Ethics of War

World History, 10th Grade

Day 15 of 17 day unit

CA Content Standards

10.8.6 - Discuss the human costs of the war, with particular attention to the civilian and military losses in Russia, Germany, Britain, the United States, China, and Japan.

CCSS (Grade 9-10)

[CCSS.ELA-Literacy.RH.9-10.1](http://www.corestandards.org/ELA-Literacy/RH/9-10/1/)  
Cite specific textual evidence to support analysis of primary and secondary sources, attending to such features as the date and origin of the information.

CA ELD Standards (Grade 9-10)

Collaborative, 1. Exchanging information/ideas (Bridging)

Contribute to class, group, and partner discussions, sustaining conversations on a variety of age and grade ‐ appropriate academic topics by following turn ‐ taking rules, asking and answering relevant, on ‐ topic questions, affirming others, and providing coherent and well ‐ articulated comments and additional information.

Big Idea/Enduring Understanding: Total war makes human life expendable

Objective/Learning Goal: Students will be able to communicate effectively in an academic setting by articulating their thoughts while drawing on appropriate historical sources and investigating the view of their peers in an orderly manner during the Socratic seminar.

Differentiation: Methods used will include modeling the activity, heterogeneous grouping, and assigning more content specific questions to students still struggling with the content and more philosophical questions of ethics that go beyond the content to students that have already mastered the content

Assessment: Formative assessment, graded according to Socratic seminar rubric

Instructional Strategies: Students will be reminded of the Socratic seminar layout as we have used them in the past. Teacher will design five groups of eight students each. Questions will be allocated to each group. Students will have time to research material from WWII that is relevant to their question. Teacher will then ensure the discussion progresses with as little intervention as possible.

Student Activities: Students will respond to questions initially in their journals. Students will then research their question and develop their ideas about the topic. The question will be posed again to the group and they will discuss their thoughts on the question in a circle in the center of the room. The other students will be audience members in a wider circle around the central “fishbowl.” Students in the audience will take notes for their reflective journal.

Resources:

Questions for seminar groups

* Is war ever the answer?
* What targets can legitimately be destroyed in a total war?
* How can you effectively enforce rules of war?
* How should a nation value the lives of their servicemen and civilians in relation to the lives of servicemen and civilians of an allied nation? Of an enemy nation?
* How should a nation behave toward their enemy after a treaty has been signed and the fighting of the war has subsided?

Socratic Seminar Analytic Rubric

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Excellent | Good | Fair | Unsatisfactory |
| **Conduct** | Demonstrates respect for the learning process; has patience with different opinions and complexity; shows initiative by asking others for clarification: brings others into the conversation, moves the conversation forward; speaks to all of the participants; avoids talking too much. | Generally shows composure but may display impatience with contradictory or confusing ideas; comments, but does not necessarily encourage others to participate; may tend to address only the teacher or get into debates. | Participates and expresses a belief that his/her ideas are important in understanding the text; may make insightful comments but is either too forceful or too shy and does not contribute to the progress of the conversation; tends to debate, not dialogue. | Displays little respect for the learning process; argumentative; takes advantage of minor distractions; uses inappropriate language; speaks to individuals rather than ideas; arrives unprepared without notes, pencil/pen or perhaps even without the text. |
| **Speaking**  **&**  **Reasoning** | Understands question before answering; cites evidence from text; expresses thoughts in complete sentences; move conversation forward; makes connections between ideas; resolves apparent contradictory ideas; considers others’ viewpoints, not only his/her own; avoids bad logic. | Responds to questions voluntarily; comments show an appreciation for the text but not an appreciation for the subtler points within it; comments are logical but not connected to other speakers; ideas interesting enough that others respond to them. | Responds to questions but may have to be called upon by others; has read the text but not put much effort into preparing questions and ideas for the seminar; comments take details into account but may not flow logically in conversation. | Extremely reluctant to participate even when called upon; comments illogical and meaningless; may mumble or express incomplete ideas; little or no account taken of previous comments or important ideas in the text. |
| **Listening** | Pays attention to details; writes down questions; responses take into account all participants; demonstrates that he/she has kept up; points out faulty logic respectfully; overcomes distractions. | Generally pays attention and responds thoughtfully to ideas and questions of other participants and the leader; absorption in own ideas may distract the participant from the ideas of others. | Appears to find some ideas unimportant while responding to others; may have to have questions or confusions repeated due to inattention; takes few notes during the seminar in response to ideas and comments. | Appears uninvolved in the seminar; comments display complete misinterpretation of questions or comments of other participants. |

(Adapted from Paul Raider)