

Division 4 Humanities

Ally

Cost of War

I agree with option 2. I think that our best bet for ending the war in Afghanistan will be to repair relationships with Afghanistan and Pakistan while slowly withdrawing military forces. I think that supporting democracy and providing aid and education will be the most useful to help Afghanistan rebuild.

I think that, for the most part, Afghanistan has borne most of the cost of this war. The Taliban had already caused devastation before the U.S. had even arrived, leaving Afghanistan rather vulnerable. When the Taliban started to shelter Al Qaeda, that brought even more destruction. At this point, the U.S., in targeting Al Qaeda, was targeting Afghani territory. Although, in the end, the U.S. did kill Osama bin Laden, the sacrifices made in order to do so were more on the Afghanistan's end. The fighting that happened forced many Afghani people out of the country or into cities in order to avoid the U.S. bombings. As the choices reading said on page 24 "More than three thousand Afghan civilians died during the bombing campaign. Fighting also disrupted food aid, which three million Afghans depended on even before the war." Not only this, but many Afghans were apprehended by the U.S. during the hunt for Osama bin Laden, causing even more turmoil.

I think that, in terms of benefits, the whole world shares them, it's just about the value. Osama bin Laden was killed and Al Qaeda was brought down, which was a goal of the war. For the U.S. this is very beneficial. For Afghanistan, it could be considered beneficial as well, but at that point they still had to deal with the Taliban that was still very much in power.

I don't think there are or aren't acceptable grounds to go to war. I feel like a country will have a reason to go to war that maybe other countries think isn't valid, but that was their reason, and they did it. Of course, there are some circumstances where wars are declared unnecessarily and some cases where it is needed. I think that it is hard to say that there is a threshold for what makes war okay. Ideally these wars end when every group involved manages to come to some sort of agreement with something on the line if it is broken, and should be done if the danger has passed or will be once the agreement is put in place.

I'm not sure what role the U.S. should play in the world. It is a global superpower with an enormous military that includes a not-so-small nuclear arsenal and has quite of a bit of control in the market. Ideally, the U.S. tries to focus on itself right now, fixing things within the country, which would, in turn, make it easier to support other countries. I don't consider think that the motivation for the U.S. right now is similar to the one that started war and I don't think their policies are similar nor do I think they will be.

At the end of the day, I don't think the U.S. has made enough "victories" to make this war worth the destruction. Maybe early on, when the U.S. achieved its goal of finding Osama bin Laden, there could be an argument that the war was worth it. But right now, considering how little we have done recently, and how much damage we do, I don't think there's an argument. And if there is an argument, the U.S. isn't transparent enough for us to see that. Consider the drone wars, on page 36 in the choices reading, it says "Because the program is covert, the method for determining who or what is a legitimate target is unknown." Basically, the drones are being sent to places and killing people without the U.S. really knowing how those people were involved with the war. So if the U.S. keeps this much

from the population, we can only form an opinion on what we have. And I just don't see the benefits being worth all the loses.