



730 Boston Post Road, Suite 24, Sudbury, Massachusetts 01776

Author Report 20 June 2013

Title of Paper: Just War Theory

Code Number: 513MEME000339

Author: Withheld

School: Middle School

Home Address: Qingdao, Shandong, China

Total Score: (5–30) Reader One 24 Reader Two 16 Final 20 (Good) (4)

| | | | |
|------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| 28-30 = A+ | Superior | (reported score of 6) | (<1 in 100 papers rated) |
| 23-27 = A | Very Good | (reported score of 5) | |
| 18-22 = B | Good | (reported score of 4) | |
| 13-17 = C | Average | (reported score of 3) | |
| 8-12 = D | Poor | (reported score of 2) | |
| 5-7 = F | Very Poor | (reported score of 1) | |

Category (check one): Short (1,500 to 2,500 words) Actual length: 22,855 words
Long (4,000 to 6,000 words)

Each paper is read by two Readers, both senior secondary instructors.

I. Reading (Sources)

Score: (1-6) Reader One 6 Reader Two 5

Reader One:

Yours is a mature and demanding subject. Your work is both convincing and authoritative, and your research is first class. From Jean Bethke Elshtain onward you cover all the bases in the field of ethics. Your use of primary source material is outstanding. There are flashes of genuine distinction in all you do. Congratulations.

Reader Two:

This paper is based on the author's reading of an impressive number and quality of sources, 63 (!) of them altogether. They include writings by Augustine, Aquinas, Grotius, and Kant, articles in scholarly journals, and monographs on the subject, such as Michael Doyle's examination of Kant's "democratic peace thesis" and, especially, Jean Bethke Elshtain's scholarship. The bibliography is not in alphabetical order, as it should be.

II. Thinking (Understanding)

Score: (1-6) Reader One 6 Reader Two 3

Reader One:

Thomas Aquinas is referred to by his full name, or as St. Thomas, but never as St. Aquinas.

You have done well with Aquinas, and the line between his thoughts on the subject, in contrast with St. Augustine, is finely drawn.

Your narrative on Hugo Grotius makes one want to review the contrasting views of Hobbes and Locke, but when he addresses the standard of “atrocious and evident,” who gets to be the judge? At another point in your paper, one wants to pit Kant’s view of a “state of nature” with that of Rousseau. Good scholarship affects readers this way. It gets the academic blood moving. Well done.

Your work on both Augustine and Aquinas is superb, It shines particularly when you comment on *The City of God*.

Reader Two:

This is a remarkable undertaking for a high school student, ambitious in scope but too broad a topic for a paper of this sort. Having read as deeply and widely as s/he has, the author might have better selected just one of those agents of just war theory—Augustine, Aquinas, Grotius, or Kant—and focused on his contribution to that theory’s development. Focusing on Kant, for instance, the author could have examined how he drew from Augustine, Aquinas, and Grotius but then distinctively refined just war theory in modern terms.

III. Elaboration (Use of evidence)

Score: (1-6) Reader One 3 Reader Two 3

Reader One:

When you write a research paper in history, you MUST use the University of Chicago (Turabian) format. Your history teacher will advise you on this issue. In the meantime, you might want to check it out online. If you decide you want to purchase a copy for yourself, go to your local bookstore ask for a paperback copy of Kate Turabian, *Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses, and Dissertations*. You would also be well-served if you picked up a copy of: Richard Marius & Melvin E. Page, *A Short Guide to Writing About History*, 5th Ed. (NY: Pearson Longman, 2005). You might also take a look at Jules R. Benjamin, *A Student’s Guide to History* (Boston: Bedford Books (1998). *The Craft of Research* by Wayne C. Booth, Gregory G. Colomb and Joseph M. Williams, 3rd Ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2008) would also be helpful. As you gain more experience, you might also want to locate a copy of this classic work through an inter-library loan program: Jacques Barzun & Henry F. Graff, *The Modern Researcher* (NY: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1970). Online you can easily access the excellent Bowdoin College guide: Patrick Rael, *Reading, Writing and Researching for History*. If you would like more help in this area, go to the Purdue University’s site Online Writing Lab (OWL), and click on Grades 7-12 Instructors and Students.

There is no need for a formal Introduction. Simply integrate your comments into the main body of the text. There's also no need to inform your reader what you plan to do, Simply do it! Integrate your "Plan" into the standard pathway of your prose.

Perhaps a bit more on Cicero's influence on St. Augustine would have been both interesting and helpful. The same might be said both about the emergence of Scholasticism in the 12th Century, as well as a slightly expanded treatment of the general world-view of the "Schoolmen." The average academic reader might not have a full understanding why, in their collective judgment, Reason and Faith were not mutually exclusive.

Supply page numbers for the convenience of your readers.

As you move from Aquinas to Grotius, it is obvious the some pages are out of order.

When you write a research paper, don't employ the first person singular. If you do, you can't maintain a posture of scholarly detachment. If this criticism sounds a bit arch, it really isn't. It's customary in an academic venture of this kind to maintain a sense of "opinionated objectivity." In a way, let your research and analysis do the speaking for you. For example, instead of declaring "I think Lincoln was a great man," you might say "One must conclude that Lincoln was a great man."

Use the long quote format when appropriate. See endnote 146, for example.

You are repetitive at various points of your paper.

Reader Two:

Although the author generally uses evidence correctly, the endnote format is unconventional (and unnecessarily wordy). Oftentimes, the author unnecessarily employs serial citations from the same source, sometimes even citing the same source twice in one sentence (e.g., endnote numbers 12 & 13). Occasionally, quotations seem to be errantly transcribed (e.g., end notenumber 22).

IV. Writing (Use of language)

Score: (1-6) Reader One 4 Reader Two 2

Reader One:

You are erudite, and your vocabulary is extensive. At times your prose sails above the basic requirements of the research paper. At a few other times, however, it stumbles a bit.

There are quite a number of "word choice" issues in the text. For example, the word is Christendom, not "Christiana." It is vengeful not "revengeful," etc. There are also a number of errors in the use of the definite and indefinite articles.

Your paragraph structure needs a great deal of attention, but this is not an uncommon flaw in the work of young writers. Simply remember that each paragraph must be constructed upon a single main idea. One way to avoid any problems in this regard is to write an (informal) outline. Use it as a guide when you sit down to write your final draft. As you put it together, be conscious of your choice for "topic sentences."

Something is unique, or it's not. It is never "very unique."

Reader Two:

This paper is LONG, partly because it's so repetitive. For example, the first paragraph about Augustine's theory of just cause states three or four times that war, to Augustine, can be an instrument of God's will. Throughout the paper that redundancy is compounded, restating Augustine's view of just cause as it discusses Aquinas's view of it, then again Grotius's view, and then again Kant's view.

There are many sentence errors and awkward constructions, perhaps English is not the author's first language as indicated by errant word usage, e.g., "Kant inevitably discoursed issues ..."; "Each of these categories contents certain principles ..."

Unfortunately, the paper reads too much like an unfinished draft, retaining still even the author's parenthetical notes to himself or herself, e.g., ([add] quotation), (check the citation), and (cite). It wants more careful proofreading, as indicated also by many typos, e.g., society; juts (meaning just); turn the other check (not once but several times); dose (meaning does); simplily (sic).

V. Overall Result

Score: (1-6) Reader One 5 Reader Two 3

Reader One:

You say that Kant is an "anti-utilitarian and non-consequentialist," and indeed he was. Your commentary cries out for an explanation however. Let's begin with Deontology. It is a philosophical term which comes from the Greek word *deon* which means a "binding duty." Utilitarianism focuses upon a means-to-an-end perspective, and on the consequences of human actions. Deontologists like Kant believe that moral values exist apart from such circumstances. They believe that there are overriding principles of duty that a person must confront. They hold that motive is very important in human conduct, and that actions are "wrong," for example, because they involve a fundamental moral transgression. Promises must be kept, because it is one's duty. The same may be said for being honest, kind, protecting children, feeding the hungry, etc. Motive, in all of this, characterizes the moral worth of the individual's response.

Kant believed that our own self-interest, much less utilitarian concerns, should not be the chief focus of moral concerns. One doesn't not steal for fear of getting caught. You don't do it because it's not right. He believed that we must have within ourselves a "good will," and that we must act according to universal norms. It follows, he thought, that at any given time our conduct has or has not a "moral value." He believed that there were, in fact, universal moral rules which apply to everyone. Those universal rules were ones that could be rejected by no rational person. He was firmly convinced that "all moral concepts have their seat and origin entirely *a priori* in reason."

Just a note aside: It is said that as St. Augustine began to formulate his thinking on his just war theory, he wondered what the proper moral response would be if a person came upon the Good Samaritan 15 minutes earlier, if one came in time to see the robbers go about their nasty work. Have you come across this in his writings, or is it simply an old wives' tale?

Reader Two:

In researching and writing this paper, the writer has gained a raft of knowledge about the evolution of just war theory through the writings of Augustine, Aquinas, Grotius, and Kant. Wanting in the paper, though, is some more refined sifting of all that information. First, it wants a thesis. In the final analysis, although it compares and contrasts views of these four agents of just war theory, it's now a lengthy descriptive digest of those views. Second, it wants more polished writing. Consider, for instance, this passage, transcribed verbatim: "Kant is generally considered one of the founders of the system of *jus post bellum* doctrine, this category of principles in just war theory have the purpose of constraining the states to establishing a perpetual peace The idea here is that a state should commit itself to certain rules of conduct, and appropriate war termination, as part of its original decision to begin the war."

Total Score (5–30) Reader One 24 Reader Two 16 Final 20

Varsity Academics®

Independent Assessment of Academic Writing

<http://www.tcr.org>; 800-331-5007; fitzhugh@tcr.org; 978-443-0022