

The Ethics of Warfare Part 2 - How do you define a combatant?



Dr Peter Gray

"This autumn, the University of Birmingham will launch a Policy Commission on Remote Warfare. Here is the second in a series of Perspectives examining the key issues being considered ahead of the launch."

[Read full opinion \(/research/impact/perspective/ethics-of-warfare-pt2-peter-gray.aspx\)](/research/impact/perspective/ethics-of-warfare-pt2-peter-gray.aspx)

Have your say

This debate has now closed.

Feedback

PM on 23 August 2013, **Tari Rai** wrote

The taking out of enemy combatants without caring who gets hurt or killed (collateral damage?) in the process is something that irks most decent people. The fact that on many occasions where the bad guys are taken out by drones or whatever else, the very people that the knights in shining armour purport to be trying to save die as well. Civilian deaths amounting to so many thousands is something our heroes care little for. The fact that it is done to protect us and in our name (depending on who "we" are) should put us to shame, particularly for accepting this new way warfare and not being more vocal about how unethical this is. How different are we then from those same enemies who attack civilians in order to make a point.

[Report this comment \(/webteam/bigdebate/ReportCommentsForm.aspx?commentID=2. &commentUsername=Tari Rai&commentPageURL=/research/impact/perspective/ethics-of-warfare-pt2.aspx\)](#)

M on 16 August 2013, **Lianne Abrahams** wrote

A related question: why are certain countries so selective in their choice of which dictatorships to define as a combatant versus which dictatorships to leave to their genocidal ways?

[Report this comment \(/webteam/bigdebate/ReportCommentsForm.aspx?commentID=1. &commentUsername=Lianne Abrahams&commentPageURL=/research/impact/perspective/ethics-of-warfare-pt2.aspx\)](#)