8.5 Just War Theory and Holy War: 30-minute Pack

AQA 8062 · about 30 minutes

Total Marks

Name: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / _____

Answer ALL questions.

1 Give three facts about the traditional just war criteria.

(Total for Question 1 is 3 marks)

2 Explain two religious teachings that support the idea that war can sometimes be morally justified. Refer to a source of wisdom and authority in your answer.

(Total for Question 2 is 4 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

3 This question is about religious and non-religious perspectives on just war theory and holy war. It is the AQA-style 24-mark, five-part question: parts (a) to (d) are worth 12 marks; part (e) is the 12-mark evaluation.

(a) State one just war criterion other than just cause or legitimate authority. **(1)**

(b) Give two reasons why the last resort criterion matters in just war theory. **(2)**

(c) Explain two just war criteria concerned with how a war is fought, rather than whether it should be fought at all. Refer to a source of wisdom and authority in your answer. **(4)**

(d) Explain two contrasting views, religious and/or non-religious, about whether just war theory is still a useful way to judge modern warfare. Refer to a source of wisdom and authority or another source in your answer. **(5)**

(e) Evaluate this statement: 'Absolute pacifism is a stronger moral position than just war theory.' In your answer you should: refer to religious teaching, refer to different points of view, reach a justified conclusion. **(12)**

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

(Total for Question 3 is 24 marks)

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

Mark scheme · 8.5 Just War Theory and Holy War: 30-minute Pack

Question 1

a just war must be declared by a legitimate authority, not a private group, oe **B1**

a just war must be fought for a just cause, such as self-defence, oe **B1**

a just war must be a last resort, only entered into once peaceful options have been exhausted, oe **B1**

Answer: Any three: legitimate authority; just cause; last resort (also acceptable: proportionality, reasonable chance of success, right intention).

Question 2

point 1: the Christian just war tradition, developed by thinkers such as Augustine and Aquinas, teaches that a war can be justified if it meets strict moral criteria, including legitimate authority and just cause, oe **B1**

development: Paul teaches that the ruling authority 'does not bear the sword for no reason' (Romans 13:4), which some Christians read as showing that the state may sometimes rightly use force, oe **B1**

point 2: many Muslims teach that fighting can be justified when believers have been wronged or attacked, provided it is proportionate, oe **B1**

development: the Qur'an teaches 'fight in the way of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress' (Qur'an 2:190), oe **B1**

Answer: E.g. the Christian just war tradition and Romans 13:4 on the state's use of force; Qur'an 2:190 permitting proportionate self-defence.

Question 3

(a) last resort, proportionality, reasonable chance of success, or right intention, oe **B1**

(a) Answer: E.g. last resort, proportionality, reasonable chance of success or right intention.

(b) it requires that peaceful options, such as negotiation, have genuinely been tried and have failed before war is chosen, oe **B1**

(b) it prevents war being used as a first, easy option when other solutions might still work, oe **B1**

(b) Answer: E.g. requires peaceful options to be tried first; prevents war being chosen too readily.

(c) point 1: the criterion of discrimination requires that combatants (fighters) and non-combatants (civilians) are treated differently, and that civilians are not deliberately targeted, oe **B1**

(c) development: many Christians link this to the teaching to love one's neighbour, found in Jesus's summary that the second greatest commandment is to 'love your neighbour as yourself' (Matthew 22:39), oe **B1**

(c) point 2: the criterion of proportionality of means requires that the force used in fighting a war is not greater than necessary to achieve its just aim, oe **B1**

(c) development: many Muslims link this to the Qur'an's instruction to 'fight in the way of Allah those who fight you, but do not transgress' (Qur'an 2:190), understood as ruling out excessive or indiscriminate force, oe **B1**

(c) Answer: E.g. discrimination between combatants and civilians (Matthew 22:39, love your neighbour); proportionality of force used (Qur'an 2:190).

(d) view 1: many religious believers argue that just war theory remains a valuable moral checklist, because its criteria of just cause, proportionality and discrimination apply to any war in any era, oe **B1**

(d) development: Aquinas's original formulation, that a just war needs proper authority, a just cause and a right intention, is still widely taught and applied by religious ethicists today, oe **B1**

(d) view 2: some non-religious ethicists argue that just war theory can also be defended on entirely secular grounds, using reason rather than religious authority, oe **B1**

(d) development: the secular philosopher Michael Walzer developed a non-religious version of just war theory based on human rights and the moral equality of soldiers, arguing the same criteria can be justified without appeal to God, oe **B1**

(d) reference to a source of wisdom and authority or another appropriate source made accurately, oe **B1**

(d) Answer: Contrast: religious defence of just war theory via Aquinas's criteria vs a secular defence via Walzer's rights-based just war theory - both conclude the framework is still useful, from different foundations.

(e) **L4** A well-argued, balanced answer that considers more than one point of view in a developed way, using accurate and detailed references to religious teaching and/or scripture to support each point, and reaches a clear, justified conclusion. **10-12**

(e) **L3** A clear and reasoned answer that considers more than one point of view, supported by relevant references to religious teaching and/or scripture, though the justification of the conclusion may be less developed. **7-9**

(e) **L2** A reasoned answer that considers at least one point of view, with some relevant supporting evidence, but with limited or no consideration of an alternative view. **4-6**

(e) **L1** One or more relevant points are made, but with little or no supporting evidence and no reasoned conclusion. **1-3**

(e) **L0** No relevant content. **0**

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk

(e) Indicative content:

- Agree: absolute pacifists, such as many members of the Religious Society of Friends (Quakers), argue that all human life is sacred and that no cause can justify deliberately taking a life, which they see as a clearer and more consistent moral rule than a multi-part checklist.
- Agree: Jesus's teaching to 'turn the other cheek' rather than resist an evil person (Matthew 5:39) is used by many Christian pacifists to argue that any use of violence, however carefully justified, falls short of the ideal taught in the Gospels.
- Agree: some Humanists argue that a simple commitment to non-violence avoids the risk that just war criteria, such as proportionality, are stretched or misapplied by leaders seeking to justify a war they already want to fight.
- Agree: pacifism does not depend on getting a complicated set of criteria right in the heat of a crisis, which some see as a practical strength as well as a moral one.
- Disagree: many religious believers argue that refusing to use force even to stop a serious act of aggression can leave innocent people undefended, and that just war theory better protects the victims of aggression.
- Disagree: the Qur'an's teaching that permission to fight was given to 'those who are being fought, because they were wronged' (Qur'an 22:39) is used by many Muslims to argue that a carefully limited, criteria-based use of force can be the more responsible moral choice.
- Disagree: secular just war theorists such as Michael Walzer argue that a strict, reasoned framework for judging when and how force may be used gives clearer real-world guidance than an absolute rule that cannot bend to circumstances.
- A middle position: some argue that just war theory and pacifism agree far more than they disagree, since both treat violence as, at best, a last and deeply regrettable option rather than something to be welcomed.
- A balanced answer might conclude that pacifism is a stronger position for an individual's own conduct, while just war theory remains the more workable standard for judging the actions of states, so 'stronger' depends on what the position is being asked to do.

© Revision Library | revisionlibrary.co.uk