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***Are wars against terror analogous to conventional wars? Why or why not?***

           To be sure, the phrase "war on terror" is vague, since the context of the word "war" has evolved over time. For several years, war was a convectional and typical conflict, but it has now evolved into a – anti conflict. In the other hand, there really is no specific field in the war in Afghanistan, and the enemy is not a force. Lyndon Johnson's war on poverty and Ronald Reagan's war on drugs can also be used to describe the war on terror. Unlike other conflicts, the war on terror began with a symbolic call to arms and ended with real-world consequences. In most instances, the war on terror has resulted in a long-term convectional war..

***Statman claims that targeted killing is morally preferable to conventional war. Do you agree? Why or why not***

Most countries are unable to respond to the threat of terrorism. The conventional weapons of war, such as planes and helicopters, are obsolete in this type of conflict because terrorists use knives and suicide vests. As a result, when dealing with terror, a different paradigm should be used, one that is not typical in traditional war. Because of the design of the arms used, target shooting is superior to convectional killing in this niche. It'd be ridiculous for a government to approach terrorists with war vehicles since this gun is inflexible in the face of the conflict.