Name: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ Period: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**What Would You Do?**

**Directions: Read each of the following scenarios and determine whether or not:**

***• Is this type of action necessary in a time of war? If so, explain why?***

• ***If not, should someone be held responsible for these actions in a court of law? Explain why***

**Scenario #1**:

In a time of war, a naval commander for a European country orders his submarines to attack all ships, regardless of whether or not they are transporting civilians. His goal is to hit submarines that may be carrying weapons to his enemy. When one of his submarines DOES attack a ship that

(Answer: Nazi commander Karl Donitz was NOT found guilty of war crimes during WWII, but was found guilty of waging wars of aggression).

→**My Response**: This type of action isn’t necessary in my opinion. Civilians traveling on a ship don’t deserve their lives to be wasted over warfare. It happens often but it doesn’t make that tactic okay. There’s ways around an act like this. If it was an only option to destroy an enemy’s weaponry, then it would become necessary. That being said, it depends on the magnitude of the war. The aggressor can come off as too aggressive.

**Scenario #2**:

An eastern European country contains several ethnic groups. Groups from surrounding countries have lived in “Country A” for years. Due to ethnic tensions in the country, the leader of Country A begins a campaign to “rid” his country of these foreigners. He has burned their villages, arrested them without trial, and murdered many. Over 500,000 have fled Country A for safety. When outside intervened, several mass graves were discovered with thousands of bodies. It is estimated that 100,000 civilians are either missing or have been killed.

(Answer: This scenario represents the genocide in Kosovo in 1999 under Slobodan Milosevic.

He was charged with crimes against humanity, including murder, forcible transfer, and deportation

and "persecution on political, racial or religious grounds”, but died before the end of his trial.)

→**My Response**:

This type of action during war is certainly not necessary. Those innocent people couldn’t control what ethnic group they belonged to. The leader of Country A should be dealt with in a court of law and they should be responsible for this war. This type of action wouldn’t even help a country during war. It’s a waste of time and it may definitely ruin the support of one’s country.

**Scenario #3**:

In an effort to fight the “War on Terror”, a prison has been established for “persons of suspicion” to be detained for further questioning. Many of these prisoners are arrested and detained without arrest warrants and are not given the right to counsel (a lawyer). Yet, valuable information may result from questioning these suspects. In order to “extract” this information, the following tactics are used: pouring the phosphoric liquid on detainees; pouring cold water on naked detainees; beating detainees with a broom handle and a chair; frightening and intimidating detainees with threats of attack, and in one instance actually biting a detainee.

(Answer: The above scenario describes the conditions at Abu Ghraib during the Iraq War. While several U.S. soldiers have been brought to trial for their actions, many have been acquitted, dishonorably discharged, or are serving light sentences.)

→**My Response**: This type of action may be necessary if used the right way. Detainees shouldn’t be tortured for not releasing information. Some detainees may not even have information. The question is, “How do you separate the detainees with information from those who know nothing?” If a detainee is known to have information and they won’t release it, they should be held captive for a longer time until they come out with the information. Each detainee also deserves a lawyer, however if they use the lawyer to escape the situation without any release of information they know, then they don’t deserve a lawyer.

**Scenario #4**:

You are a U.S. soldier. You have been assigned to fight in a jungle country. It is difficult to distinguish your enemy from everyday civilians. A recent attack on your company resulted in the death of a close friend. You have been asked to raid the homes of suspected enemies and confiscate weapons. You raid the homes, but find no weapons. You’re emotionally and physically exhausted. You take your frustration out on the villagers you have encountered. Before you know it, you and your fellow soldiers have burned the village to the ground and killed many of its civilians.

(Answer: The above scenario represents the My Lai Massacre during Vietnam. Only one man

was arrested for this incident and has since been pardoned.)

→My Response: There’s an obvious reason of why an event like this would occur. It’s still considered a war crime. Although a friend was lost in war, they signed up to be in the army. There’s going to be high chance death at almost any time. If you had to raid a village and confiscate weapons, there should be no burning the village. That’s just use of excessive force. If the enemy were to do that, it’d be unfair so why do it to them. War doesn’t actually create enemies because without it, there’s a chance that your “enemy” had potential to be friend to you. These soldiers should be held responsible for this act but because it was during war, they let it slide.