

THE COSTS OF WAR SINCE 2001: IRAQ, AFGHANISTAN, AND PAKISTAN



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Eisenhower Study Group
Eisenhower Research Project

June 2011



Executive Summary

The Costs of War

Eisenhower Study Group

As one who has witnessed the horror and the lingering sadness of war — as one who knows that another war could utterly destroy this civilization which has been so slowly and painfully built over thousands of years — I wish I could say tonight that a lasting peace is in sight.

As we peer into society's future, we — you and I, and our government — must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering for our own ease and convenience the precious resources of tomorrow. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.

Dwight D. Eisenhower, Farewell Address, January 1961

Ten Years, 225,000 Killed, and More than \$3.2 - 4 Trillion Spent and Obligated to Date

Nearly every government that goes to war underestimates its duration, neglects to tally all the costs, and overestimates the political objectives that can be accomplished by the use of brute force. Eisenhower knew this, but we could have earlier found this truth in the record of war from Thucydides', *History of the Peloponnesian War* and Barbara Tuchman's account of World War I, *The Guns of August*.

Over this long nearly ten years, the United States launched two major wars and engaged in the largest reorganization of its government in since the Great Depression. A new weapon, the remotely piloted "drone" aircraft was sent to kill militants in Yemen and Pakistan. More than U.S. 2.2 million Americans have gone to war and over a million have returned as veterans. Some who have returned have been honored, a small number have been tried for war crimes and too many have committed suicide. Americans debated the costs of civil liberties lost at home and cringed at revelations of torture in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantanamo. U.S. generals have switched strategies several times and most recently decided to emphasize "population protection" because they realized that, in the words of the new counterinsurgency manual, "An operation that kills insurgents is counterproductive if collateral damage leads to the recruitment of fifty more insurgents."¹ But it is the wounded and the dead — the latter very conservatively estimated at

¹ United States Army and Marine Corp, *U.S. Army/Marine Corps Counterinsurgency Field Manual: Field Manual no. 3-24: Marine Corp Warfighting Publication no. 3-33.5* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2007) I-141, p. 45.

225,000 and the great majority civilians in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan – who most urgently require that we not simply turn the page.

It is appropriate as we approach the ten-year mark to recall some of the costs we may have forgotten and to assess what has not been counted, cannot be counted and the human and economic costs that will come due in the next decades.

What have the wars that the U.S. has undertaken since September 2001 cost in blood and treasure, opportunities lost and possibilities foreclosed? What are the ongoing consequences for the people who fought them, for bystanders, for democracy, human rights, and civil liberties, for the American economy, budget, and the deficit? How has the social and political landscape of Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan been altered? What do we know about the likely future costs of the wars?

We found that in terms of those values that could be counted in dollars and in numbers, the costs of war have been generally underestimated or uncounted. One reason for our underestimation of the costs and consequences of these wars, and their likely duration, was the fact that most assessments of the wars only examined one or two elements of the wars. Additionally, disagreements about who, what and how to count — about how to record the death and injury in war or about whether future interest costs should be included as a war cost — has sometimes been the focus of attention, drawing our eyes away from the big picture and into the intricate and complicated details.

For example, although the U.S. has been funding Pakistan to fight militants since 2001 and fighting there itself, many of the costs of the U.S. war in Pakistan have not been included in tallies of war costs. This is despite the fact that the death and displacement in Pakistan is as or more severe than the war in Afghanistan.

Thus, while we often think of these wars as discrete efforts, and divide the costs into categories, the budgetary costs and human toll are much larger if we total the costs and think not only of costs to the U.S. and its allies, but to the civilians in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan. Further, we found that although the consequences of wars do not end when the fighting stops and the troops go home, many of the future costs and consequences of these wars have not been counted or have been discounted or dismissed. Many bills will become due over the next several decades. Many social and political costs — to families and civil liberties — could not be quantified. We also found that the more we looked, the more costs of these wars were to be found, only some of which we had the time and resources to include.

Human Costs

The human toll — in death, injury and displacement — has been underestimated and in some cases undercounted. There are many difficulties in counting those who are killed and wounded in combat, as discussed in the individual reports by Neta Crawford and Catherine Lutz. Thus, an extremely *conservative* estimate of the toll in direct war dead and wounded about 225,000 dead and about 365,000 physically wounded in these wars so far.

More than 6,000 U.S. soldiers and 2,300 U.S. contractors have already been killed. The deaths of U.S. allies, including Iraqi and Afghan security forces and other coalition partners total more than 20,000. The numbers of Afghan and Pakistani military and police killed are probably higher than the totals given here.

Summary Table 1. The Wars' Dead, Estimates by Category of Person

The Dead	Conservative	Moderate
<i>Allied Military</i>		
US Soldiers	6051	6051
US Contractors	2300	2300
Iraqi Security Forces	9922	9922
Afghan Security Forces	8756	8756
Pakistan Security Forces	3520	3520
Other Allied Troops	1192	1192
Total Allied Security	31741	31741
<i>Civilians</i>		
Afghan Civilians	11700	13900
Iraqi Civilians	125000	125000
<i>Undetermined</i>		
Pakistani	35600	35600 ²
Total Civilian and Undetermined	172300	174500
<i>Insurgents/Opponents</i>		
Afghan Insurgents	10000	20000
Iraq Army 2003	10000	10000 ³
Pakistan Insurgents	?	20893 ⁴
Total Insurgents	20000	50893
<i>Journalists and media workers</i>		
Afghanistan	18	19
Iraq	143	202
Pakistan	7	34
Total Journalists	168	255
<i>Humanitarian workers</i>		
Afghanistan	172	172
Iraq	94	94
Pakistan	?	?
Total Humanitarian	266	266
Grand Total	224,475	257,655

There are significant disputes about the toll of those killed and wounded, debates that have tended to deflect attention from what we do know about the cost in lives in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan. The toll in civilian lives in Afghanistan and Iraq is at least 137,000 lives to mid 2011. We cannot say with confidence how many of the more than 35,000 Pakistanis who have been

² Total includes civilians and militants

³ No count for Iraqi insurgents

⁴ Involves some double counting with Pakistan Undetermined

killed since 2004 are civilians since the Pakistani security forces have not allowed journalists and humanitarian organizations free access to the conflict areas to investigate the deaths there.

Summary Table 2. The Wars' Dead, Estimates by Country

	Iraq		Afghanistan		Pakistan	
	Conservative	Moderate	Conservative	Moderate	Conservative	Moderate
Security forces	9,922	9,922	8,756	8,756	3,520	3,520
Civilians	125,000	125,000	11,700	13,900	35,600	35,600
Journalists	143	202	18	19	7	34
Humanitarian	94	94	172	172		
Insurgents	10,000	10,000	10,000	20,000		20,893
US troops	4,457	4,457	1,594	1,594		
US contractors	1,537	1,537	763	763		
Other allies	318	318	874	874		
	151,471	151,530	33,877	46,078	39,127	60,047
Country Totals						
Iraq	151,471	151,530				
Afghanistan	33,877	46,078				
Pakistan	39,127	60,047				
	224,475	257,655				

Of course the human toll includes the visible and invisible war wounds. Though the statistics on war injuries and psychological wounds are calculated in different ways, we nevertheless estimate that at least 150,000 U.S. soldiers and contractors have been physically wounded. Further, about 68,000 of America's military allies including Iraqi and Afghan security forces have been wounded since these wars began. And though the figures for civilian wounded are the least certain and most likely seriously undercounted, we estimate that at least 145,000 civilians have been wounded in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan. The psychological wounds — depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress — are enormous as well, and in many cases still emerging. The ability to treat both the physical and psychological wounds has been surpassed by the demand in the U.S., Afghanistan and Iraq.

Summary Table 3. The Wars' Wounded

The Wounded

Allied Military

US Soldiers	99065
US Contractors	51031
Iraq Security Forces	29766
Afghan Security Forces	26268
Other Allied Troops	12332
Total	218462

Civilians (NCTC figures)

Afghan Civilians	17544
Iraqi Civilians	109558
Pakistani Civilians	19819

Total **146,921**
Grand Total **365,383**

The number of people displaced by fighting rises and falls with the intensity of the wars. The numbers displaced in Pakistan are growing. Many of the displaced seek assistance in refugee camps and their numbers are more or less well documented. Many do not live in camps and it is difficult to know the number of displaced with any precision.

Summary Table 4. The Wars’ Refugees and Displaced Persons

Currently Displaced	Total	Refugees	Internally Displaced Persons
Afghan Civilians	3,315,000	2,900,000	415,000
Iraqi Civilians	3,500,000	1,800,000	1,700,000
Pakistani Civilians	1,000,000	965,000	35,000
Total	7,815,000	5,665,000	2,150,000

Wars cause physical and psychological wounds outside the war zone. The costs at home include the toll on those left behind when active duty armed forces and reservists deploy. The deployments are not only dangerous, but also longer and more frequent than those of previous wars. Zoë Wool shows that the increasing pace of military operations has taken a toll at home on both service members and their families. Some handle the pressure, but we dishonest if we minimized the potent homefront mix of tense family relationships, physical and emotional pain, and, increasingly, drug and alcohol abuse and other risky behavior that imperils the safety of life at home for both service members and their families. The consequence is to make military communities as a whole more precarious, meaning that service members — especially Soldiers and Marines who see the most combat — and civilian family members alike are subject to cycles of anxiety and trauma.

While American soldiers and their families have demonstrated great resilience, the burdens of these wars that have fallen on veterans and their families include higher rates of suicide and mental illness, increased drug and alcohol dependence, higher rates of violence including homicide and child abuse and neglect (the latter both among the parent left behind and by the returning veteran), high risk behaviors that have resulted in elevated numbers of car crashes and drug overdoses, elevated levels of homelessness and divorce, and clinical levels of stress among the children. There has already been attention to the rising suicide rates among U.S. soldiers and veterans. In 2003, the year of the invasion of Iraq, suicides across the DoD accounted for more deaths than combat. Despite suicide awareness campaigns across the services, across the DoD suicide outnumbered combat deaths again in 2008.

Inside the war zone, battle does not only injure and kill with bombs and bullets. As shown by Omar Dawichi, an Iraqi physician, and Norah Niland, the former director of Human Rights of the United Nations Mission in Afghanistan, the devastation has been greater than most of us in the West know. Dawichi highlights the enduring displacement in Iraq, showing how it has led to other problems such as unemployment. Although some have returned to their homes millions have been and remain displaced. Niland's report highlights the frustrations of the attempt to rebuild a society — by Afghans and international actors — while continuing to destroy it.

The effects of war in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan ripple through those societies' basic health and health care infrastructure and cause death indirectly. People suffer and die from lack of access to clean drinking water, medicine, and from diseases that they would not have gotten if their economic and health care infrastructure had not been destroyed or disrupted by war, or if millions had not been internally displaced or become refugees in neighboring countries. Crawford argues that this indirect war-related death is a significant problem that will continue to kill after the

fighting stops. We have not made an estimate for the number killed and harmed by malnutrition and diseases they were exposed to because of the wars. The mental health consequences of war in Afghanistan and Iraq include anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder.

The U.S., other state donors, and international organizations such as the United Nations, the World Health Organization, the World Food Programme, the International Committee of the Red Cross, Handicap International, Oxfam and others have given resources to help offset the burdens of war, build basic infrastructure such as water treatment plants and support the health care needs of individuals in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. The governments in the war zones have also mobilized to meet these challenges. But there have been and will continue to be enormous health effects for the remainder of these wars and long after they are concluded. The needs are particularly acute for those millions who were or remain displaced whether in refugee or displaced persons camps or who are living with extended family.

Budgeted and Long Term Economic Costs

We calculate that the U.S. federal government has already spent between \$2.3 and 2.6 Trillion in constant 2011 dollars. This number is greater than the trillion dollars that the President and others say the U.S. has already spent on war since 2001. Our estimate is larger because we include more than the direct Pentagon appropriation for the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the larger global war on terror; wars always cost more than what the Pentagon spends for the duration of the combat operation.

But the wars will certainly cost more than has already been spent. Including the amounts that the U.S.⁵ is obligated to spend for veterans, and the likely costs of future fighting as well as the social costs that the veterans and their families will pay, we calculate that the wars will cost between 3.7 and 4.4 trillion dollars.

In March of this year, the Congressional Research Service report by Amy Belasco on the costs of Iraq, Afghanistan, and other operations related to the war on terror estimated that the Pentagon allocations for war through the current fiscal year were already \$1,208 billion in current dollars.⁶ The CRS report also added to war-related spending by the Veterans Administration and the State Department/USAID, and concluded that the wars cumulated costs through FY2011 were \$1,283.3 billion dollars. In 2008, Joseph Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes published *The Three Trillion Dollar War: The True Cost of the Iraq Conflict*, totaling many of the costs of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars to that point and projecting the costs into future decades.⁷

We found that the CRS report of appropriations and estimate of the budgeted costs of the war, which was extremely thorough, nonetheless did not include some important and ultimately expensive costs of the war. When we total the costs of what the U.S. has spent — the budgeted costs of the war (Congressional war appropriations) and our incurred obligations for Veterans medical and disability — the total is more than the CRS reports and *already* exceed the Stiglitz and Bilmes estimate of \$3 trillion for present and future costs of the wars.

⁵ The federal government usually reports appropriations and expenditures in current dollars. We use constant \$2011, taking inflation into account.

⁶ Amy Belasco, "The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 9/11," Congressional Research Service, 29 March 2011, RL33110. Belasco's categories include spending by the Defense and State Departments, for Afghanistan and Iraq, by the DOD for "Enhanced Security" and "unallocated" expenses, and by the VA for medical expenses for FY2001-FY2011.

⁷ Joseph E. Stiglitz and Linda J. Bilmes, *The Three Trillion Dollar War: The True Cost of the Iraq Conflict* (New York: W.W. Norton, 2008).

Summary Table 5. The Budget and Other Economic Costs of War

	Conservative Estimate	Moderate Estimate
Congressional War Appropriations to Pentagon	1,311.5	1,311.5
Additions to the Pentagon Base Budget	326.2	652.4
Interest on Pentagon War Appropriations	185.4	185.4
Veterans' Medical and Disability	32.6	32.6
War Related International Assistance (State Department/USAID)	74.2	74.2
Additions to Homeland Security Spending for the War on Terror	401.2	401.2
SUBTOTAL FEDERAL OUTLAYS FY2001 Through FY2011, Constant \$2011	2,331.1	2,657.3
Projected Obligated Funds for Veterans' Medical and Disability to 2051 ⁸	589.0	934.0
Social Costs to Veterans and Military Families	295.0	400.0
TOTAL OUTLAYS TO 2011 AND ADDITIONAL COSTS OF VETERANS' CARE	3,215.1	3,991.3
Pentagon War Spending Requested for FY2012	118.4	118.4
State Dept./ USAID War Related Spending Requested for FY2012, Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan	12.1	12.1
Projected Pentagon War Spending FY2013-2015, w/reduction to 45,000 troops*	167.6	167.6
Projected Pentagon War Spending FY2016-2020	155.0	155.0
SUBTOTAL FUTURE PROJECTED DIRECT WAR SPENDING⁹	453.1	453.1
ESTIMATED TOTAL COSTS OF WAR	3,668.2	4,444.4
Additional Interest Payments to 2020	1,000	1,000

THESE TOTALS DO NOT INCLUDE: Medicare costs for injured veterans after age 65; Expenses for veterans paid for by state and local government budgets; Promised \$5.3 billion reconstruction aid for Afghanistan; Additional Macroeconomic Consequences of War Spending including infrastructure and jobs

⁸ These costs include already obligated spending Bilmes estimate of \$346 to \$469 billion in obligated costs for veterans medical and disability for soldiers who have already returned through December 2010 and those who have yet to return and join the VA system. The additional amount includes those who serve after December 2010, and assuming that the war continues for a number of years into the future.

⁹ Calculated using Amy Belasco, "The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terror Operations Since 2011," Congressional Research Service, March 2011; and K. Alan Kronstadt, "Pakistan-U.S. Relations: A Summary," Congressional Research Service, 16 May 2011. Congressional Budget Office, "Long-Term Implications of the 2011 Future Years Defense Program," February 2011, p. 8.

The largest single component of costs to date is Pentagon war spending. Since 2001, in addition to the \$1,313 billion in 2011 constant dollars (using the Pentagon's own deflators) spent for the wars, \$5,238.7 billion in constant dollars was appropriated for ostensibly non-war DOD expenses (also known as the “base” DOD budget) up to the end of 2011.

Winslow Wheeler argues that the extent that long range Pentagon budget planning just before 9/11 can be deciphered, a pre-war “baseline” trajectory of spending can be established. This report’s calculation of that baseline spending is \$4,572 billion for fiscal years 2001-2011. Thus, the DOD “base” budget grew over the discernable pre-war 2001 plan by \$667 billion in 2011 dollars (\$616 billion in “current” dollars). This additional spending was politically driven by popular sentiment to “support for the troops” that translated into not just support for war funding but for the broader DOD budget as well. Any efforts to reduce the base budget, or even to hold it steady, would predictably run into arguments like those of Congressman Buck McKeon, R - Calif., (current Chair of the House Armed Services Committee) that it is unthinkable to refuse growth to the defense budget while we are “at war.” The report’s author, Winslow Wheeler a participant at the staff level in congressional debates on the defense budget for over 30 years, observed that the defense budget grew not just in the war-related accounts but in the “base” budget as well, and that “base” budget growth was an artifact of the wars. The \$667 billion in 2011 dollars appropriated to the Defense Department's base budget since 2001, clearly a result of the political dynamics of the post-9/11 wars, should be counted as an additional, albeit indirect, cost of the wars and should be included in any comprehensive attempt to capture the total cost of the wars.

Other costs to date include the International Assistance budget for what was given to Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan since 2001 in foreign aid. The key agencies involved in administering this aid are the Department of Defense (DOD), the Department of State, and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). Of the assistance *not already* counted as a part of the Pentagon's budget for the military costs of war, the sum is over \$74 billion in inflation-controlled dollars. More than half of the total has gone to Iraq. As Anita Dancs shows in her breakdown of the funding, much of the International Assistance program is for military related purposes. Thus, we, and the CRS include it as a cost of war.

Federal spending on homeland security increased from \$17.1 billion in Fiscal Year 2001 to more than double in real terms by 2011. Homeland security is arguably either an alternative to war, or cost of the mobilization for the war on terror. Anita Dancs only included in her estimate for homeland security spending what she calculated to be the increase in spending for homeland security due to the war on terror. It was impossible to calculate state, local and private spending due to the war on terror.

Linda Bilmes reports that US has already spent \$31.3 billion since 2001 in providing medical care and disability benefits to veterans. As of December 2010, 1.25 million service men and women had returned home from Iraq and Afghanistan. Many have been wounded or injured in some way — over 90,000 seriously enough to require medical evacuation from the conflict. A much larger number suffer from other injuries, ranging from brain injuries to hearing loss. To date, 650,000 Iraq and Afghanistan veterans have been treated in Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) medical facilities for a wide range of medical conditions. Nearly 500,000 of these veterans are receiving compensation from the VA for injuries sustained or worsened during their military service.

But America's commitment to veterans continues after the war ends. The service members who have been deployed to the Afghanistan and Iraq conflicts are entitled to receive free or subsidized medical treatment for the rest of their lives. In addition, a significant percentage of them are eligible to receive permanent disability compensation and other benefits for physical and/or mental disabilities stemming from their wartime service. Veterans of the current wars will be also entitled to receive a certain educational, housing, training and other benefits funded by government agencies outside of VA.

The future costs of the wars will include the direct budgetary costs of Veterans Medical and Disability payments, which will probably peak in about 40 years and the economic costs to veterans and their families for care not covered by the Veterans Administration or other government agencies including social security. The history of previous wars shows that the cost of caring for war veterans rises for several decades and peaks 30-40 years or more after a conflict. This will be especially true for veterans of the current wars. Veterans from Iraq and Afghanistan are utilizing VA medical services and applying for disability benefits at much higher rates than in previous wars. Based on current patterns of benefit claims and medical usage, it is estimated that the total present value of such costs for Iraq and Afghanistan veterans over the next 40 years is in the range of \$600 billion to \$1 trillion. The social costs to veterans and their families — of jobs lost, of lost productive capacity, of time taken to care for mental illness are generally not included in the costs of war. But like Stieglitz and Bilmes, we believe these are real costs.

These wars were financed almost entirely by borrowing adding more than \$1.3 trillion dollars to the national debt. Ryan Edwards shows that while the wars did stimulate economic growth to about .9 percent, the increased debt had several macro-economic effects including raising U.S. interest rates by perhaps about .3 percent. The interest on the war debt, from 2001-2011 can be calculated using various assumptions. Our estimate, again conservative because it uses the March 2011 CRS figure for spending on the wars through 2011, is that the financing of the debt attributable to the war has already cost about \$177 billion in current dollars (more than \$185 billion in constant dollars). It may seem as if these interest payments is a small amount, compared to the total costs of the war, but it exceeds the Department of Defense's budgeted costs of war in Afghanistan and Iraq for the current fiscal year. Assuming that the United States continues to spend more on the war and other operations after formal withdrawal, we estimate that by 2020, interest payments alone could exceed \$1,000 billion. But of course the precise amount of interest paid on the war debt will depend on both political choices and the economic conditions that prevail over the next decade.

The large increase in military spending and debt has other effects on interest rates, jobs, and investment. While Heidi Garrett-Peltier shows that U.S. military spending has undoubtedly increased employment in sectors related to the military, that spending in other sectors would have produced many more jobs directly and indirectly. Similarly, while spending on military infrastructure has grown, overall spending on U.S. public infrastructure and assets has not kept pace with the needs for repair and investment, which some call the "infrastructure deficit," over the last decade. James Heintz argues that spending on public assets would have increased private productivity. William Hartung underscores the benefits to one major military contractor, Lockheed.

The war has also affected the economies of Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan. Specifically, Bassam Yousif found a bifurcated Iraqi economy. Enormous oil revenue has been generated since 2003, and GDP per capita has risen. However rebuilding has been slow for several reasons. Political instability and violence create a climate of uncertainty. Many of the killed professionals, who left the country during the early years of the war have not returned. Thus, unemployment remains high and the benefits of increased oil revenue (mostly due to higher oil prices) have not been spread throughout the population.

Social and Political Costs

Civil liberties have been curtailed in the war on terror. In the U.S. American citizens have been subjected to increased electronic surveillance, while some Muslims and people of South Asian descent have been questioned at airports, fingerprinted or deported for visa problems. Few have been accused of terrorism. In Afghanistan, former warlords were put into positions of power and many have come to see elections as a shallow form of sham democracy. The United States has detained hundreds of thousands of individuals in Afghanistan and Iraq, and elsewhere in the world. Many of those detained as suspected militants are innocent according to the

International Committee of the Red Cross. Some in U.S. run prisons have been tortured in Afghanistan, Iraq, and at Guantanamo Bay.

Lisa Graves and Brendan Fischer report that torture and detention remain an important concern. In Iraq, over 100,000 prisoners have passed through the American-run detention system, with many of those detained in the first years of the war processed through the Abu Gharaib prison that had been notorious for abuse under Saddam Hussein. Iraqi security chiefs allege that the existence of, and conditions in, U.S. prisons actually strengthened Al Qaeda, and they blamed the detention system increased violence in 2010.¹⁰ Meanwhile, prison systems under Iraqi control have been described as “miserable.” Hidden facilities have been identified that do not comply with International Red Cross requests for site visits.

In Afghanistan, many sites, such as the infamous “Salt Pit” located north of Kabul’s business district, are designated by the United States as “host-nation facilities” but are reportedly financed largely by CIA funds. Over 3,000 prisoners were held at Afghanistan’s Bagram Airbase between 2001 and 2010, and many were subjected to torture and mistreatment including beatings, sleep deprivation, sexual humiliation, shackling to ceilings, and threats with guard dogs. A 2009 report from Marine Major General Douglas Stone found that 2/3 of the Bagram detainees being held at the time were innocent and should be released.¹¹ Many had been held for several years without trial.

Lawsuits against the U.S. for the violations of human rights and international law associated with its rendition and torture practices have been unsuccessful.¹² Courts have accepted the Obama and Bush Administrations’ invocation of the “state secrets doctrine,” but critics say the judicial created “privilege” should not be allowed to shield the government from embarrassment or exposure of wrongdoing.¹³

In part as a result of torture, hundreds of persons have died while being detained and/or interrogated by the United States. At least 108 died in detention in the first four years of the war,¹⁴ and at least 80 more have died in subsequent years.

Environmental Damage and Human Health

The natural environments of Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan have been harmed by war. Radical destruction of forest cover and an increase in carbon emissions. In addition, the water supply has been contaminated by oil from military vehicles and depleted uranium from ammunition. Along with the degradation of the natural resources in these countries, the animal and bird populations have also been adversely affected.

In peacetime, the Department of Defense has been the country’s single largest consumer of fuel, using about 4.6 billion gallons of fuel each year.¹⁵ War accelerates fuel use. By one

¹⁰ Martin Chulov, Iraq Prison System Blamed for Big Rise in Al Qaida Violence, *The Guardian*, May 23, 2010, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2010/may/23/iraq-prison-al-qaida-violence>.

¹¹ Tom Bowman, Steve Inskeep and Renee Montagne, "U.S. Gen. Urges Release of Bagram’s Detainees," National Public Radio, Aug. 20, 2009, available at <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=112051193>. Major General Stone’s 700-page report stated that 400 of the 600 detainees were innocent.

¹² Carol J. Williams, "Five Foreign Men Lose 'Extraordinary Rendition' Case," *Los Angeles Times*, May 17, 2011, available at <http://articles.latimes.com/2011/may/17/local/la-me-rendition-20110517>

¹³ Suzanne Ito, Canadian Torture and Rendition Victim Denied Supreme Court Review, ACLU Blog, June 14, 2010, available at <http://www.aclu.org/blog/national-security/canadian-torture-and-rendition-victim-denied-supreme-court-review>.

¹⁴ U.S. has Detained 83,000 in Anti-Terror Effort, MSNBC, Nov. 16, 2005.

estimate, the U.S. military used 1.2 million barrels of oil in Iraq in just one month of 2008.¹⁶ This high rate of fuel use over non- wartime conditions has to do in part with the fact that fuel must be delivered to vehicles in the field by other vehicles, using fuel. One military estimate in 2003 was that two-thirds of the Army's fuel consumption occurring in vehicles that were delivering fuel to the battlefield.¹⁷

The military vehicles used in both Iraq and Afghanistan produced many hundreds of thousands of tons of carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen, hydrocarbons, and sulfur dioxide in addition to CO₂. In addition, the allied bombing campaign of a variety of toxics-releasing sites such as ammunition depots, and the intentional setting of oil fires by Saddam Hussein, during the invasion of Iraq in 2003 led to air, soil, and water pollution.¹⁸

While destruction of military base garbage in burn pits and toxic dust from military operations have added to air pollution, heavy military vehicles have also disturbed the earth, particularly in Iraq and Kuwait. Combined with drought as a result of deforestation and global climate change, dust has become a major problem exacerbated by the major new movements of military vehicles across the landscape. The U.S. military has focused on the health effects of dust for military personnel serving in Iraq, Kuwait and Afghanistan. Microbiologists have found heavy metals, including arsenic, lead, cobalt, barium, and aluminum, which can cause respiratory distress, and other health problems.¹⁹ Since 2001, there has been a 251 percent rise in the rate of neurological disorders, a 47 percent increase in the rate of respiratory problems, and a 34 percent rise in rates of cardio-vascular disease in military service members that is likely related to this problem.²⁰ The people of Afghanistan, Iraq and Kuwait will obviously be exposed to this dust for much longer periods.

The wars have also damaged forests, wetlands and marshlands in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq. The degraded environment itself may contribute in turn to further conflict.²¹ Water near military bases and battles is often contaminated by the chemical residue of weapons and military operations, such as depleted uranium from shells and benzene and trichloroethylene from air base operations. Perchlorate, a toxic ingredient in rocket propellant, is one of a number of contaminants commonly found in groundwater around munitions storage sites around the world, with research needed on the extent of such pollution in all three war zones.

War related pollution has clearly already affected the health of Iraqis and Afghans. A household survey in Fallujah, Iraq in early 2010 obtained responses to a questionnaire on cancer, birth defects, and infant mortality. Significantly higher rates of cancer in 2005-2009 compared to

¹⁵ Col. Gregory J. Lengyel, USAF, *Department of Defense Energy Strategy: Teaching an Old Dog New Tricks 21st Century Defense Initiative*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, August, 2007, p. 10.

¹⁶ Associated Press, "Facts on Military Fuel Consumption," *USA Today*, 2 April 2008, http://www.usatoday.com/news/washington/2008-04-02-2602932101_x.htm.

¹⁷ Cited in Joseph Conover, Harry Husted, John MacBain, Heather McKee, "Logistics and Capability Implications of a Bradley Fighting Vehicle with a Fuel Cell Auxiliary Power Unit." SAE Technical Papers Series, 2004-01-1586.

2004 SAE World Congress, Detroit, Michigan, March 8-11, 2004.

<http://delphi.com/pdf/techpapers/2004-01-1586.pdf>

¹⁸ United Nations Environment Programme. "Desk Study on the Environment in Iraq." UNEP, 2003.

¹⁹ Kennedy, Kelly. "Navy researcher links toxins in war-zone dust to ailments," *USA Today*, May 14, 2011. http://www.usatoday.com/news/military/2011-05-11-Iraq-Afghanistan-dust-soldiers-illnesses_n.htm.

²⁰ *Ibid.*

²¹ Carlotta Gall, "War-Scarred Afghanistan in Environmental Crisis," *The New York Times*, January 30, 2003.

rates in Egypt and Jordan were found. The infant mortality rate in Fallujah was 80 deaths per 1000 live births, significantly higher than rates of 20 in Egypt, 17 in Jordan and 10 in Kuwait. The ratio of male births to female births in the 0-4 age cohort was 860 to 1000 compared to the expected 1050 per 1000.²²

Benefits: Gender Equality, Democracy

The invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq both resulted in the eviction of two of the world's most repressive regimes, that of Saddam Hussein and of the Taliban. While bringing democracy to the two countries was not the initial rationale for either war (v. eliminating safe haven to terrorists and weapons of mass destruction), democracy promotion and gender equality quickly became a stated goal for each as Shiva Belaghi reports.

We were unable to systematically investigate the question of gender equality in Afghanistan and Iraq. It is clear however that women in Afghanistan and Iraq still face major barriers to full political and social participation. In both countries, women hold a quarter of the seats in their respective national legislatures. Gender inequality parallels the parlous state of democracy in these two countries. Cynthia Enloe found that in particular, individual women women's rights organizations faced extreme obstacles.

On a widely used evaluation and ranking of the quality of democracy across the world's states, the "Democracy Index", Iraq ranks poorly. Of the 167 countries ranked for 2010, Iraq is classified as a "hybrid regime" (between a "flawed democracy" and an "authoritarian regime") and comes in at #111.²³ According to Transparency International, on a corruption scale from 0 to 10, Iraq ranks 1.5 – the worst in the Middle East - in corruption (defined as "abuse of entrusted power for private gain") in 2010.²⁴ Freedom House simply says: "Iraq is not an electoral democracy. Although it has conducted meaningful elections, political participation and decision-making in the country remain seriously impaired by sectarian and insurgent violence, widespread corruption, and the influence of foreign powers."²⁵ Freedom House also notes that hundreds of professors were killed and many fled the country during the height of the sectarian fighting, a blow to academic freedom; the judiciary's independence is threatened by political pressure, and sectarian violence continues to threaten the religious freedom.

On the Democracy Index Afghanistan is categorized as an authoritarian regime and ranks at 150. Afghanistan ranks 1.4 on the Transparency International corruption scale – the worst in South Asia. Of the 178 countries assessed, the only countries they rank ahead of are Myanmar and Somalia.²⁶

Norah Niland writes that democracy promotion in Afghanistan was in trouble from the beginning, in the meeting which resulted in the December 2001 Bonn Agreement. The resuscitation of well-known warlords who had just been installed in their former fiefdoms for the primary purpose of helping the US prosecute the Global War on Terror was of great concern to Afghans. Significantly, Bonn did not include groups concerned about the marginalization of women, human rights advocates, nor representatives of the victims of war and abuse. A significant proportion of the Pashtun community, particularly those associated with the Taliban and rural norms, were not invited to Bonn and were, effectively, relegated to the margins of Afghan politics.

²² Busby C, Hamdan M and E. Ariabi, "Cancer, Infant Mortality and Birth Sex-Ratio in Fallujah, Iraq 2005-2009," *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 2010, 7, pp. 2828-2837.

²³ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Democracy_Index

²⁴ http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2010/results.

²⁵ <http://www.freedomhouse.org/template.cfm?page=22&year=2011&country=805>.

²⁶ http://www.transparency.org/policy_research/surveys_indices/cpi/2010/results

Whereas Afghans do want a say in how they are governed, as indicated in the 70 percent turnout in the 2004 elections, a growing number of citizens are less and less interested in the ineffective democracy that has been on offer. By August 2009, impunity and corruption were more entrenched than before and Karzai's western backers were still married to the notion that elections, however unconvincing to Afghans, were needed to sustain domestic support in ISAF troop-contributing countries. Elections, and Karzai's bid to retain his Presidency, were marred by violence and well-documented, systematic fraud.²⁷ Turnout was low and polling day was the worst single 24-hour period of recorded violent incidents, including the deaths of 57 Afghans, since the overthrow of the Taliban regime.²⁸ The second round of parliamentary elections in 2010 fared no better in terms of being credible or acceptable to Afghan voters. Little effort had been made to correct either the electoral system or the faults that had marred previous rounds of voting.

The widespread violence and corruption in Afghanistan has, ironically, boosted the image of the Taliban which the Taliban have been able to exploit because of their reputation and approach to criminality. They ended the mayhem associated with their predecessors many of whom are Karzai's allies who have reverted to their predatory practices. The study commissioned by U.S. General Stanley McChrystal in 2009 led to the conclusion that "widespread corruption and abuse of power exacerbate the popular crisis of confidence in the government and reinforce a culture of ombudsmen "to investigate abuse of power in its own cadres and remove those found guilty."²⁹

US disregard for international law in Afghanistan has greatly undermined security and efforts to construct a rule of law system that is just and credible. Many Afghans believe they deserve a "Bonn II" that is free of external interference, embraces the full diversity of Afghan society, and is geared to the identification of genuine power sharing, peace-consolidation, and transparent state-building arrangements.

Alternatives

The United States government immediately framed the 9/11 attacks as an act of war that demanded a military response, and the United States launched a war against Afghanistan. Mathew Evangelista argues that war was not the only or perhaps even the most effective way to confront the threat posed by Al Qaeda.

Although some countries have adopted the military approach to terrorist challenges, usually in the context of ongoing wars of secession or national liberation, others have dealt effectively with terrorism over the years without resort to war.

France, Algeria, Russia, and Canada used military force confront terrorism. France used military force when it faced anticolonial opposition in Algeria from 1954 until 1962, the year Algeria achieved its independence. French forces destroyed Algerian villages with napalm bombs and tortured women and men suspected of membership in urban terrorist networks. Ironically, the post-independence Algerian government adopted similar tactics in the early 1990s when it confronted an armed Islamist movement that resorted to terrorist methods. Russia fought a devastating and unsuccessful war against the secessionist republic of Chechnya starting in 1994. It withdrew its forces in defeat in 1996, but resumed the war in 1999 in the wake of terrorist bombings of apartment buildings in several Russian cities that killed hundreds of civilians. Continued terrorist violence, including suicide bombings (something previously unknown in Chechnya's centuries-old secessionist struggle) reinforced Russia's characterization of the war as an "anti-terrorist operation." In fact, as in the Algerian war of independence, much of the

²⁷ UNAMA-AIHRC Joint Monitoring of Political Rights, Presidential and Provincial Council Elections, Third Report, 1 August – 21 October, Kabul, October 2009.

²⁸ Scott Worden "Afghanistan: An Election Gone Awry", *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 21, Number 3, July 2010, p. 18.

²⁹ COMISAF Initial Assessment (Unclassified), Kabul, 30 August, 2009.

terrorist violence constituted a response to rather than a cause of the state's military violence, including indiscriminate killing of civilians. In the case of Canada in October 1970 a spate of bombings, kidnappings, and murder by the Front de Liberation du Québec led Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau to invoke the War Measures Act, bring tanks into the streets of Montréal, and arrest nearly 500 suspected terrorists and sympathizers. Although much criticized by peaceful proponents of Québec's independence from Canada, the action put an end to the violent secession movement. Henceforth Québec's status would be decided by peaceful means: negotiations and popular referenda.³⁰

Other countries have dealt with terrorist violence without resorting to military means or the war paradigm. Consider these statistics: In the first six months of a certain year, there were 1400 episodes of political violence, including 925 bombings and shootings. Some 22 terrorist "groups organized on a permanent basis" were responsible for half of the incidents, but there were more than a hundred groups whose names were known to the authorities during that same period. About a thousand militants had gone underground and were involved in what were called "urban guerrilla activities." An estimated 3000-8000 "part-time guerrillas" lived ordinary legal lives, but participated in some way in the terrorist acts. Sympathizers to those engaged in political violence were estimated to number between two and three hundred thousand. This was not Iraq in 2005, but Italy in 1978.³¹ Italy still occasionally suffers isolated terrorist bombings and assassinations, but the broad-based terrorist movement on the 1970s and 1980s was eradicated without resort to war.

One might argue that the threat posed by home-grown terrorists such as Italy's *Brigate Rosse* is not comparable to that of al Qaeda, that it may be possible to defeat domestic terrorism with police powers, this argument holds, but fighting foreign terrorists requires military means. In fact, however, the terrorist organizations in Europe and Japan in the 1970s did benefit from international contacts, including training centers and safe havens. In the 1970s members of Germany's Red Army Faction "received training in Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) camps that operated under the auspices of the Syrian government in Lebanon's Bekaa Valley."³² The communist regime in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) also provided support for West German terrorists: "In the 1970s the GDR appears to have been an important transit country for RAF members as they traveled abroad to elude the investigations of the West German police." Japan's Red Army also received considerable support from abroad for its terrorist activities. Under close supervision at home,

Left-wing radicals moved to North Korea or the Middle East. From these foreign locations the JRA staged daring operations, such as the attacks on the Tel-Aviv airport in 1972, a Singapore oil refinery in 1974, on the French embassy in The Hague in 1974, and on the U.S. and Swedish embassies in Kuala Lumpur in 1975. In the 1980s the JRA had about thirty core cadres operating abroad.³³

Both Germany and Japan dealt with their transnational terrorist challenges mainly through police work, including extensive surveillance that many Americans might find threatening to civil liberties. Japan's efforts, more successful than Germany's, had the paradoxical effect of driving the terrorists to seek foreign sanctuaries. Ultimately, the factors that most contributed to the defeat of the terrorist threat to these countries were luck and time, especially time for the

³⁰ Details on all of the cases mentioned in this paragraph are found in Matthew Evangelista, *Gender, Nationalism, and War: Conflicts on the Movie Screen* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011).

³¹ Alessandro Silj, "Case Study II: Italy," in David Carlton and Carlo Schaerf, eds., *Contemporary Terror: Studies in Substate Violence* (London: Macmillan, 1981).

³² Peter J. Katzenstein, "Same War—Different Views: Germany, Japan, and Counterterrorism," *International Organization*, vol. 57, no. 4 (2003), 731-760, at 742.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 745.

international environment to change and become less hospitable to terrorists. Nevertheless, the international changes themselves were the result of efforts to deal with some of the underlying issues that allowed for terrorist movements to make common cause across borders, particularly the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The Oslo Agreement of 1993 accelerated the JRA's "withdrawal from the Middle East." The weakening of the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine and "a change in Syrian policy in the mid-1990s left the JRA no choice but to withdraw completely. Within a few years, with the exception of seven JRA members believed to be living in Lebanon, all of the senior JRA cadres had been apprehended and were in jail."³⁴ The international dimension of Germany's antiterrorist policy focused on cooperation with law enforcement agencies in the European Union, whereas Japan "relied on economic aid, its preferred policy instrument, to further its antiterrorist policies." Japan appears to have rewarded Syria with economic assistance, "presumably as a *quid pro quo* for Syria's restricting the geographic mobility of the JRA."³⁵

Activists who turned to violence had often been victims of state violence and repression themselves. As one observer mentioned in regard to the French war in Algeria and the troubles in Northern Ireland, prisons turn out to be "a marvelous recruiting and training centre."³⁶ Many other cases support this generalization. Especially when the prison experience includes torture, friends and family members of the victims often seek revenge by engaging in terrorist activities.

How did the urban terrorism of 1970s Europe end? Here the generalization that seems most convincing is that political systems and social and political organizations became more inclusive and more open to the concerns that had earlier found expression only in political violence. By addressing the main grievances that underlay the violence, the authorities could isolate the relatively small number of terrorists from the much larger population of potential sympathizers. Evangelist argues that the point is not that every terrorist is motivated by a legitimate political grievance that should be addressed. Rather for terrorism to persist on any meaningful scale it has to have some at least passive support from a broader group of individuals who themselves might not consider engaging in violence. If those individuals find their concerns addressed by the government and society, they are more likely to withhold their support from the terrorists who remain committed to violence and even endorse state efforts to maintain order.³⁷

What We Have Not Assessed

We did not, nor could we, count or assess all the effects of these wars.

We did not include in our tallies of budgets:

- future State Department/US AID spending on the wars beyond 2012 including \$5.3 billion of reconstruction aid promised but not yet delivered to Afghanistan
- some expenses related to veterans, including the budget for the new GI bill, and the benefits to veterans from state and local governments

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Peter J. Katzenstein, "September 11 in Comparative Perspective: The Antiterrorism Campaigns of Germany and Japan," *Dialog-IO* (Spring 2002), 45–56, at 49.

³⁶ Alistair Horne, *A Savage War of Peace* (New York: Viking, 1978), 111.

³⁷ For more details, see Donatella Della Porta and Sidney Tarrow, "Unwanted Children: Political Violence and the Cycle of Protest in Italy, 1966-1973," *European Journal of Political Research* 14 (1986); Sidney Tarrow, *Democracy and Disorder: Protest and Politics in Italy 1965-1975* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989). For a good summary and application of this literature to current concerns, see Anne Marie Baylouny, "Democratic Inclusion: A Solution to Militancy in Islamist Movements?" *Strategic Insights*, vol. 3, issue 4 (April 2004), <http://www.ccc.nps.navy.mil/si/2004/apr/baylounyApr04.asp>.

- state and local costs for homeland security that are not reimbursed by the federal government
- how much all the allies and military partners of the United States spent on the wars and how much those expenditures may have been offset by reimbursement, grants, loans, or other forms of compensation, and, in particular, how much the wars have cost the governments and economies of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan
- the budgetary and economic effects of the wars on the economies of the regional neighbors of Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan (e.g. the extra costs of caring for refugees or the potential stimulating effect of increased demand for goods by refugees)

We did not count or systematically estimate or evaluate the:

- effectiveness of the wars in providing security or raising risks to the US
- effects on natural disaster preparedness of having U.S. National Guard troops and equipment abroad
- effectiveness of the efforts in Iraq and Afghanistan of the US, its allies, the United Nations system and non-governmental organizations in promoting economic reconstruction, health, and education. The U.S. Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) <http://www.sigir.mil/> and the U.S. Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstruction (SIGAR) <http://www.sigar.mil/> have issued many reports and testified before Congress.
- profits, excess profits, and waste of all defense contractors and weapons manufacturers
- number of "insurgents" killed or how many contractors employed by U.S. allies have been killed or wounded
- resources devoted by the United Nations system, non-governmental organizations, and other nations to ameliorate war related suffering in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan
- success of the U.S. promise to bring democracy to Iraq (although see Niland in this report on Afghanistan). We have not done a similar assessment for Iraq and Pakistan.

We have not assessed changes in American "standing" in the rest of the world since the wars began. For this, see research done by the Pew Research Center's "Global Attitudes Project," <http://pewglobal.org/>.

Some budgetary items are included in the totals for Pentagon war spending but their portion of the spending is not easy to identify or estimate for various reasons, including concerns about secrecy. Specifically, we were unable to specifically identify:

- how much of the money within the Pentagon's budget for these wars for "Commander's Emergency Response Program funds" in Afghanistan and Iraq was used for condolence (or "solatia") payments to the survivors of a civilian killed by U.S. operations, or to individuals who have been injured or whose property has been damaged by the war. Those payments totaled about \$31 million in Iraq in FY2005 and 2006 and 210,000 in Afghanistan in FY2006.³⁸ We have not identified the additional condolence money that has been paid in Afghanistan and Iraq by the United States Department of State and the Agency for International Development. Although the Pakistani government does provide some assistance, the U.S. does not provide aid to civilian victims of drone strikes in Pakistan.
- the costs of the CIA managed Predator and Reaper RPV "drone" surveillance and strike

³⁸ Government Accountability Office, "The Defense Department's Use of Solatia and Condolence Payments in Iraq and Afghanistan," *GAO*, May 2007.

program in Pakistan (and Yemen, where strikes have also occurred). This "black" budget item is inside the Pentagon budget and includes the costs of the drones, the operators, fuel, and weapons, and is not publicly known. We cannot say if expenditures for the drone program are entirely contained in the accounting of Pentagon spending for the wars or also partly in the "base" portion of the Pentagon budget. We can say this about the Air Force version of the drone program. As the *New York Times* reported in 2009, "Air Force officials acknowledge that more than a third of their unmanned Predator spy planes — which are 27 feet long, powered by a high-performance snowmobile engine, and cost \$4.5 million apiece — have crashed, mostly in Iraq and Afghanistan."³⁹

- the portion of the National Intelligence budget devoted to the wars. The proposal to separate the National Intelligence Program money from the overall Pentagon budget has not been approved by Congress. In February 2011, the Director of National Intelligence released for the first time their annual budget request: \$55 billion. "Any and all subsidiary information concerning the National Intelligence Program (NIP) budget, whether the information concerns particular intelligence agencies or particular intelligence programs, will not be disclosed. Beyond the disclosure of the NIP top-line figure, there will be no other disclosures of currently classified budget information because such disclosures could harm national security."

Finally, we obviously could not quantify the emotional suffering in the U.S., Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iraq of those who have lost loved ones or their communities.

Recommendations

However one judges the US waging of the wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Pakistan, at the very least, we should know what each of those wars has been like. We should know who has been killed, what kinds of wounds have been suffered, and what kinds of economic costs and consequences have been incurred. Those costs have been consistently minimized, misunderstood, or hidden from public view.

While there are those who would argue that the role of the citizenry should be simple assent once the nation is at war, a wide variety of goals – from enhanced democracy to enhanced human security – require more specific knowledge about these and any wars. In addition, the US public should know what the decision to go to war in each of these cases has wrought. Because information facilitates democratic deliberation and effective decision-making, the U.S. should increase transparency by:

- recording all war related deaths and injuries in the war zones; this includes the deaths of US troops (not just those medically evacuated) and contractors (whether U.S. citizens or not), civilians in the war zones, enemy combatants, and prisoners. Records should be completed promptly and systematically and made public on a regular basis;
- continuing to track the war-related deaths (e.g. suicide) and injuries of troops after deployment, whether or not they receive VA treatment;
- fully disclosing the number and nature of detentions at home and abroad and in a timely way;

³⁹ Christopher Drew, "Drones are Weapon of Choice in Fighting Qaeda," *The New York Times*, 16 March 2009, <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/03/17/business/17uav.html>.

- making Pentagon accounting for wars and base expenditures more transparent by setting up separate appropriations for war funding, as the Congressional Research Service recommends;
- including in the accounting of war costs the additions to the "base" Pentagon and Veterans Administration expenditures that are clearly war related, such as the New GI bill, death gratuities and insurance;
- fully describing and auditing the use of private contractors;
- regularly disclosing the Pentagon's fuel consumption for each war zone and supporting operations, including the transportation of fuel;
- making public the National Intelligence Program budget that is directly related to war (e.g. the CIA drone surveillance and strike program).

Transparency and accountability for war budgets and costs must include not only what has been spent, but the amounts that the U.S. will be obliged to spend by virtue of the fact of going to war. The U.S. should make comprehensive estimates of the budgetary costs of these wars by

- including the future obligations to veterans;
- refraining from funding the wars through special or emergency appropriations;
- including the estimated costs of paying the interest on war borrowing and the estimated difference in cost between borrowing for war versus raising taxes or selling war bonds;
- estimating the costs of war that are passed on to state and local governments and to private individuals;
- estimating the macroeconomic effects of war spending on the U.S. economy.

Finally, the research reported here is only a beginning: an independent non-partisan commission should make a thorough assessment of the human, financial, and social costs of the wars of the last decade for the people of Afghanistan, Iraq, Pakistan, the United States and other countries directly affected by the wars.

Background on the Project

A comprehensive accounting of the costs of war must add them all up — the human, economic, social, political, and the lost opportunities in the U.S. and abroad. The Eisenhower Research Project at Brown University's Watson Institute for International Studies was founded with the mission to do research on the issues of war and the costs of war. The Eisenhower Study Group, experts on aspects of the current wars — economists, anthropologists, political scientists, lawyers, historians, and humanitarian field personnel, — was assembled by the project directors, Neta Crawford of Boston University and Catherine Lutz of Brown University. The economist Anita Dancs of Western New England College helped put the economic team together, working to coordinate their efforts. Andrea Mazzarino worked as project coordinator.

In January 2011, the Eisenhower Study Group met at the Watson Institute at Brown University in Providence, RI to discuss first drafts of papers assessing the costs of nearly ten years of war. These initial papers were revised, updated, and circulated to other experts for their review. Additional experts were asked to make contributions to the project by writing new papers or memos on topics that emerged during the meeting. Later some students and recent graduates at Brown contributed research assistance. The project directors gave comments to the authors.

The project directors did not tell the authors the conclusions they needed to come to, nor how to phrase their reports. We asked the contributors questions and then, in some cases, we asked them to keep digging. In areas where we did not have enough information or potential paper authors did not have time to revise their work, we chose to table those topics for future exploration. The reports remain individually authored and thus the style and tone of the individual reports is not uniform.

Eisenhower Study Group Participants

Project Directors

Neta C. Crawford is Professor of Political Science at Boston University. She is the author of more than two dozen peer reviewed articles on issues of war and peace and the author of two books, *Soviet Military Aircraft* (1987) and *Argument and Change in World Politics* (2002), named Best Book in International History and Politics by the American Political Science Association. Crawford has served on the governing Board of the Academic Council of the United Nations System, and the governing Council of the American Political Science Association.

Catherine Lutz is the Thomas J. Watson, Jr. Family Professor of Anthropology and International Studies at the Watson Institute for International Studies and Chair, Department of Anthropology at Brown University. She is the author of numerous books on the US military and its bases and personnel, including *Breaking Ranks* (with M. Gutmann, 2010), *The Bases of Empire* (ed., 2009); *Homefront: A Military City and the American 20th Century* (2001), and a co-founder of the Network of Concerned Anthropologists, publishers of *The Counter-Counterinsurgency Manual* (2010). She has also conducted research on UN peacekeeping in Haiti and Lebanon. Lutz is past president of the American Ethnological Society, the largest organization of cultural anthropologists in the US.

Project Coordinator:

Andrea Mazzarino received her Ph.D. in cultural anthropology from Brown University in 2010. In 2011 she served as Faculty Fellow at the Holleran Center for Public Policy and Community Action at Connecticut College. As a Ruth Landes Gender Studies Scholar in 2011-2012, she is conducting research on women, national politics, and work in urban Russia.

Other Contributors:

Andrew J. Bacevich is Professor of History and International Relations at Boston University. A graduate of the U. S. Military Academy, he received his Ph.D. in American diplomatic history from Princeton. He is the author of *Washington Rules: America's Path to Permanent War* (2010), *The Limits of Power: The End of American Exceptionalism* (2008), and *The New American Militarism: How Americans Are Seduced by War* (2005), among other books.

Shiva Balaghi is a historian of the modern Middle East. She is an International Humanities Fellow at the Cogut Center, Brown University. Her publications include *Saddam Hussein: A Biography* (2006) and *Picturing Iran: Art, Society and Revolution* (edited volume, 2002). She is co-director of the Brown Afghanistan Working Group at the Watson Institute.

Linda J. Bilmes is Daniel Patrick Moynihan Senior Lecturer in Public Policy at the Harvard Kennedy School, is a leading expert on US budgeting and public finance. Bilmes was Assistant Secretary and Chief Financial Officer of the US Department of Commerce during the Clinton administration. She is co-author (with Joseph Stiglitz) of the *New York Times* bestseller [*The Three Trillion Dollar War: The True Cost of the Iraq Conflict*](#) (2008). She has written extensively on the cost of war and veterans' issues, including "*Soldiers Returning from Iraq and Afghanistan: The Long-term Costs of Providing Veterans Medical Care and Disability Benefits*" (2007). Bilmes is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Anita Dancs is Assistant Professor of Economics at Western New England College. She writes on the military and the U.S. economy, and the economics of war and empire. She has been interviewed extensively by national media including appearances on CNN, CNBC, and Marketplace, and her research has been covered by the *Washington Post*, *New York Times*, and Associated Press amongst others. She was research director of the National Priorities Project, and has been a staff economist with the Center for Popular Economics for more than 15 years, making economics more accessible to the general population.

Omar Dewachi is a physician from Iraq and medical anthropologist, currently an Assistant Professor of Public Health at the American University of Beirut. In 2008, he graduated from Harvard University with a PhD in Social Anthropology. Dewachi has worked on Iraqi medical doctors, their role in the formation of the Iraqi state, migration to the UK and integration in the British National Health Service (NHS). Dewachi's current research is on humanitarian interventions on displaced Iraqis in Syria, Jordan, and Lebanon.

Ryan D. Edwards is Assistant Professor of Economics at Queens College, a member of the doctoral faculty at the City University of New York, and a faculty research fellow with the National Bureau of Economic Research. His studies focus on the interrelated causes and consequences of health, mortality, and economic well-being. Edwards' most recent work has focused on the later-life health and life-cycle earnings of U.S. veterans.

Cynthia Enloe is Research Professor at Clark University (Massachusetts) in the Program of Women's and Gender Studies and the Department of International Development, Community and the Environment (IDCE). She received her Ph.D. in Political Science from the University of California, Berkeley. Among Enloe's books are *Bananas, Beaches and Bases: Making Feminist Sense of International Politics* (2000); *The Curious Feminist* (2004); and *Globalization and Militarism: Feminists Make the Link* (2007), *Nimo's War, Emma's War: Making Feminist Sense of the Iraq War* (2010). Enloe's latest book (coauthored with Joni Seager) is *The Real State of America: Mapping the Myths and Truths of the United States* (2011).

Matthew Evangelista is President White Professor of History and Political Science and former chair of the Department of Government at Cornell University, where he teaches courses in international and comparative politics. He is the author of five books: *Innovation and the Arms Race* (1988); *Unarmed Forces: The Transnational Movement to End the Cold War* (1999); *The Chechen Wars* (2002); *Law, Ethics, and the War on Terror* (2008); and *Gender, Nationalism, and War* (2011). He is the editor of *Peace Studies*, 4 vols. (2005), and co-editor of *Partners or Rivals? European-American Relations after Iraq* (2005); *New Wars, New Laws? Applying the Laws of War in 21st Century Conflicts* (2005); and *Democracy and Security* (2008).

Brendan M Fischer is a law fellow with the Center for Media and Democracy. He will graduate from Wisconsin Law School in December 2011. Prior to law school, he worked for a music publicist and served as a Peace Corps Volunteer in a rural community in El Salvador.

Phillip Gara is a filmmaker with the Global Media Project at the Watson Institute for International Studies at Brown University. He was an associate producer on the documentary *Human Terrain*, directed shorts including *Virtuous War*, *Disastrous Horizons*, *The Military Industrial Complex...50 Years Later*, and is currently directing a feature documentary, *Project Z*.

Heidi Garrett-Peltier holds a PhD in Economics from the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. She currently works as a Research Fellow at the Political Economy Research Institute at UMass. Heidi has written and contributed to a number of reports on the clean energy economy, including [*Green Prosperity: How Clean-Energy Policies Can Fight Poverty and Raise Living Standards in the United States*](#) and *The Economic Benefits of Investing in Clean Energy*. She has also written about the employment effects of defense spending with co-author Robert Pollin in publications such as *The U.S. Employment Effects of Military and Domestic Spending Priorities*. Additionally, Heidi has consulted with the U.S. Department of Energy on federal energy programs and she is an active member of the Center for Popular Economics.

Lisa Graves is the Executive Director of the Center for Media and Democracy. She has testified as an expert witness before the U.S. Senate and House on national security issues. Graves' former leadership posts include serving as Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Office of Legal Policy/Policy Development at the U.S. Department of Justice; Deputy Chief of the Article III Judges Division of the U.S. Courts; Chief Counsel for Nominations for the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee; Senior Legislative Strategist for the ACLU; and Deputy Director of the Center for National Security Studies. She has also appeared as an expert on CNN, ABC, NBC, CBS, National Public Radio, Air America, Pacifica Radio, and in the major US dailies.

William D. Hartung is Director of the Arms and Security Initiative, New America Foundation. He is an internationally recognized expert on the arms trade, nuclear policy, and military spending. Hartung is the author of *Prophets of War: Lockheed Martin and the Making of the Military Industrial Complex* (2011), the co-editor of *Lessons from Iraq: Avoiding the Next War* (2008), and *And Weapons for All* (1995). Hartung's articles on security issues have appeared in the *New York Times*, the *Washington Post*, the *Los Angeles Times*, *The Nation*, and the *World Policy Journal*. He has been a featured expert on national security issues on CBS 60 Minutes, NBC Nightly News, the Lehrer Newshour, CNN, Fox News, and scores of local, regional, and international radio outlets.

James Heintz is Associate Research Professor and Associate Director at the Political Economy Research Institute of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. He has published widely on employment, economic policy, labor standards, international trade, clean energy, and human rights. He has worked with the International Labor Organization, the United Nations Development Program, the UN Research Institute for Social Development, and the Economic Commission for Africa. Part of his work has involved examining the relationships between economic policy and social and economic rights in conjunction with various human rights organizations.

Norah Niland has spent much of her professional life with the United Nations, both in the field (including assignments in Sri Lanka, Thailand, Cambodia, Liberia and Afghanistan), and in New York on humanitarian, human rights, and development issues. Niland recently completed an assignment in 2010 in

Afghanistan as Director of Human Rights in UNAMA. Before this, she was in charge of policy development with the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs in Geneva.

Winslow T. Wheeler is Director of the Straus Military Reform Project of the Center for Defense Information in Washington, DC. He is the author of *The Wastrels of Defense* (2004) and *Military Reform* (2007), and the editor of the anthology *The Pentagon Labyrinth: 10 Short Essays to Help You through It* (2011) and the 2008 anthology, *America's Defense Meltdown: Pentagon Reform for President Obama and the New Congress* (2009). From 1971 to 2002, Wheeler worked on national security issues for members of the U.S. Senate and for the US Government Accountability Office (GAO). In the Senate, Wheeler advised Jacob K. Javits (R-NY), Nancy L. Kassebaum (R-KS), David Pryor (D-AR), and Pete V. Domenici (R-NM). He was the first and last Senate staffer to work simultaneously on the staffs of a Republican and a Democrat.

Zoë H. Wool received her Ph.D. from the University of Toronto and is currently a Postdoctoral Associate. She has conducted ethnographic fieldwork with injured U.S. soldiers and their families rehabilitating at Walter Reed Army Medical Center. Her work on this and other issues related to the U.S. military since 9/11 can be found in peer reviewed journals of Anthropology and Sociology.

Bassam Yousif is associate professor of economics at Indiana State University. He has written extensively on the economic development and political economy of Iraq. Recent publications include, 'The Political Economy of Sectarianism in Iraq,' *International Journal of Contemporary Iraqi Studies*, (forthcoming in) 2011. His work has led to policy consulting. His book on the development history of Iraq, *The Human Development of Iraq*, is forthcoming from Routledge (fall 2011).

Research Assistant: Chantal Berman recently received her B.A. from Brown University with degrees in International Relations and Middle East Studies. She has conducted research on Iraqi refugee policies in Syria and Lebanon. Berman works as an Assistant Producer at Radio Open Source with Christopher Lydon.

Research assistance on the project was also provided by Brown University students Sujaya Desai, Sofia Quesada, and Hannah Winkler.

Communications Director, Watson Institute for International Studies, Brown University

Karen Lynch began her career as a journalist and editor covering the global telecommunication and internet sectors. Prior to joining Brown, she was communications and content director at the Development Gateway Foundation, a World Bank initiative using the web to share information and practical solutions for alleviating poverty. She is also past director of the Markle Foundation's Global Digital Opportunity Program, which advanced the use of information and communication technologies for development.