ours."

Egyptian President Gamal Nasser, May 22, 1967

Vietnam War

"[American war aims are] 70% to avoid a humiliating US defeat (to our reputation as a guarantor); 20% to keep South Vietnam (and then adjacent) territory from Chinese hands; 10% to permit the people of South Vietnam to enjoy a better, freer way of life....It is essential – however badly Southeast Asia may go over the next 1-3 years – that the US emerge as a 'good doctor.' We must have kept promises, been tough, taken risks, gotten bloodied and hurt the enemy very badly."

Assistant Secretary of Defense John McNaughton, "Plan of Action Memo on South Vietnam," March 24, 1965

Persian Gulf War

“Kuwait is struggling for survival. And along with many other nations, we’ve been called upon to help. The consequences of our not doing so would be incalculable, because Iraq’s aggression is not just a challenge to the security of Kuwait and other Gulf nations, but to the better world that we all have hoped to build in the wake of the Cold War. And therefore, we and our allies cannot and will not shirk our responsibilities. The state of Kuwait must be restored, or no nation will be safe, and the promising future we anticipate will indeed be jeopardized.”

President George H. W. Bush, November 8, 1990

The US War on Terrorism

“We’re a peaceful nation. Yet, as we have learned, so suddenly and so tragically, there can be no peace in a world of sudden terror. In the face of today’s new threat, the only way to pursue peace is to pursue those who threaten it.”

President George W. Bush

LESSON IV, STUDENT WORKSHEET
IN THEIR OWN WORDS: HOW LEADERS JUSTIFY WAR

Directions: You will be given one conflict to analyze. Begin by using the quotes on Handout IV and use additional PRIMARY SOURCES ONLY to answer the questions below.

Conflict: _____

1. What themes predominate in the justification of the conflict?

2. Did the justification change depending on the specific audience? (i.e. constituents, allies, neutral parties, opponents). If so, how?

3. Did the justification change over time? If so, how?

5. Did the intended audience accept the justification? This can be judged by examining newspaper columns and editorials, statements by governments, reported polls.

Lesson V

Developing an Editorial Position on the Justness of a Conflict

(1 class period)

Rationale: This lesson gives students the opportunity to analyze opposing viewpoints on the justness of war and reinforces the concepts from the previous lessons.

Objectives:

Students will:

- Become more familiar with the principles of a just war.
- Practice advocating a position on a violent international conflict.

Materials:

- Lesson V Handout
- Description of the role they will play

This activity is a short role-playing exercise on advocacy and decision-making. Students will all play members of a newspaper staff, in groups of three. The scenario: It is 1999 and the newspaper plans to write an editorial for tomorrow's edition that will either endorse or oppose the American-led NATO bombing campaign in Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Each student will take on a different role in deciding what the newspaper's editorial position on the NATO bombing should be. One student will play the managing editor of the newspaper. He or she supports the bombing campaign. Another student will play the senior foreign affairs correspondent. That person opposes the bombing campaign. Finally, the third student will play the publisher of the paper, the one who ultimately has to make the decision as to which editorial position to take. The publisher wants to make the decision based on whether the use of strategic air power can be justified or not. He or she wants the two newspaper people to convince him or her of their position based on the justification of war criteria. For the group or groups that have 4 students, 2 students will play publishers.

At the beginning of this lesson, students should already be divided into groups and should know their roles.

Step 1

For 10 minutes have all the students representing the managing editors who support bombing meet together, all those representing the foreign correspondents who oppose bombing meet together, and all the publishers meet together. Collectively, they should discuss the arguments for their position, or if they are the publishers, talk about what criteria they consider most important in making the editorial decision as to whether the NATO bombing is justified.

Step 2

After 10 minutes, have each group of 3 (or 4) students meet together for 10 minutes. Each supporter and opponent of the bombing should make their case to the publisher(s).

Step 3

After 10 minutes, suspend the meetings and have the publishers announce in turn his or her decisions on the editorial position of the newspaper. Discuss and de-brief the results with the entire class.

- How many publishers decided to oppose the bombing in the editorial? How many publishers decided to support the bombing in the editorial?
- Was the final decision difficult to make? Why?
- Which arguments were the most persuasive?
- How were you able to apply the principles of a just war to this discussion?

LESSON V, STUDENT HANDOUT

NATO'S BOMBING OF KOSOVO AND YUGOSLAVIA

Scenario

It is 1999 and violence between Serbs and Albanians in Kosovo is widespread. In mid-March Albanians accepted a proposal that came out of a peace conference in Rambouillet, France, led by Britain and France. The proposal promised Albanians freedom and autonomy while ensuring that the province would remain part of Yugoslavia. At this conference, the west also insisted that NATO troops be admitted into Yugoslavia and Kosovo to supervise an agreement. Serbs rejected the proposal and at the same time launched a major Serbian offensive that killed thousands of Albanians and forced over a quarter of a million Albanians from their homes in Kosovo. The United States is now threatening to use military force if the Serbs do not halt the military incursion.

Your newspaper has to write an editorial for tomorrow's edition that will either endorse or oppose an American-led NATO bombing campaign in Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The publisher will make the final decision about the position expressed in the editorial based on the arguments made by the paper's managing editor and senior foreign correspondent in a last-minute meeting.

Background

Federal Republic of Yugoslavia forces drove over one million people from their homes by murder, rape, burning and looting of their villages. This ethnic cleansing of the Kosovars was not the result of collateral damage from war, but was the product of a systematic campaign. The world knew what was happening and who was responsible. The following is a summary of the conflict.

Kosovo, an autonomous province of the Republic of Serbia, within the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, has been disputed between Serbs and Albanians for generations. For most of this century, Serbs have been a minority in Kosovo and by the late 1960s the Serb share of the population dropped to about ten percent. In 1986/7 Slobodan Milosevic rose to power in Serbia, exploiting in particular Serb grievances against the Albanians in Kosovo. In 1989 he revoked Albanian autonomy and banned the language in schools and offices. In 1992, under the pacifist leadership of Ibrahim Rugova, a strategy of passive resistance was adopted, a parallel state set up, a new constitution proclaimed and elections held. In 1995, however, the Dayton Agreement recognized Serbia and Montenegro as the new Yugoslavia, within existing boundaries, with no special recognition for the status of Kosovo. Frustrated at continued Serb discrimination and repression by the Belgrade government, many Albanians became loyal to the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA), a movement promoting independence through violence.

By 1998, there was extensive violence between Serbs and Albanians in Kosovo. Albanians accepted a proposal presented at a peace conference convened at Rambouillet in France in early 1999, but Serbs rejected this proposal. Serbs then initiated a major offensive during which thousands of Albanians were killed and over a quarter of a million Albanians were forced from their homes in Kosovo. Indeed, hundreds of thousands had to leave Kosovo as refugees. In mid-March the United

States threatened military force if Milosevic did not halt the military incursion. The next day, NATO air strikes began.

For almost 80 days NATO flew over 35,000 sorties against Yugoslavia, including the use of high-level bombing and cruise missiles. Estimates of deaths during the NATO campaign were 600 Yugoslav military forces and about 500 Serb and Albanian civilians. An additional 1.25 million Albanians were forced from their homes during the first weeks of the air campaign. Close to one-third of those fled across international borders. Estimates of over 11,000 killed or missing Albanians were reported by the United Nations.

LESSON V, STUDENT HANDOUT

ROLE CARDS

Managing Editor: You support the bombing campaign. You want to convince the newspaper publisher to print an editorial that endorses the American-led NATO bombing campaign in Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. To convince the publisher of this, you must persuade him or her that the use of strategic air power is justified. Some of your reasons for supporting the campaign are as follows:

- The Serbs have begun a campaign of ethnic cleansing, or even genocide. Bombing could prevent further killing.
- The ethnic cleansing campaign has forced hundreds of thousands of refugees to spill over into neighboring countries, thus potentially de-stabilizing Macedonia and Albania in particular.
- The Serbs have rejected a proposed settlement to the dispute.
- The bombing will not deliberately target or strike civilians.
- Smart bombs allow NATO to specifically focus on Serb military targets while minimizing civilian loss of life.
- A ground war would widen the conflict and would change the factors involved in assessing the proportionality of the conflict.

Senior Foreign Affairs Correspondent: You oppose the bombing campaign. You want to convince the newspaper publisher to print an editorial that opposes the American-led NATO bombing campaign in Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. To convince the publisher of this, you must persuade him or her that the use of strategic air power is not justified. Some of your reasons for opposing the campaign are as follows:

- While Serbian tactics and strategy are reprehensible, Kosovo is an internal issue, a struggle for self-determination within a sovereign state.
- The conflict in Kosovo does not pose a threat to global peace and stability. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia cannot be equated with Germany in 1938 or Iraq in 1991.
- "Humanitarian intervention" is not reason enough to resort to war. Aggression must be prevented or halted, but repression does not require the same commitment.
- The loss of innocent life will be great.
- The use of air power is disproportionate, and the NATO forces risk little by avoiding a ground conflict.
- All diplomatic or other non-violent means have not been exhausted.

Publisher: You must decide whether the newspaper will print an editorial that endorses or opposes the American-led NATO bombing campaign in Kosovo and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Listen to the arguments made by your Managing Editor and Senior Foreign Affairs Correspondent and make your decision based on whether you feel the use of strategic air power can be justified or not.

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Contents

Supplemental Teaching Resource: Thinking About Conflict and Conflict Resolution	31
Special Feature: Extension Activities.....	34
Tips for Helping Students Write a Successful Peace Essay	35
National Content Standards	36
Additional Resources.....	37

THINKING ABOUT CONFLICT AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION

Understanding a conflict—whether it is between friends or strangers—is a very difficult task. There are often so many issues involved that it is hard to sort them out. Understanding a conflict that is taking place in another part of the world adds to the complexity, as you have to learn about the history, geography, political, economic, and social conditions that surround the conflict. But understanding the nature and dynamics of conflict is the first step in deciding how to respond to the situation. Once you know what the conflict is about, how it began, what is fueling it, and who the players are, you may be able to identify some ways to resolve the conflict.

Conflict Analysis

In order to analyze a conflict, it is useful to develop a framework that looks at the following factors:

Actors: Who are the key people (antagonists, decision-makers, peacemakers, neighbors, influential outsiders) involved in this conflict? What power do they possess? What are the important institutions?

Issues and underlying factors: What is this conflict about? What does each party want? Are the issues that the adversaries say they are fighting about the only issues that divide them? Does each side have other concerns and needs that must be dealt with in order for the conflict to be resolved?

Relationships: What is the relationship between the adversaries? Do they communicate, and if so, how? What power do they possess? Are they equally balanced in terms of power? What relationships do they have with other actors, including outsiders?

Characteristics of the conflict: When did this conflict begin and what triggered it? How long has it gone on? What are its dynamics? Is there active fighting, and if so, is it violent? Has it changed in intensity or gone through phases? Is it confined to a specific space or distributed over a large area? Could this conflict spread to neighboring regions? What would the consequences be?

Capacities: What resources do the adversaries have to continue the conflict? Have these changed over time?

Context: What is the context—history, political system, economic, social and environmental conditions—in which this conflict is occurring? What is happening internationally that would affect the conflict?

Conflict Resolution: What has been the history of peacemaking efforts? Have the parties tried to solve their problems without outside help? If outsiders have helped, what has been the result of their efforts?

Responding to Conflict

Once you have developed this framework, you may start to develop some ideas of how to respond to the conflict. If the problem centers around a lack of contact and communication, you might think of ways to increase interaction between the parties in conflict: starting dialogue groups, student exchanges, common projects that will bring antagonists together. If you are analyzing a civil conflict or a conflict between two countries, you might think of activities that would work at the official level (i.e. with the government) and at the non-official level (i.e. with religious institutions, schools, community groups, and other non-governmental associations). The following is a list of tools that policy-makers, mediators, and private peacemakers use to promote peace in international conflict. Which ones would work for the conflict you have analyzed?

Political instruments

Confidence-building Measures

A joint activity undertaken by parties to a conflict, usually designed to reduce tensions, demonstrate the benefits of cooperation, and build trust between parties. An example of confidence building that includes outside parties is monitoring and verification. This is a process by which outside actors and/or monitoring technology can observe and confirm that parties to an agreement are in compliance. Successful monitoring and verification can help build trust, reduce suspicion, and increase incentives for cooperation.

Fact-finding

Fact-finding helps provide decision makers with timely and accurate knowledge by inquiring into the facts of a dispute and reporting on them (without offering a solution).

Mediation and facilitation

Active engagement by an outside party to a dispute in the search for a negotiated settlement. Facilitation is usually limited to bringing the parties into communication. Mediation may be more directive and include creating an agenda for negotiations, chairing negotiating sessions, recommending solutions, and holding out rewards or threats as inducements.

Official Diplomacy

Diplomacy is the principal means by which states communicate with each other via a system of open, formal, regularized communication. This allows states to conduct their business peacefully with each other through negotiation. Traditionally, diplomacy is carried out by government representatives who conclude treaties and other international agreements. Communications between disputants or antagonistic parties may be maintained through formal diplomacy, public diplomacy (communications and, at times, negotiations that are carried out publicly often for domestic consumption or to give a particular perspective on an issue) or secret diplomacy (negotiations in which the content of negotiations or the fact that they are even being conducted is kept secret).

Unofficial Diplomacy

Third-party peacemaking carried out by an individual or non-governmental organization and may include capacity building, dialogue groups, facilitation, and mediation. These processes may be pursued on their own or as a supplement to official negotiations or mediation.

Arbitration

The process of adjudication of a dispute by a third party or an ad hoc tribunal acceptable to the disputants. The disputants agree to accept the decision of the arbitration as final and binding.

Military and Coercive Instruments**Peacekeeping**

Operations that use impartial and non-threatening military forces and/or civilian personnel *at the request of the parties* to a dispute to help supervise a cease-fire agreement and/or separate the parties. The object of peacekeeping is the cessation of violence through such means as assisting in the establishment of a ceasefire or truce, supervising the withdrawal of troops, or serving as a buffer between opposing forces.

Peace-enforcement

Military operations that *forcefully* restore peace between belligerents who may be engaged in combat, either between states or within a state.

Arms embargo

Measures that prohibit or block the targeted actor or group of actors from securing access to or purchasing weapons and munitions that have been prohibited by the targeting actor/s.

Economic sanctions

The targeted and coercive use of economic measures by an actor or a group of actors against another actor (or group of actors) considered a threat to peace. The goal is to secure the targeted actors' compliance by denying them access to certain goods and services.

Aid-Based Peacemaking Tools**Capacity building**

Non-military measures that often involve strengthening political, economic, social, and legal institutions in a bid to address the structural causes of conflict and help reconstruct societies after a war.

Humanitarian Assistance

Humanitarian assistance is emergency aid or relief to provide basic means of survival—food, water, shelter, sanitation, health care—and sometimes advocacy and protection for victims of war or violence following emergencies characterized by civil conflict, weak or collapsed state authority and structures, food insecurity, and massive population displacement.

Military and economic assistance

Outside parties may lend military equipment, personnel, supplies, and economic support for either peacekeeping or peace enforcement measures. Such assistance may also be extended into areas of capacity building and re-building infrastructure.

SPECIAL FEATURE: EXTENSION ACTIVITIES

The following extension activities give your students opportunities to expand their knowledge about the concept of a just war. In addition, if your state or school requires students to complete a large project prior to graduation from high school, the National Peace Essay Contest and these activities may be used to satisfy this requirement.

- ❑ Conduct a public opinion poll on questions related to the peace essay topic and analyze the results in a written and/or oral presentation that includes graphic depictions (bar, pie, and line graphs).
- ❑ Interview your member of Congress, staff person from your Senator's office, a local college professor of international relations or U.S. government, or a person with expertise or experience related to the topic. Write a report of this interview.
- ❑ Write letters to elected officials, newspapers, or magazines expressing your opinion on the topic.
- ❑ Build on Lesson V and write the editorial or op/ed column that would result from the simulated editorial meeting.
- ❑ Participate or establish a web site related to the topic, including a chat-room for interested persons to share their opinions.
- ❑ Create a video documentary about whether a particular conflict was a "just war."
- ❑ Create a work of visual or performance art expressing your ideas about just wars, for example drawing, painting, sculpture, collage, dance, play.

TIPS FOR HELPING STUDENTS WRITE A SUCCESSFUL PEACE ESSAY

Here are some ideas for improving the quality of your students' essays and making them potential contest winners!

- ❑ Be sure students carefully read all the rules and guidelines for successful essays.
- ❑ Encourage students to read winning essays from past years which appear in the brochure and on the U.S. Institute of Peace website (www.usip.org).
- ❑ If students select conflicts which remain at crisis stage at the time their essay is written, be sure they acknowledge this situation in their essay and have the most up-to-date sources possible at the time of writing.
- ❑ Because your students are now familiar with conflicts used in this guide, you may anticipate that many of them will select these operations for their essays. Point out that other conflicts could also be used to evaluate a just war. Stress to students that originality and creativity in making such selections will be recognized by the essay judges.
- ❑ English and Social Studies teachers can complement each other's knowledge and abilities if they work together to help students with the peace essay. Consider collaborating or team teaching for this project. You may choose to permit students who have research paper requirements in courses in both departments to use the NPEC to satisfy both assignments.
- ❑ After all essays are written, consider asking one or more colleagues to read and rate the strongest ones. Students whose papers receive high ratings can then prepare them for submission to the NPEC by correcting all typographical or grammatical errors, updating information as needed, and making last-minute improvements.
- ❑ Emphasize the importance of using primary sources to answer the first question in the essay concerning the way in which leaders justify war.
- ❑ Emphasize that all three parts of the essay question must be covered in the essay.
- ❑ Direct students who are not writing the essay as a class assignment to use the "Tips for Students Working Independently" at the end of each lesson.

Note: Students are permitted to submit essays to the National Peace Essay Contest as individuals or as part of a classroom submission by a teacher.

NATIONAL CONTENT STANDARDS

The lessons in this guide apply to the following National Content Standards of the Mid-continent Regional Educational Library.

Civics Standards

- Understands how the world is organized politically into nation-states, how nation-states interact with one another, and issues surrounding U.S. foreign policy.
- Understands the impact of significant political and nonpolitical developments on the United States and other nations.
- Understands issues regarding personal, political, and economic rights.
- Understands how participation in civic and political life can help citizens attain individual and public goals.
- Understands the importance of political leadership, public service, and knowledgeable citizenry in American constitutional democracy.

Language Arts Standards

- Demonstrates competence in the general skills and strategies of writing.
- Demonstrates competence in the stylistic and rhetorical aspects of writing.
- Uses grammatical and mechanical conventions in written compositions.
- Gathers and uses information for research purposes.
- Demonstrates competence in the general skills and strategies of reading.
- Demonstrates competence in the general skills and strategies for reading a variety of informational texts.
- Demonstrates competence in speaking and listening as tools for learning.

Life Skills Standards

- Performs self-appraisal.
- Understands and applies the basic principles of presenting an argument.
- Effectively uses mental processes that are based on identifying similarities and differences (compares, contrasts, classifies).
- Applies decision-making techniques.
- Displays effective interpersonal communication skills.

United States History Standards

- Understands developments in foreign policy and domestic politics between the Nixon and Clinton presidencies.

World History Standards

- Understands the search for community, stability, and peace in an interdependent world.
- Understands major global trends since World War II.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES

Childress, James E. "Just-War Theories." *Theological Studies*, 1978: 427-445.

Coady, C.A. J. "The Ethics of Armed Humanitarian Intervention." *Peaceworks No. 45*, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Institute of Peace, July 2002.

Coates, A.J. *The Ethics of War*, Manchester, U.K.: Manchester University Press, 1997.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke. ed. *Just War Theory*, New York: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Lackey, Douglas. *The Ethics of War and Peace*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1989.

Luban, David. "Just War and Human Rights." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 9, 1980: 160-181.

Reagan, Richard J. *Just War: Principles and Cases*, Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

Seabury, Paul and Angelo Codeville. *War*. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1989

Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. "War." Online. Internet. 12 August 2000. Available at <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/war/>

Small, Melvin and David J. Singer ed. *International War: An Anthology* (2nd edition) Chicago, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1985.

Smock, David. *Religious Perspectives on War* (2nd edition) Washington, DC: U.S. Institute of Peace, 2002.

St. Augustine. *The City of God, Book XIX*.

United States Naval Academy, Center for the Study of Professional Military Ethics. Online. Internet. 12 August 2000. Available at <http://www.usna.edu/Ethics/>

University of San Diego. "Resources on Just War Theory." Online. Internet. 12 August 2002. Available at <http://ethics.acusd.edu/applied/military/justwar.html>

Walzer, Michael. *Just and Unjust Wars. A Moral Argument with Historical Illustrations* (2nd edition) New York: Basic Books, 1992.



United States Institute of Peace
National Peace Essay Contest
1200 17th Street NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036

Nonprofit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Washington, DC
Permit No. 2806