

CHALLENGING DRONOTOPIA

A report of the 2012 Know Drones Tour to Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia
and suggestions for further action.

By Nick Mottern

October 20, 2012

www.knowdrones.com

Introduction

This is a report about an educational expedition on US drone warfare and drone surveillance that George Guerci and I undertook into parts of Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia in September and October 2012.

This was the final leg of the 2012 Know Drones Tour¹, the purpose of which was to not only to educate the public about drones but to learn what people are thinking politically across the country and to explore ways of increasing peace activism.

We carried with us two, eight-foot-long replicas of the MQ-9 Reaper drone; the Reaper is the workhorse of US global campaign of drone assassination and terror². The replicas were extremely valuable in emotionally engaging a public immersed in an America-First culture, desperately trying to avoid the sadness of war and trying to survive economically and emotionally amidst the wreckage of a manufacturing economy.

Our method was to talk to people for as long as they wanted, to be respectful and not argumentative, and to explain what drones are, what they are doing and what they will be able to do. We said that the drone is an extremely dangerous weapon in part because it energizes fantasies of killing without consequences. We constantly had to respond to the argument that drones are saving lives.

In our presentations and conversations, we provided the following information and analysis, much of which may be familiar to you:

Drones, unmanned aircraft, have been used in various forms on a very limited basis since the early 1900s. For instance, Joseph Kennedy, a brother of President John Kennedy, died in World War II while flying a drone bomber that exploded just as he was about to bail out and have control of his plane shifted to radio control. At the beginning of the 21st Century advances in micro-technology and satellite communication have enabled a dramatic expansion in the use of drones.

The US Air Force is now training more drone pilots than pilots for manned aircraft; indeed there is a shortage of drone pilots. New drone control bases are being opened in Nashville, Tennessee and at Fort Benning, Georgia, adding to existing bases in the West and East.

¹ For itinerary and other details on the Know Drones Tour see www.knowdrones.com

² To date, 15 replicas have been built and distributed to local organizers in the U.S. and four more are under construction to meet other requests. Further information is at www.knowdrones.com as well as a video, *Less Distance from War*, that lays out in a simple direct way, fundamental concerns about drone war and surveillance.

Drone spending is growing in the US military budget. In universities and aerospace firms across the US, there are thousands of researchers, funded by hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of dollars in military grants, working on an array of artificial intelligence, sensing, control and communications devices for new generations of drones. These drones, of all sizes, will have ever greater capabilities of attack and surveillance and the power to obliterate our privacy, safety and community, our sense of control over our own lives, our sense of identity, our economic health and our lives.

Already US drones are doing this to thousands of people in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia and the Philippines. Drones are being sent back to Libya and will be sent to Mali. **Drone killing, sometimes called targeted killing, and terror generated by drones, has reached the point where Medact, an organization of health professionals in the United Kingdom, has called for drones to be included in arms limitations treaties and made “the subject of specific legislation to limit and eventually stop their development, use and proliferation.”**

http://www.medact.org/content/wmd_and_conflict/medact_drones_WEB.pdf³

Nevertheless, the drone is becoming a key weapon, if not the most important weapon, in US military and diplomatic strategy. This is in spite of the fact that US drone strikes are violating international and domestic laws; President Obama, in ordering these strikes, is a war criminal.

The drone, without a human pilot on board, and at risk, is the perfect weapon, as well as a symbol, for an American public wishing to be disengaged from feelings of responsibility and consequences of killing.

Although we are effectively at war in the nations under drone attack, **Congress has made no objection to the attacks and has exercised no effective oversight on the drone wars;** members of Congress receive substantial contributions from drone makers.

The major US news organizations enable public disengagement by failing to present images of victims of drone strikes, just as they have censored images of Americans and Afghanis who are being wounded and killed in more than 10 years of the Afghanistan War. Nor has the major press reported fully on the legal, moral and political implications of our drone attacks.

The major press has let stand without challenge the notion that drone attacks are saving US lives rather than the more accurate view that drones are increasing risk for Americans, essentially like throwing gasoline on a fire.

³ The Medact report was released after we completed the Ohio/Pennsylvania/Virginia tour, but the points it makes are ones that we made on the tour, including calling for an international ban on weaponized drones and drone surveillance.

For example, the Quilliam Foundation, a British analytic group, believes that the killing of the US ambassador to Libya in September 2012 was in retaliation for the killing of a Libyan in Pakistan in a June 2012 US drone strike.

The US press also refuses to note that drones, and US troops, are engaged in long-term struggles to secure zones of safe operation and profit for Western corporations in resource-rich parts of the world. These struggles, described by Michael Klare in *The Race for What's Left*, are never mentioned by major news organizations, much less the central and expanding role that drones will play in these struggles. Nor is there any talk of how “conquering” resource zones contributes to the profligate use of non-renewable resources and consequences like global warming.

Under a law enacted in 2012, drones of any size and carrying any type of weapon will be permitted to fly in US airspace as of September 15, 2015, provided “safety technology” can be perfected to prevent collisions. This presents a threat to personal privacy and to the right to peacefully assemble to protest, an essential right, particularly in the face of the erosion of the US economy.

In reaction to the human tragedies created daily by drones, a few Americans have undertaken symbolic blockades of drone control centers at Creech AFB in Nevada, Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri and Hancock Air Base near Syracuse, NY. At least 60 people in total have been arrested in these witnesses. Some have been fined and others have been jailed. Most recently Brian Terrell was sentenced on October 11, 2012 to six months in federal prison in connection with his drone protest at the Whiteman base.

The most drone base protests appear to have been undertaken by the Upstate New York Coalition to Ground the Drones, directed against the Reaper drone control center at Hancock Air Base. The coalition has an excellent website.
<http://upstatedroneaction.org>

In addition, the following peace and justice organizations have been working to educate the public about drone killing and surveillance: Code Pink <http://droneswatch.org>, Voices for Creative Non-Violence <http://vcnv.org>, World Can't Wait <http://www.worldcantwait.net> and the Know Drones Tour <http://knowdrones.com> and <http://www.facebook.com/KnowDronesUsa> .

Medea Benjamin, co-director of Code Pink, and author of *Drone Warfare: Killing by Remote Control*, has been touring extensively speaking to speak against drone wars, as has retired Army Colonel Ann Wright. Medea led a delegation of 30 US peace workers, of which Ann was a member, on a visit to Pakistan in September and October to protest US drone strikes there. Kathy Kelly, director of Voices for Creative Non-violence, has travelled to Afghanistan numerous times and is helping Afghan youth who are working for peace and who want an end to drone warfare. Debra Sweet and her colleagues at World Can't Wait have been persistent in using

drone replicas to inject anti-war and anti-drone war messages at a variety of public events, such as the Democratic National Convention.

Joe Scarry, a political organizer in Chicago, is building solidarity and a forward dynamic among state “No Drones” groups through his state-focused blogs and nationwide blog network.

<http://nodronesnetwork.blogspot.com/2012/08/no-drones-groups-nationwide-state-by.htm> It is important to note that peace organizers in Indiana are conducting an on-going tour in their state opposing drone warfare.

Other nations and political/military organizations are building drones and beginning to use them. We must work not only to stop US drone attacks but for an international ban on weaponized drones and drone surveillance⁴.

We presented this message in key presidential election swing states within weeks of the election.

On September 17, we leafleted people lined up for an Obama rally at Schiller Park in Columbus, Ohio. While we were packing up our drone replicas, after the crowd went into the rally, we could hear President Obama greeting the people and then huge roars rising up over the trees into the afternoon sky as the crowd responded to him. It frightened me to hear this kind of adulation for a person who orders executions of people in faraway places, trashing international law, raining down death and carnage from the sky. I thought of the ferocious crowds in George Orwell’s “1984”.

But it may be important to consider the roars of the crowd as cries of desperation for a savior of personal and public dreams. Columbus has weathered the recession better than most communities in Ohio, the nation’s third largest manufacturing state, which has lost tens of thousands of manufacturing jobs in the last decade. At the same time, Columbus is a city that looks to a new casino for hope, has a poverty rate of about 22 percent⁵ and has large swaths of dilapidated and abandoned houses. Most of its residents, like most Americans, are hounded by debt and fears of being unexpectedly laid off.

To stop US drone killing and spying, it appears that we in the peace movement will have to do more than document the death, illegality and immorality of drone war. We will have to show how drone warfare is key to sustaining the structure of global exploitation that is destroying lives, livelihoods and the environment here in the United States as well as around the world.

⁴ The 24/7, day by day monitoring of individuals and groups that is possible with drones makes surveillance itself a weapon of intimidation and terror.

⁵ *The State of Poverty in Ohio*, Ohio Association of Community Action Agencies, May, 2011.

Please view this report as a step toward a continuing conversation on what we all can do to stop the drone killing and to end the globalization of US military power. Please send your thoughts, and we will publish them. nickmottern@earthlink.net

PART ONE – WHAT WE EXPERIENCED ON THE ROAD

“U.S.A., U.S.A., U.S.A.”

In the late afternoon of September 20, 2012, in Room 101 of Maginnes Hall at Leigh University, in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, a young woman student from Yemen touched off a blast of reality that startled and sobered 50 or so of her fellow students and townspeople attending a talk I was giving about US drone attacks and surveillance.

Paraphrased, she said:

“I get the feeling that there are those in this room who value American lives much more than the lives of other people in the world. I am from Yemen. I am a city girl, but I live not far from a village where I have family members and where US drones killed 40 people who were doing nothing but minding their daily business. The people in the village have no idea why this happened, they know nothing of al-Qaeda; they are trying to sue the United States.”

After she spoke, there were other comments and questions, but her words hung in the air, a stark personal, undeniable witness to the fact that yes, US drone attacks are killing people and creating great suffering. For all of us there, drone killing now had a face, and the United States stood convicted. At the end of the Q & A, people went up to her to talk and to say they were sorry for what is happening; several, including me, gave her a hug and more thanked her for speaking out.

The woman, with a sweet, friendly disposition, speaking in a soft, direct but extremely firm way, crystallized what appears to be the main reason that the American public is so accepting of drone wars – that is, **the widely-held feeling that Americans are exceptional.**

This notion and the mistaken belief that drones have enabled the US to enter an ideal state of warfare in which the US can kill without consequences are the twin fantasies fueling our drone wars, leading to the illegal killing of thousands and the terrorizing of tens of thousands more.

Her remarks were echoed the next day in the Q & A portion of a similar talk I gave at Lafayette College when a man from Pakistan said that the drones are a waste of money

and effort: “You’re trying to win hearts and minds, and then you blow up people at a wedding the next day.”

The words of these people are so strange and compelling because the American press is so American-centered. Furthermore, it appears that there is a thorough-going determination among editors of major news organizations, perhaps toeing a government line, to prevent any images or commentary that could be considered “anti-drone” from reaching the American public. **Certainly there is absolutely no TV coverage from the sites of drone attacks.**

This truly deadly combination of America First-ism and censorship is depriving the American public of empathy, an essential human emotion needed for learning and surviving. The woman from Yemen engaged our empathy, piercing, for that moment, the massive government/press conspiracy to suppress it.

The Tour and Our Goals

George Guerci and I visited Lehigh and Lafayette as part of the “Know Drones Tour” that took us to Dayton, Springfield and Columbus, Ohio and Bethlehem, Easton and Lahaska Pennsylvania and Charlottesville, Virginia between September 12 and October 6, 2012. This was the latest leg of the 2012 tour that has taken George, Kwame Madden, Geoff Smith and me, separately and together, since April 2012, to: Brooklyn, New York; southern New Jersey; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Baltimore, Maryland; the northern tier of Maryland; and Hartford, Connecticut. The tour is focused primarily on Congressional districts of the 55-member Unmanned Systems (drone) Caucus, a body that is essentially a lobbying arm of the drone industry within the US Congress.

We went to Dayton/Springfield because this area, Ohio’s Miami Valley, is second only to southern California as a center for drone research and development, with the focal point Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is the home of Air Force Research Laboratory and the office that oversees the construction, maintenance and improvement of the Predator, Reaper and Global Hawk drones. In addition, Ohio Air National Guard drone “pilots” are controlling Predator drones from Springfield Municipal Airport, attacking in Afghanistan and probably Pakistan.

Our goals were to inform people about the legal, moral and privacy issues presented by drone killing and drone surveillance and to assist local organizers in recruiting people, particularly people in their 20’s and 30’s, to work to ban drone killing and spying, as well as to do other peace work. So we focused on college and university campuses.

Skeptics in an Information Void

Because of the lack of responsible press coverage about drones, I must say that often it seemed that the audiences, absent the testimony of the Yemeni woman or the Pakistani man, were initially skeptical when we told them that drone attacks are not saving lives

but are in fact creating more enemies and more desire for violent revenge. We also found that people cannot imagine life in the United States in which drones will be able to watch individuals and groups 24/7, days, weeks and months on end, and will be permitted to carry weapons; all as would be permitted under current law.

Our narrative was supported, within a week of our return home, by the publication of *Living Under Drones*, prepared by the International Human Rights and Conflict Resolution Clinic of Stanford Law School and the Global Justice Clinic of New York University. At the same time, the US General Accountability Office released a report entitled *Unmanned Aircraft Systems: Measuring Progress and Addressing Potential Privacy Concerns Would Facilitate Integration into the National Airspace System*, which notes that drones present serious privacy issues and that: “Currently, no federal agency has specific statutory responsibility to regulate privacy matters related to UAS (unmanned aerial systems or drones) for the entire Federal government.”

Our “Drone” Government

In addition to skepticism about our message, we also found a strong sense among people that there might be no way to stop drone attacks regardless of what people might do because the government – the Congress and the Presidency – are controlled not by their elected representatives but corporations and the wealthy. People also were confounded by the recognition that drone killing will almost certainly continue regardless of who is elected president.

The reality of what I came to call on the tour “drone” government, remotely-controlled government, was demonstrated for us on September 14. A week earlier a letter was sent to Republican Congressman Michael Turner, representing Dayton, asking him to: call for a halt to US drone attacks; send nearly \$150,000 in campaign contributions that he has received from drone-related businesses to agencies helping victims of US drone attacks; and introduce legislation banning campaign contributions from arms makers as well as lobbying by them. He was also asked to resign from the drone caucus. (See Attachment A to read the letter to Cong. Turner.)



Daytonians protest drone-maker contributions to Cong. Michael Turner in front of Cong. Turner's office in the U.S. Bankruptcy Court building. Photo by Steve Fryburg

As members of Daytonians Against War Now (DAWN) and Veterans for Peace protested outside Congressman Turner's office, a delegation of four Dayton residents met with Valerie Lemmie, the congressman's district director. She told them that she could not make any specific responses to the letter and that the group should not expect a written response either.

Congressman Turner did, however, find time to issue a statement to the press, saying that drones "play a key role in ensuring the safety and security of our nation. They also keep our troops safe on the ground and out of harm's way in the skies. As our community looks to new centers for economic development, UAS (unmanned aerial systems) represents an area where potentially thousands of jobs can be created; putting more Ohioans back to work."

He choose to say nothing about the conflict of interest in taking money from arms makers, particularly at a time when "war" is being waged.

The Congress has undertaken no effective oversight of US drone warfare. However, on June 12, 2012, 26 members of Congress sent a letter to Barack Obama asking for information on the drone attacks but stopping short of calling for the attacks to end. The president has not responded.

Congress held no hearings, and there was no debate, before the passage of provisions in the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization bill, signed into law by President Obama in 2012, that will allow drones of any kind, including those carrying weapons, to fly in US airspace after September 2015.

The Stanford/NYU report, mentioned above, notes:

“US manufacturers’ exports of drones have been limited to date because of export controls; however, significant pressure has been brought to bear on Congress, particularly by drone manufacturers, to loosen the export regime... In September 2012, it was reported that the Pentagon had given approval for drone exports to 66 countries... Representative Howard Berman (D- Los Angeles), ranking Democrat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, recently announced that his committee would soon review drone sales, declaring that ‘it’s crazy for us to shut off sales in this area while other countries push ahead.’... The *Wall Street Journal* reported in July 2012 that the US plans to provide Kenya with eight hand-launched Raven drones, which, while currently unarmed, have sensors for pinpointing targets. ... The drones are part of a military assistance package aimed at helping African partners combat Al Qaeda and al Shabaab ‘militants’ in Somalia. ...”

Drone Jobs, Drone Bubble, Drone Distraction

Drones are being promoted by the Dayton Development Coalition and the State of Ohio as jobs makers. But, as we pointed out on the tour, a 2009 report from the University of Massachusetts (Amherst) finds that spending on weapons produces fewer jobs than spending on green energy, health, education and other non-military work.

As indicated in the statement of Congressman Turner, the prospect of drone jobs is a big deal in the Miami Valley. The Examiner.com of July 30, 2012 estimated that 30,000 people in the Dayton area lost their jobs between 2006 and 2012 because of the closing of the General Motors Moraine assembly plant and other business and public-sector layoffs.

We found that Miami Valley people with whom we spoke were willing to consider our arguments about better alternatives for job spending. But the reality is that there are about 29,000 people employed at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base with more in drone and aerospace businesses clustered around the base. Criticism of the drone attacks was most often rejected because of the view that drones are keeping Americans and America safe, but one suspects that this was also a surrogate argument for keeping jobs safe.


At the same time, it is very possible, if not probable, that the hype for drone business and drone jobs is generating an unsustainable bubble of drone expectation.

The Stanford/NYU study finds that drone attacks are almost certainly creating more enemies for the US. It is also becoming very obvious that drone warfare in Afghanistan

and Pakistan are not curbing attacks against US military forces or helping to “win” the war for the US in Afghanistan.

The weapons-loaded surveillance drone can be an extremely powerful weapon of threat and intimidation, but it can quickly become, it has become, a hated symbol of the desire by the US for dominance. Moreover, **drones cannot seize and hold ground or control populations.** So while the drone may lead the US into war with the expectation of easy victory at minimal cost, it appears that, as in Afghanistan, it can create fantasies of easy triumph that are militarily and politically impossible. Libya is also a case in point. Drones are said to have contributed mightily to the overthrow of Muammar Gaddafi, but Libya remains in conflict, and US drones are going back into play there.

US military action is directed at securing zones of safety and profit for US and other western corporations in resource-rich parts of the world where there is little government or where governments have been destroyed. But people in these lands are knowledgeable and resistant. Drones will not cow these people. In addition, **the movement for an international ban on weaponized drones and drone surveillance will grow.** As this becomes clear, and the military limitations of drones become clear, enthusiasm for drone investment may dim and with it, the prospect of a surge in drone jobs.

Drone business on the US domestic side may also be less than anticipated. We found that **the overwhelming majority of people with whom we spoke do not want drone surveillance or weaponized drones in US airspace, nor do they feel comfortable with drones flying in the company of airliners.** 

Phillip Logan, a political science major at Wright State University, just outside of Dayton, who arranged for us to speak there, told us that rather than look to drones to “save” the local economy, attention should be focused on basic issues like: the need for a major jobs program (high tech jobs like work on drones is likely to leave out many in the African-American and Hispanic communities); the need to move away from property taxes as the main support for local education to make education more equal among neighborhoods and districts; national health care; reducing student debt; development of a high-speed rail link between Cincinnati and Cleveland (a project killed by Governor John Kasich); development of green technology.

Executioners’ Lives


On the evening of September 14, George, our local host Steve Fryburg and I erected a display of two drones at a busy intersection in Dayton to do outreach to people attending the Urban Nights celebration. Between the drones we hung a banner saying: “Stop the Drones, Stop the Wars”. Among those who approached us were two men who turned out to be in the Air Force. One of them had done a study of the experiences of drone pilots. In the course of a conversation that lasted about 15 minutes we learned two extremely important things.



Sidewalk education at Dayton's Urban Nights.

Photo by Steve Fryburg

First, the technology for controlling drones such as the Reaper has been introduced on a rush basis, before some of its complexities of piloting control could be simplified, putting stress on drone pilots.

Second, and perhaps most important, it appears that drone pilots working in the US are being stressed by the experience of living daily in two dramatically different realities. During their duty shift they are in a war environment on the other side of the world where they are required to kill. At the end of their shift, they return to the civilian, domestic US world. To reduce this stress, it appears that thought is being given to confining these pilots in compounds that will keep them totally in a combat environment just as they would be if assigned overseas, not letting them go home after each shift. 

As I reflected on what had been said, it seemed to me that what we have here with drone pilots is a group of men and women who are essentially executioners, being called on daily to participate in the hunting and killing of individuals. These people are expected to have "normal" lives and to bear the weight of killing in the midst of people who know nothing of that experience and who may be totally repulsed by it. In response, we may see the "pilots" being segregated, kept away from the general population, a kind of executioner class living with us but not among us.

Two days after this conversation, I talked with a Springfield policeman who came to the Wittenberg University campus as we were setting up our drone replicas. He supported the use of drones and said he has a friend who pilots drones at the Air National Guard base at the Springfield airport. I asked him whether his friend comes home every night, and the policeman said there are things his friend can't talk about. As we continued our conversation, I could see he was becoming less certain about the benefits of drone warfare. At one point he said that piloting drones was like being a police officer. I asked him how he would feel if he knew that there would be days when he would be told to put a gun to someone's head and blow their brains out. He said he would be numb, but I could see he still supported drone war.

A Window Onto A Greener, Safer Future



Drone replicas at Ralph Dull's Green Energy Center in Ohio. Photo by Steve Fryburg

To promote the idea that the US must create a renewable energy economy and turn away from going to war to get Western corporations favorable access to non-renewable resources, oil for instance, we planned to hold a press conference on September 15 at The Green Energy Center, located on the farm of Ralph Dull and his family, about 45 minutes

outside Dayton. Apparently editors felt they had already covered our visit to the Miami Valley so we had more time to spend with Ralph, 83, who gave us a tour of the center and some of the Dull Farm, which raises hogs and produces seed corn.

After spending 15 minutes in the energy center listening to Ralph, one recognizes that despite skepticism fanned by the major press, solar, wind and geothermal energy and other technology can make a huge contribution to getting us off of fossil fuels and out of oil related wars.

For example, Ralph himself has supported the development of fuel cell research by Chris McWhinney, head of Millennium Reign Energy. A fuel cell turns water into hydrogen that can power vehicles. The center has a Millennium hydrogen filling station at the end of the center's building where a neighbor fills up his hydrogen-powered pick-up truck. Ralph said that Millennium is close to starting production of fuel cells in Dayton.

Ohio is heavily dependent on coal, and a shift to green energy would be great for the environment and for jobs in green technology. Unfortunately, Ohio Governor John Kasich, has ended grants to assist in the installation of wind and solar, and he has moved away from the push for renewable energy development that was undertaken by his predecessor, Ted Strickland. Strickland visited the Ralph's Green Energy Center while he was governor to show his support for renewable energy.

Ralph understands very well that the massive change in energy generation that he advocates will have some hard consequences. He said, for example, that provisions would have to be made to assist coal miners who would lose work in a green transformation.

To simply have this kind of conversation about the future was tremendously heartening.



Nick Mottern talks with Ralph Dull at the Green Energy Center. Photo by George Guerci

Ralph, who has been a promoter for peace for many years, is opposed to US drone attacks; “It’s not collateral damage, you’re killing people. How do you expect the world to accept that without getting angry.”

“We’re not special people,” he said. “We’re not smarter than other countries, we’re not specially talented people.”

Drones in Academia

1. Wright State University – 19,000 students

The tour flyer attached (Attachment B) lists some of the **drone-related contracts** that have been given to schools of higher learning in the Miami Valley.

One of the most significant contracts is for a \$5.9 million project at Wright State intended to devise mechanisms to sort through the vast amount of video and electronic information that can be sucked up by drones and help identify the most important intelligence. Other than of controlling drones and giving them the capability of avoiding other aircraft and objects, the sifting of the deluge of information that drones can collect is possibly the toughest challenge facing researchers.

At Wright State, **Phillip Logan organized a speaking event in the atrium of the student center, complete with folding chairs for an audience of about 50, video display equipment and a large screen and a stage and podium.** The talk was well publicized, and Phillip, who is the president of the local chapter of the Young Democratic Socialists of America, put a lot of effort into making arrangements with the school’s staff.

Only about six people came to the presentation, which lasted, with Q & A, for almost two hours. But a number of students traversing the level overlooking us stopped, lingered and listened. We spent another two hours on a plaza where students gather, and while a few came over to talk, attracted by a drone replica, most ignored the drone and us.

One student, who said he was working as an intern at a firm that makes drones, was curious to hear our arguments, but I sensed he had no doubts about what he was doing in his internship.



Outreach to students and staff at Wright State University. Photo by Steve Fryburg

The extremely disturbing finding that I gathered from talking to the relatively few students with whom I spoke, most of whom were not studying technology, was that there was a strong, shared belief among them that the United States can simply kill it way out of “the war on terrorism”, when enough “bad people” are killed, terrorism will stop. I found also a complete ignorance of how the US has been engaged around the world and complete ignorance about why people from other nations might want to harm the US.

2. Sinclair Community College – 25,350 students

In Dayton, we spent several hours at the entrance to Sinclair Community College, in part because the school has a drone-piloting program. The Sinclair students were much more interested in what we were doing than those at Wright State and more supportive. We collected email addresses of at least ten people who said they might want to join the Sinclair Peace Club, which is being started by Logan Martinez, a student there. Most students had no idea that Sinclair was training drone pilots.

At Sinclair, unlike Wright State, the students who were attracted to us by the drone replicas were very open to talking about the history of US military engagement in today's war zones.

3. Wittenberg University – 2,000 students -*The Predator in the Garden*

We visited Wittenberg University in Springfield on a sunny Sunday, September 16th, thanks to the help of Peg Hanna, a long-time peace activist who is on the staff of Wittenberg's department of sociology.

We set the drone replicas on a plaza next to the student center well in advance of our presentation, hoping to students to talk. But, we experienced the same level of avoidance that we had at Wright State. We were pleased when about 25 students and faculty attended our talk. Only a few were aware that Air Guard controllers at Springfield airport are flying Predator drones flying in Afghanistan, and no one expressed an interest in protesting against the Springfield drone operations.

To add to the appeal and educational value of our visit, Peg asked students to perform a reading of *The Predator*, a play by Jack Gilroy that dramatizes arguments for and against drone warfare as spoken by a senator, a professor of peace studies, an Air Force major drone pilot and her daughter. Peg edited the play to shorten it and make it Wittenberg-specific.

Because the sun was hot, the audience of about 30 people voted to retire to a small, shaded garden edging the plaza. Microphones were abandoned, and the players – drama students Dylan George, Corey Ragan, Melanie Ellis and Jasmine Jones – gave a powerful reading that was enhanced by the intimacy of the little “theater”, secluded by trees and shrubs, and the very personal, unamplified, ancient communication between players and audience.



Wittenberg University students Dylan George, Corey Ragan, Melanie Ellis and Jasmine Jones perform a reading of *The Predator*. Photo by Nick Mottern

After the play I thanked the performers, the stage manager, Chelsea Jenkins, and the Patrick Reynolds, the assistant professor of acting and theater history, and I had the feeling that they had enjoyed their work.

I expect that all who attended, including two children, will not forget the experience.

Columbus State Community College – 31,000 students

In Columbus, our base of support was at the Free Press, a journalistic and political action organization headed by Bob Fittrakis. The organizing for our visit was handled by his friend and associate Mark Stansbery and by Suzanne Patzer, Bob's wife.



Nick Mottern speaks at Columbus (Ohio) Mennonite Church. Photo by Mark Stansbery

On September 17, we took two drones to an Obama rally, which I will discuss in more detail later. That evening we spoke to a meeting of Central Ohioans for Peace at the Columbus Mennonite Church. The audience of about 15 people was very attentive and supportive; one of the women in the audience has since volunteered to work with Mark on stopping the drone wars.

The next day, we visited Columbus State Community College, where Bob teaches and Suzanne is an administrator. As we stood by the trailer we use to carry the drone replicas, assembling a replica that we intended to roll onto the school's central plaza, students came over and began asking questions. We ended up spending 20 minutes talking there before we could get moving toward the campus plaza.

We attracted more students as we rolled the drone among the food carts at the entrance of the plaza, and when we reached our destination near a statue of Christopher Columbus we continued to be engaged in conversation. Over the course of nearly two hours, there was never a point at which both George and I were not talking to at least one person. Our audience varied widely in race, ethnicity and gender. We had an extremely satisfying experience in which people exhibited open-mindedness and hunger for information.

Ohio State University – 56,900 students (Columbus campus)

On the morning of September 19 we set up two drone replicas with the “Stop the Drones” banner at the entrance of Ohio State University (OSU) on North High Street at East 15th.

Many students passed us, apparently oblivious to our presence and to the drones. Nearly all whom we approached with literature declined to take it. A few said that “drones keep us safe” as they refused the handouts.

OSU has a large engineering program, and in late morning, a number of men from this program, dressed in suits and ties, and a few women also professionally dressed, passed by headed for a career day on campus. None stopped, all refused literature.

We have not gathered information on how much drone work is being done at OSU, but an article appearing in the Dayton Daily News (September 18, 2012) said that OSU had begun displaying its “inaugural drone prototype” at a farming exposition, a drone, the newspaper said, that may be used to monitor plant health, pesticide dispersal and need for water.

Only about 20 people were attracted by the replicas at OSU, and happily several said they were very eager to assist with local organizing.

Lehigh University – 7,000 students

Before the lecture at Lehigh that I described earlier, we set up our drone display on the lawn of the campus’ main green, assisted by Nancy Tate, director of the Lepoco Peace Center, in Bethlehem, and Lloyd Steffen, professor of religious studies and the university’s chaplain, who made the arrangements for us at Lehigh.



Outreach at Lehigh University.

Photo by Georg Guerci

Lehigh has a large engineering department, and I found a report of research being done there on a drone that will fly in the jet stream, held aloft by the jet stream itself, like a bird. This will permit it to stay in the air for long periods of time, enabling it to act as a platform for surveillance technology.

But we encountered only a few engineering students, and none seemed interested in our message. Most students ignored us, as at OSU. A few of those who did stop were opposed to drone warfare, particularly a man from Turkey. He was very serious and very concerned about the civil war in Syria and whether Turkey would be drawn in. US drones have been stationed in Turkey, purportedly for surveillance of Kurdish rebels. Turkey also possesses Israeli-made drones.

The replicas also attracted a very attentive audience of about ten middle-school aged children whose teacher was taking them on a tour of the campus to study trees. They asked good questions and were eager to take drone Occucards.

<http://www.occucards.com>

Lafayette College – 2,400 students

On the morning of September 21, we set a drone up in front of Lafayette College's Farinon student center to attract students to our lunchtime presentation. The campus was not busy, but a few students stopped. One young man talked with George for more than a half hour, and George thinks the conversation changed the student's mind, raising questions about the value of drone attacks he hadn't considered.

Lafayette, of the schools we visited, has the distinction of having had a student, Angela Mongelluzzo (Class of 2012) study and report on ethical issues raised by drone warfare as part of a program in its engineering department that examines ethical issues related to the advancement of technology. The fruit of her work is the website Dollars for Drones <https://sites.lafayette.edu/egrs451-sp12-uav/>



Presentation at Lafayette College

Photo by George Guerci

Katalin Fabian, professor of government and law, who hosted our visit to Lafayette, and Alexandra Hendrickson, the college chaplain, did a good job of turning out an audience for us. Our presentation marked Lafayette's observance of the United Nations' International Day of Peace.

About 50 students, faculty and other staff attended. The Q & A period was lively, and I got the sense that much of what I presented was new to the audience. I emphasized, as I did in other talks, that drone killing and surveillance must be viewed in the context of the struggle among industrial powers over limited non-renewable resources. We must shift our government's spending, I said, away from war and toward developing renewable fuels and materials, referencing Michael Klare's *The Race for What's Left*. I was told later that I got good marks from several students.

Charlottesville and Simple Living

On October 5, two weeks after we returned to New York from our trip to Ohio and Pennsylvania, George and I drove to Charlottesville Virginia to give presentations, that evening at Random Row Books and the next day at a gathering of the Southern Life Community, a congregation of members of Catholic Worker houses and friends living in Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee.

We arrived in Charlottesville at about 5:30 pm and set up the drone replica in Random Row, a used books store situated in a large, high-ceilinged former garage in the downtown. The store had a central open, meeting space, with several rows of folding chairs set up for the speaking event. Around the walls and at the edges of the meeting space were shelves holding some choice books, many written in the decades of ferment and personal and political revelation extending from the 1960s to the present.

When we arrived, the store was infused with evening light, and it had a familiarity and peacefulness that I found very welcoming and comforting. It spoke of taking time to read and reflect, of reflecting one's history and human history. It had a calm that I don't find in electronically generated words and images.

After having a small meal at Revolution Soup, a few blocks away, George and I returned to the bookstore and began to greet the audience arriving for our talk.



Presenting at Random Row Books, Charlottesville, VA.

Photo by George Guerci

By 7:30, about 50 people had gathered, and I began my presentation, which lasted for about 20 minutes, leaving nearly an hour for Q & A.

This was a group that I assumed would have considerable information about drones, in part because of the work in Charlottesville on militarism by David Swanson, who manages www.WarIsACrime.org and is the author of *War is a Lie* and other books. Despite this, there were questions that demonstrated ignorance of basic facts about drones that had become familiar as we travelled.

I realized again, as I have over and over, how little information is commonly held about drones, even as their use and development soars. I also was struck, again, by how important it is to be able to talk to people face to face about a complex subject and to have the opportunity to respond to questions.

A commonly asked question that we got at Random Row is: How is a drone any different from a fighter plane killing someone? These are responses that we have given:

- Drones are able to follow individual movements of individuals and groups for hours on end. Because of this monitoring, drones are able to kill when a fighter plane might not because of the normal jets' relatively limited time over the target area and its speed. The drone makes killing easier, too easy, leading to routine violations of the section of international law that requires judicial findings of guilt before sentences are imposed. Of course there is the question of whether the US has the right to impose any penalty in another nation.
- Attacks by piloted jet aircraft against individuals in sovereign nations are likely to be viewed as a type of armed aggression that is more politically and legally unacceptable objectionable than drone attacks. At this point, drones are flying in gray area of international law, which has not kept up with drone technology with respect to drone killing, terror generated by drone over-flights or violation of personal and group privacy.
- Drones enable killing without risk to the lives of pilots and at a somewhat less dollar cost than normal jet aircraft, thus giving the illusion of less political risk to politicians wishing to undertake sustained drone wars and drone intimidation. As drone wars develop, the risks it generates will be more and more apparent.

I think perhaps that learning can best be done through questions and answers because the question lays out the pathway of a person's thinking that one has walk back down to deliver new ideas. This of course helps those listening to follow the same paths. Maybe this is obvious, but it raises a question about our current heavy reliance on the internet for political communication.

One of those in the Random Row audience was a long-time friend and colleague of mine, Carroll Houle, a former Maryknoll priest who now lives in Charlottesville. He and I worked together at Maryknoll Fathers and Brothers, and we travelled to Africa together several times between 1985 and 1990 as part of our work on the Africa Peace Tour, an ecumenical project to provide information to the US public on apartheid and US military involvement in Africa.

Carroll has done a lot of work to help young people, particularly in Kenya, where he lived many years for Maryknoll. In the Q&A Carroll suggested that we describe the drone war, as well as other current wars, as war on children.

The Medact report, mentioned earlier, speaks to the impact of drones on women and children:

“Women are disproportionately affected by drones. What little control they have over their lives is further eroded by a weapon they know could strike at any time. Their lives and those of the children they try to protect are under constant threat. While men can sublimate their grief and anger to some degree by becoming fighters – one of the terrible consequences of drone warfare – women have no such outlet. And if their menfolk are

killed in a drone strike, they may have to endure the continuing presence of the drone just overhead.”

After our presentation, we drove out to the Little Flower Catholic Worker Farm in Louisa, Virginia, about 45 minutes from Charlottesville, where we would stay overnight before giving our presentation in the morning to members of the Southern Life Community.



Mosaic on the main house of Little Flower Farm. Photo by George Guerci

The farm is evidence of a simpler way of life, with five adults and five children living in three very basic and pleasant houses, sustained in part by a large garden. The farm was started in 2003 by Bill and Susan Frankel-Streit and is described this way on the Catholic Worker Movement website:

“Little Flower is a small CW homestead in rural VA, about a 1/2 hour east of

Charlottesville. We grow food, and practice community, hospitality and resistance. We spend our days working--mostly manual labor, sometimes for pay; protesting war, building giant puppets, weeding the garden and responding to the needs of the moment. We welcome visitors, whether in need of shelter or looking to experiment with an alternative lifestyle of precarity⁶, community and taking personal responsibility for addressing systemic violence. Send us an e-mail and we'll eventually check it on our slow dial-up, or call or write." littleflowercw@wildmail.com (540) 967-5574

We stayed in a relatively new house, constructed of straw bales, plastered with mortar and equipped with a composting toilet. The home has a very open, welcoming feeling, and the night George and I were there it accommodated about six visitors along with the couple and their two dogs who live there. The house holds a small chapel on the first floor, with the main living space on the second floor.

⁶ Precarity is defined by Wikipedia as a condition of living that is without predictability or security. This condition is viewed by many as undesirable and as a result of exploitation. However, Wikipedia cites this quote from Dorothy Day, a founder of the Catholic Worker movement:

"True poverty is rare," a saintly priest writes to us from Martinique. "Nowadays communities are good, I am sure, but they are mistaken about poverty. They accept, admit on principle, poverty, but everything must be good and strong, buildings must be fireproof, Precarity is rejected everywhere, and precarity is an essential element of poverty. That has been forgotten. Here we want precarity in everything except the church. (...) Precarity enables us to help very much the poor. When a community is always building, and enlarging, and embellishing, which is good in itself, there is nothing left over for the poor. We have no right to do this as long as there are slums and breadlines somewhere."



The Little Flower straw bale house under construction; photo taken in 2006 by Roger Straw.

Our presentation Saturday morning focused on specifics of drone research in academia in Virginia, North Carolina and Tennessee, and the establishment of an Air National Guard Reaper drone control base at Nashville International Airport.

I said that the immorality of drone killings is not mentioned as much as it should be and that religious leaders from denominations that spoke against the Viet Nam War have been relatively mute about drones and the US invasions of Afghanistan and Pakistan.

During the Q & A, one man asked how the drone attacks were any different from carpet-bombing in World War II or other bombing. I said that with respect to morality there is no difference, but that the world had now come to recognize the horror and unacceptability of carpet-bombing and that the fact that we are not killing hundreds of thousands of people means nothing to the people being killed; they are just as dead as if they were being carpet-bombed.

We had already talked about the illegality of drone killing under international and domestic law in that death sentences are being imposed without the accused having the benefit of a trial and with the President of the United States acting as the arresting officer, the prosecutor, the judge, the jury and the executioner.

After our presentation, we took the drone replica to the central mall in downtown Charlottesville to do sidewalk education, accompanied by about 10 people from the Southern Life Community and some of their children. We unfurled our “Stop the Drones, Stop the Wars” banner under the drone and handed out flyers and the drone Occucards.

During this time, I had a chance to talk more with Carroll Houle, whom I had not seen for about two years. He is very concerned and disappointed in the decline in the number of people involved in peace and justice work. He thinks part of the problem is that people are living more and more atomized lives.

At the mall, most people ignored the drone replica, but some took our material. One man, attracted by the replica, asked if we were local, hoping we might be able to give a presentation sometime in the next few weeks.

“Panhandlers”

In spite of the strong, positive personal interactions we experienced on this latest leg of the tour, I have made clear that the majority to people we encountered approve a drone warfare and drone surveillance as long as this happens outside the United States.

This was certainly the case among the several thousand supporters of President Obama who were on line on September 17 waiting to get into an Obama rally to be held in Columbus’ Schiller Park.

Over the course of the afternoon, George and I handed out about 400 flyers. We were pleased to have reached so many people. But the experience was also disturbing.

I estimate that about 20 percent of the people we talked to had reservations about drone attacks, and perhaps five percent would actively oppose the attacks. About 60 percent supported drone war because: 1. Drones keep our troops safe; 2. Drone attacks are better than sending our troops to war; 3. The people we are killing were responsible for 9/11, and if we kill enough of them they won’t be able to attack the US again.

Within the 60 percent is a minority who do not object to drones being used for surveillance in the US because “why should I care, I’m not doing anything wrong.”

This sampling seemed representative of what we have experienced throughout the year.

It is important to note also that the police at the Obama rally did not permit us to get anywhere near the entrance to the park, which was more than a block away, much less into the park or anywhere President Obama or his aides. None of them would have the slightest chance of seeing us. The only contact we seem to have had with presidential officialdom was a visit by two men who were probably Secret Service agents. They looked at the drones, took one of our flyers, said nothing and left. Situated on a corner

about a 150 feet from the line entering the rally, our drone display was even hard to see from the line of people we were leafleting.

For all practical purposes, we were excluded from any meaningful participation in this major public political event. Our First Amendment right to peacefully assemble to protest was rendered worthless and violated because we were totally out of the view of the officials who were the subject of the protest.

“We had no recourse,” George said, “We were like panhandlers.”

“There are no voices of dissent allowed, period,” George said. “All we are hearing are voices of consent.”

The rules now limiting where and how freedom of speech is permitted ensure, George said, that “your harmless, you’re completely innocuous.”

People in Congress know that the president is breaking the law in conducting the drone attacks, George continued, but they do nothing about it.

“People we vote for do not represent us. That’s why we are going down.”

“It looks like we’re in for it, sir.”

When I was leafleting cars at the Urban Nights celebration in Dayton, I handed a flyer into the window of a car with a young woman passenger and young man driving who looked like he was in the military or had been. He indicated that he agreed with our message, “Stop the Drones, Stop the Wars”, but, he said, “It looks like we’re in for it, sir.”

I was stunned by what seemed to a prophecy, coming from such a young man.

Next Steps

Here are local plans of action resulting from the tour, as reported by local organizers.

Dayton/Springfield

Steve Fryburg: The Dayton area No/Know Drones group plans to continue to put pressure on Congressman Turner to publicly expose his collusion with the military drone industry through his accepting contributions from them while sitting on the Congressional committee providing oversight to the same program.

Additional actions are being planned at University of Dayton, Sinclair Community College and Wright State. Through the No Drones Ohio Facebook site we are soliciting for new places for programs and demonstrations throughout the state where the mock drone can be used. The Campus Ministry at Ohio University has also showed an interest in a Know Drones program which will probably take place after the first of the year.

DAWN (Dayton Against War Now) will continue its demonstrations against drone usage and the war in Afghanistan on a regular basis and will now be able to use the mock drone for its actions.

Columbus

Mark Stansbery: As for the Know Drones work, we have identified three targets for a local campaign: 1. Ohio State University (OSU) Engineering students and staff; 2. Columbus City Council. and 3. General public education on drones.

There is also talk of an after election day Central Ohio conference of activists to discuss what priorities are there in this next Congress and US Administration, and along what international partners we might develop in this work.

Bethlehem/Easton

Nancy Tate: As a local multi-issue peace group we will continue these efforts with an eye for other ways to raise this important issue. We found the tour to be inspiring for activists, old and new, with the combination of a visually engaging presentation, tour participants eager to engage all passers-by in discussion, and thoughtful presentations. One possible further clear link will occur if we are able to engage Medea Benjamin for our Annual Dinner speaker this March. That possibility is in the works. We will see what other possibilities develop. It was very clear to me that there is hope for raising this issue with the public when one uses enough drama and commitment. I think that is especially true because of the linking of the international implications (which people are often somewhat closed to) and the domestic implications.

Charlottesville

Beth Brockman: The Southern Life Community is exploring ways to raise awareness about drones in their region.

PART TWO – OBSERVATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Education

The tour experience suggests that there is an urgent need for a major program of public education that includes:

- Information on drone warfare and drone surveillance. Basic readings include:

Drone Warfare: Killing, by Remote Control, by Medea Benjamin

Wired for War, by Peter W. Singer

Terminator Planet, by Nick Turse and Tom Engelhardt

Important government documents on drones can be found in the download section of KnowDrones.com. Current information can be found daily by typing in “drones” in the news section of Google.

- Reports of the experiences of victims of drone attacks, presented by the victims themselves or by citizens of those countries under attack.
- The history of US involvement in our current war zones, particularly military and corporate involvement. An introductory reading might be *War is a Racket* by the late Marine Corps General Smedley Butler.
- An explanation of how US military force is being used to maintain a system of global energy exploitation that is harming Americans and the American economy as well as causing suffering around the world. Work needs to be done to explore and clarify these relationships; *The Race for What's Left* by Michael Klare documents the connection between war and getting hold of non-renewable resources. This study would include an analysis of US involvement in nations where workers are oppressed to maintain low wage zones.
- Information on the benefits of spending tax dollars on non-military jobs and specific new, non-military work that can be done by specific military contractors. A starting point would be these studies by researchers at the University of Massachusetts (Amherst)
http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/research_brief/MA_Military_May2012.pdf
http://www.peri.umass.edu/fileadmin/pdf/published_study/PERI_military_spending_2011.pdf

- Alternatives for living needing dramatically less energy and involving more mutual support. A reading that may be helpful is *Too Much Magic*, by James Howard Kunstler.
- Understanding the history and benefits of non-violent resistance. Among readings might be *Why Civil Resistance Works: The Strategic Logic of Nonviolent Conflict*, by Erica Chenoweth and Maria J. Stephan.

Much of this type of education is already being done by individuals and groups who are focusing on one, or a few, of the points above.

But there needs to be consideration of creating a wide-spread, public education program that would address these elements and that would include sidewalk education. This raises questions about people-power, speakers and funding.

Peace Movement Challenges

Over the last six months, we on the tour have had what may be a unique opportunity to spend several days at a time with peace groups in a significant number major and medium - sized cities. These observations about local and national peace organizations may be helpful:

1. Local peace groups generally have active members ranging from two or three to 20 or 30. This is the number of people who can be relied upon to attend meetings, vigils and other demonstrations and to work on specific projects. Some of the largest cities have the smallest numbers of active peace workers.
2. Members of these groups in many cases appear to not have made a commitment to themselves and the group to appear at functions when requested by the groups' organizers. Some groups do not appear to have an effective phone bank or muster system to turn people out.
3. Peace groups are stretched thin because their members are also drawn to work on a variety of local, survival issues, many of which are being neglected, and in some cases totally ignored, by local, state and federal governments. These include: stopping fracking; closing nuclear power plants; protection or restoration of clean air and drinking water; stopping police lawlessness against black and Hispanic people; preventing layoffs of teachers, public health care workers and public employees and the under-cutting of their rights and job quality.
4. The groups are often only able to respond to the latest outrage, such as the threat of war against Iran, but do not have the membership needed to address issues requiring long-term work, such as closing US military bases globally. It also appears that it is rare for groups to systematically educate on basic factors in the generation of war, which would include: history of US military interventions;

campaign contributions and lobbying by weapons makers; factors determining the global basing of US military forces; the need to shift public spending from the military to production of renewable energy and materials (See *The Race for What's Left*.)

5. Members of peace groups are largely people in the age range of 50 to 80, but most groups have a few members in their 20s and 30s. The leadership and membership seems to be fairly evenly divided between men and women. The groups are largely white but generally there are a few black and/or Hispanic members, most of whom seem to have been participants for a number of years.
6. The level of participation in these groups seems to have declined since the election of Barack Obama as have vigils and demonstrations. Conversations with peace group members suggest that this is because: (a) there was the expectation and hope that President Obama would be less warlike than George W. Bush and would reduce the level of killing; (b) there is a reluctance to speak out against drone warfare, the Afghanistan war and virtually any other issue, because such opposition might be seen as a criticism of President Obama and thereby reduce his chance of being re-elected.
7. Most groups do not appear to have a plan for recruiting new, younger, black and Hispanic members. Recruiting appears to be the most critical issue facing peace organizers.

Recruiting Considerations

It is clear that there is a need for a determined, sustained effort to recruit people in their teens, 20s and 30s to the peace movement. Local peace group, however small, would benefit if just one or two people took the responsibility of systematic outreach to engage new members, particularly in colleges and universities, and to work with student organizations sharing peace and justice concerns.

Recruiting is a particularly daunting task because, we found in our sidewalk interactions, there is a very low level of public knowledge about other countries and US historic involvement around the world. This can be traced to US-centric education in our schools. Further, as we were told by people from other countries, most US news coverage is highly concentrated on what happens in the United States. A man from Somalia made a very important point when he noted that US domestic CNN and other news channels, seem to be too much devoted to commentary on the news, compared to international CNN which provides more direct reports from within the US and around the world.

In addition, as discussed earlier, it can be argued that there has been a systematic, unofficial censorship in the major press of images of the victims of drone strikes as well as the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. This has had the effect of surpassing public

empathy. This manipulation of a population of 350 million people in what is the world's most technologically powerful military power has, among other things, deprived the US public of an essential understanding of the situation we are in.

Community Colleges

We found the most interest in our message at community colleges – Sinclair Community College in Dayton and Columbus (Ohio) State Community College. A relatively large number of students at these were very curious about the drone replica, and there was diversity with respect to gender, race and country of origin. Those who were interested readily gave their email addresses for further contact. Students of four-year schools were much less curious about what we were doing, but we did find at least a few supporters in every school we visited.

At both community colleges and four-year schools, the drone replicas brought people over to talk who already had some information about drone wars and who were eager to work with others on the issue.

Peace education in academia can usefully focus on those in drone research as well as in political science and other areas of the humanities.

It is very important to note that we had excellent cooperation from chaplains, professors and administrators in arranging our visits.

It appears likely that the drone replicas would be very effective in outreach at high schools, based on our experience with high-school and even middle-school aged students.

Displays and props - maps, cartoons, enlarged photos, papier mache figures – are extremely helpful, in addition to signs and posters, in drawing people into conversation.

Kali Cichon, 26, who attended our presentation in Charlottesville, suggested that in our presentations, people be asked to do small things, like putting up posters or distributing flyers, enabling them to be engaged at the same time they are studying, holding down jobs or caring for others.

In Attachment C, Joe Scarry, a political organizer in Chicago, offers observations and raises questions that may be helpful in recruiting work.

Women and Drones

It seems that women may be put off by drones and possibly the subject of war altogether, and this concern deserves discussion.

At the Lafayette College Q&A, our host, Professor Katalin Fabian, interrupted about 15 minutes into the session to ask that women ask questions because so far, none had.

Several women then did, but the period was devoted largely to questions and statements from men.

This experience caused me to realize that most of the people who are attracted to the drone replica are men. In addition, those responding to our Facebook page entitled Know Drones USA are overwhelmingly male.

Black and Hispanic Concerns About Drones

We found that many African-Americans are totally against drone warfare as well as US occupations overseas. Most African-Americans with whom we spoke saw immediately the threat to their communities that is presented by police use of drones.

Throughout the tour we met a few people who had been involved with the Occupy movement in their communities, and it seems it would be useful to work on maintaining contact with Occupy participants.

A Framework for Understanding Continuing War

Providing a framework for understanding US drone killing and surveillance is important for education, recruiting and coalition building.

We found that drone warfare was of a concern to people not only because of the killing but because it opens up the question of why we are involved in drone killing and where drones are taking us with respect to privacy, our right to peacefully assemble, our sense of ourselves and our sense of community.

Framing drone killing and drone spying within the context of the struggle over non-renewable resources helps people to understand why our wars seem endless and why current wars must be ended and new wars avoided. We recommended reading *The Race for What's Left*, by Michael Klare, to provide more information on the struggle of industrialized nations for the shrinking supplies of fossil fuels and other resources. (People were surprised that the US has deployed drones to the Philippines and now, apparently, Mali, as well as Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen and Somalia.)

This points to the need to move dramatically and urgently toward green energy, something that many high school and college age people understand immediately, and to look at the \$1 trillion military budget as a source funds for this shift. One can argue that without this change in spending and public understanding, there is no practical way to rebuild our societies around renewable energy and materials as well as to reduce armed conflict and killing.

Moving along this chain of logic, cutting the campaign funding and lobbying links between arms makers and members of Congress become essential to funding shifts and stopping the killing. We found that a number people are surprised and offended that members of Congress, who decide on war and peace, whether people will suffer and die

in war, are so willing to ignore the huge conflict of interest by taking money from arms makers.

These considerations above also point to a campaign to begin closing US military bases around the world, pulling the US Navy back to US shores and eliminating nuclear weapons. These goals have long been discussed, and now we are beginning to see the necessity of taking these steps as a matter of economic survival and of having the money to move into a new phase of green development, in the US and globally.

Discussing this framework leads to the possibility of building coalitions among peace and environmental groups, a challenge that has long existed.

A Framework for Understanding Threats to Human and Civil Rights

We found that people across the political spectrum do not want police doing drone surveillance, and they were surprised to hear that police will be able to buy drones that carry 12-gauge shotguns, rubber bullet guns and tear gas and that there is nothing in existing law to prevent this. They were also astounded to hear that drones are being developed that will stay aloft and conduct surveillance almost indefinitely and that some drones can now uplift cellphone and text messages.

People are also quick to understand that government drones can be used to monitor and intimidate people who wish to gather to peacefully protest. This is of particular concern to people who recognize that this right will be more needed and more repressed in the face of high unemployment and efforts to drive down wages and benefits. This suggests the possibility of alliances between unions, civil liberties and peace advocates to ban police use of drones in the United States.

Talking about these things helped people here to view drones through the eyes of people overseas.

We found support for local laws that ban drones from municipal airspace, not only with respect to human and civil rights but from a safety standpoint, in that the capacity of drones to sense and avoid other aircraft continues to be undeveloped.

Person-to-Person Communication Needed

Our recruiting work extended to gathering email addresses of interested people, leaving follow-up to local organizers. We sense that developing the relationships from these lists involves a great deal of personal, face to face conversation to get an understanding of peoples' personal as well as political goals, their responsibilities and the kinds of information and spirit of community and mutual support that they need.

The Drone Replica and a Need to Talk

Reflecting on our experience over the last six months, I think it is essential to say that although the tour was initially impelled by the aforementioned lack of press coverage, we are becoming more and more impressed with the profound need that people have for face-to-face, personal conversations about their ideas and feelings not only about drones but about politics, the economy and the environment/global warming. These conversations started with drones but often moved into the realm of what people are pondering about their own futures.

For example, I had conversation with a young man at Wittenberg University in Springfield who came to learn about the drones after our formal presentation and eventually talked about how his being sidelined for the football season by a meniscus tear in his knee, what he was weighing in deciding on his course of study and how much he liked Wittenberg.

These kinds of conversations seem to be stimulated by the presence of the drone replica. Perhaps by being large enough to seem threatening, it may help people talk about basics, their deeper feelings and thoughts.

Another example came, after a short presentation on drones at the Quaker Peace Fair in Lahaska, Pennsylvania, that we attended on September 22, when a woman who thought drones might be a good idea also reflected on doing peace work since Pearl Harbor was attacked in 1941 when she was 17.

The person at the fair who was most interested in drones was a boy named Max, about 10, who came to ask about the replica when we got there, then came to my talk, and then came over again to say goodbye as we were packing up.

The Role of National Organizations

It could be very beneficial for national peace organizations to identify communities that are heavily involved in military industry, and/or with military installations and coordinate with local organizers to bring speakers into these communities on scheduled basis.

In addition, it could be very useful for national organizations to create a joint speakers bureau that would have serve local organizers. Ideally it would offer speakers with a range of knowledge and experience who collectively forward an education campaign covering subjects outlined above.

One overlay for identifying areas needing intensive, long-term educational work is the map produced by the Congressional Unmanned Systems Caucus showing the geographical distribution of its 55 members. A quick analysis points immediately to southern California, the Miami Valley of Ohio and the eastern portion of Virginia as important focal points.

<http://unmannedsystemscaucus.mckee.house.gov/about/membership-map.shtml>

Another overlay might be a map showing the distribution of drone bases around the United States. <http://publicintelligence.net/dod-us-drone-activities-map/>. Another analysis would be to identify Congressional districts with the highest levels of military spending on military industry and the military itself.

Funding

Most groups with whom we worked had large mailing lists of supporters, but not the money one would expect from these numbers. The same is true for national groups. After the election and before the end of the year, all groups will be trying to raise money. It may be that a determination to undertake a broader, cooperative, coordinated educational campaign, something that does not exist, would be an incentive to potential donors, regardless of who is elected president.

Press Coverage

The tour received moderately good press coverage in most places but remarkably fulsome coverage in Bethlehem/Easton Pennsylvania. We thought this might be because these are moderate-sized communities in which the press is more hungry for news than the press in major cities. Nancy Tate, director of Lepoco Peace Center in Bethlehem said:

“That kind of coverage is rare for peace work locally and they seemed to get the message and conveyed it clearly. I think that positive coverage was due in no small part to the clarity and drama of your presentation, both the drones and the talks and conversations. Also, you might want to mention the talk at the Quaker meeting. While attendance was small, it did include some people in LEPOCO and in the Quaker meeting who make things happen in many venues and the discussion may bear fruit the possibilities for which are not immediately visible.”

It also appears likely that the coverage was so good because we visited local colleges.

Concluding Thoughts

In our tour to Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia, as with earlier parts of the tour, we were assisted at every stop by local organizers who have been committed workers against war for years, in most cases at least a decade and in some cases even longer. These are people who have made personal and monetary sacrifices to do this work in the face of an indifferent and sometimes hostile public, and still they are pressing forward.

So the observations and suggestions above should not be viewed in any way as criticism but an attempt to help us all to see where we are and to stimulate conversation and help planning.

A very good piece of news is that at nearly all our stops we meet people in their 20's who are energetically beginning lives of peace and justice advocacy. They were eager to learn about drone warfare and the larger issues mentioned throughout this report. They are putting in work to back their beliefs, they are inspiring.

A moment that made us very happy and hopeful came on the street corner in Dayton where we had erected the drones for the Urban Nights festival. Two couples in their 20s rushed over to us to thank us for being there, giving us high-fives and hugs.

We're going to win.

Thanks to those in Ohio, Pennsylvania in Virginia who worked with us and to those who helped prepare this report:

Harriet Ackerman
Beth Brockman
Peter Crownfield
robert Daniels II
Ralph and Christine Dull
Katalin Fabian
Bill and Susan Frankel-Streit
Bob Fritrakis
Steve and Rose Fryburg
Ingrid Guerci
Peg Hanna
Alexandra Hendrickson
Phillip Logan
Jim Lucas
Logan Martinez
Suzanne Patzer
Peter Ray
Bob and Carmen Riggs
Mark Stansbery
Lloyd Steffen
Nancy Tate

Thanks also to organizers from the earlier portions of our tour:

Michael Diamond
Cindy Farquhar

Jane Kurinsky
Peter Lems
Max Obuszewski
Malgot Schmidt and Barry Kissin
Georgina Shanley and Steve Fenichel
Bob Smith

Thanks especially to those at our home base of WESPAC Foundation, in Westchester County, New York, who have assisted in so many ways, in fund-raising and outreach and encouragement. Thanks to Nada Khader, WESPAC's Executive Director. Thanks also to Enrico Rodrigues who has so faithfully kept www.knowsdrones.com up to date and helped with our flyers and to Debbie Kair for help with drone construction. Finally, a special thanks to WESPAC board member Gayle Dunkelberger, who has started a tag sale store in her garage in Katonah, NY, to assist in funding the tour and the building of drone replicas.



Gayle Dunkelberger, holding a blue donation bucket, at her tag sale store on opening day, September 28, 2012, accompanied by: (l to r) Nick Mottern, Montana Hooker, Martha Conte, George Guerci, Nora Freeman and Christiana Hooker.

Photo by Andrew Courtney.

Ohio/Pennsylvania Tour press coverage:

<http://www.wdtn.com/dpp/news/local/montgomery/know-drones-tour-lands-in-dayton#.UGirMbSBW-I>

<http://daytoninformer.com/?p=220674>

<http://www.daytondailynews.com/news/news/local-govt-politics/anti-war-protesters-military-drones-killing-machin/nSBC3/>

http://www.lehighvalleylive.com/bethlehem/index.ssf/2012/09/lehigh_university_students_hear.html

<http://salisbury.patch.com/articles/know-drones-tour-comes-to-lafayette-22bd4d41>

<http://www.wfmz.com/news/news-regional-lehighvalley/Speaker-wants-to-take-down-drones/-/132502/16698740/-/11hcelaz/-/index.html>

http://www.lehighvalleylive.com/thebrownandwhiteblog/index.ssf/2012/09/nick_mottern_gives_lecture_to.html

<http://www.freepress.org/departments/display/18/2012/4712>

http://www.abc22now.com/shared/news/top-stories/stories/wkef_vid_8818.shtml

<http://www.wcrsfm.org/content/wcrs-community-forum-interview-know-drones-tour>

ATTACHMENT A – TURNER LETTER

September 14, 2012

Congressman Michael Turner
120 West 3rd Street, Ste 305
Dayton, Ohio 45402.

Dear Congressman Turner:

We are writing to ask that you:

1. Call for an end to all U.S. drone attacks and drone surveillance worldwide.

U.S. drone attacks are violating international law, national sovereignty and commonly-held standards of ethical and moral conduct. Thousands of people have been killed by U.S. drones, including at least two members of the U.S. armed forces, and tens of thousands are living in terror of drone attacks.

U.S. drone surveillance is following people in various parts of the world on a 24-7 basis, violating national sovereignty and individual and group rights to privacy and freedom from oppression.

Nations affected include: Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, Iran, Uganda and the Philippines.

(See Attachment A for supporting information.)

2. Send all the campaign contributions that you have received from drone makers and drone-related businesses to agencies providing aid to survivors of U.S. drone attacks. Based on our analysis of data provided by Open Secrets.org, we estimate that you have received at least \$147,525 for your 2012 run for Congress from entities doing drone-related work. We believe that accepting campaign contributions from arms makers, particularly during a time of war when thousands are being killed is a gross conflict of interest, violating basic ethical standards.

(See Attachment B for supporting information.)

3. Resign from the Unmanned Systems Caucus in the U.S. Congress, a caucus that is essentially nothing more than a lobbying arm of the drone industry in the Congress.

4. Introduce legislation that will ban campaign contributions and lobbying by arms makers in the U.S. Congress.

5. Introduce legislation repealing the drone-related sections of the recently-passed FAA Reauthorization and Reform Act and the National Defense Authorization Act because these sections, taken together, expose the U.S. public to: unlimited violations of the right to privacy, intimidation of those exercising their right to peacefully assemble and to extremely serious, and possibly insoluble, safety issues.

Sincerely,

Stephen S. Fryburg, Constituent and member of Veterans for Peace

Phillip Logan, President, Young Democratic Socialists of America – Wright State University

James A. Lucas, Daytonians Against War Now

Nick Mottern, Director, 2012 Know Drones Tour www.knowdrones.com

ATTACHMENT A to Turner letter.

1. Summary execution, which has become easier and therefore routine because of drone technology, denies those targeted the right to a fair trial, imposing the death penalty regardless of the laws of the nation in which the killing is conducted. All this is a violation of international law and national sovereignty.

Further, the United States cannot look to international law for justification for drone killing even in Afghanistan based on the argument that drone attacks are being conducted in a combat zone because the United States invasion and occupation of Afghanistan are themselves violations of international law.⁷

The number of illegal killings is likely to grow dramatically given the US Air Force plan to increase drone sorties from the current average of 15 per day to about 70 a day in 2016, according to an April 5, 2012 report in Salon.com.

2. Drone attacks and the constant aerial presence of attack drones and drone surveillance are creating political and armed resistance to the United States and its allies. A December 2010 report by the Medical Association for the Prevention of War (Australia) notes that there is a concern about “the intense and growing grievance about armed drones among Afghani, Pakistani and other networks.

⁷ Marjorie Cohn, “Obama’s Af-Pak War is Illegal”, MWC News, 21 December 2009.

This includes extremist terrorist networks, and creating a hardening of enmity, coalescing around extremists, and increasing cycles of violence. These concerns have stimulated the view that armed drones pose a unique danger.”⁸

3. Drone surveillance is in itself a weapon of intimidation and terror, particularly since the people being watched fear they may be killed by a drone at any moment.

In Afghanistan and Pakistan, the sound of drone motors terrifies whole populations, some of whom take sleeping medicine and anti-depressants because they fear death from the sky.

The Global Hawk drone now has the capacity to monitor cell phone and texting messaging. Constant visual and electronic monitoring on a global scale violates rights of privacy and respect for national sovereignty.

Drone surveillance aircraft and airships are being developed that will stay aloft for years, according to a recent U.S. Air Force report, which described airships with “football field size radars” that would give “extreme resolution/persistence”. The report discusses plans for three-dimensional urban mapping that would allow “low collateral damage strikes in urban areas.”⁹ One can envision whole sections of the globe being subjected to a drone-o-sphere of surveillance, informing attack drones and ground forces.

US law enforcement agencies have begun to embrace drones, and this trend will accelerate with the recent passage of legislation forcing the Federal Aviation Administration to develop rules that will enable drones to fly throughout U.S. The new law does not prohibit flying weaponized drones in US airspace or drone surveillance. This is of grave concern given the tragic history of police killings and misconduct in America’s low-income communities.

4. Drones have imperfect “vision” resulting in the killing of non-combatants and friendly forces through misidentification. In addition, contrary to official claims, drone weapons are not “precise” because drones use missiles and bombs, creating explosions, unlike a bullet, which inevitably kill untargeted as well as targeted people.
5. Drone warfare, conducted by United States forces far distant from combat zones, offers the temptation of being able to wage war without suffering consequences in terms of loss of life, money and political capital. However, systematic killing whether in conventional war or drone war does have consequences, as is evident

⁸ “Robotic Warfare in Afghanistan and Pakistan” pg. 2, Medical Association for Prevention of War, Australia (MAPW). December 2010.

⁹ “Remotely Piloted Aircraft-Future Air Force Science and Technology”, Dr. Mark T. Maybury, Chief Scientist, United State Airforce, September 27, 2011.

in Pakistan, where a government possessing nuclear weapons is being destabilized, in significant part by drone warfare.

The apparent minimal political cost of using drones has inevitably resulted in a lack of interest in drone warfare in Congress and a further shift of power to conduct war to the Executive Branch and into specialized branches of the military and intelligence agencies that operate drones, such as the Central Intelligence Agency and the Special Operations Command. Drone warfare technology has resulted in removing the conduct of war even further from popular control and giving extraordinary political and military power to a relatively few, unelected, people.

Admiral William McRaven, commander of the Special Operations Command, reports the New York Times, “wants the authority to quickly move his units to potential hot spots without going through the standard Pentagon process governing overseas deployments. Historically, the deployment of American forces overseas began with a request from a global combatant commander that was processed through the military’s Joint Staff and placed before the defense secretary for approval, in a cautious and deliberate process.”¹⁰

But a substantial number of drone operations are outside the military chain of command, being in the hands of the Central Intelligence Agency or private contractors, particularly in areas where there is no military engagement or color of authorization for military action.

The reluctance of Congress to monitor and control drone warfare increases the potential for violation of national sovereignty and the right of due process.

6. Drone warfare makes it easier to enter wars and exit wars not only because of the apparent “low cost” but because the farther distant soldiers and air crews are from actual combat the less chance there is that they will put a brake on war because of their normal human emotions of empathy and war weariness. Drone warfare is entering a new realm of inhumanity with the development now underway of drones that will attack autonomously once targets are programmed into their control computers. The relentlessness of war by machines with minimal human involvement is a terrifying prospect.
7. Drones have been accident-prone. The Congressional Research Service reports that accident rates for drones have been higher than manned aircraft although the rates have declined as individual drones are improved.¹¹ Nevertheless, there is a

¹⁰ “Admiral Seeks Freer Hand in Deployment of Elite Forces” New York Times, February 12, 2012.

¹¹ “U.S. Unmanned Aerial Systems” pg. 17, Congressional Research Service, January 3, 2012.

- high potential of drone accidents as new models are developed. This problem will magnify in the United States as more and more drones enter U.S. airspace.
8. There is the potential also for “enemies” to capture drones electronically. This is particularly frightening given the plans of the United States to develop a drone bomber that can carry nuclear weapons.
 9. Drones are a disproportionate use of force against opponents armed with much less sophisticated and powerful weapons.
 10. Armed drones and surveillance drones are used primarily against people who are struggling for self-determination in low-income countries or regions that have a history of repression and gross exploitation.
 11. Fifty nations now have drone technology, and it is certain that drones will be used against the United States. Given the relative newness of drone technology, now is the time to ban the use of drones for attack and surveillance.
 12. Drones have become the cutting edge of United States foreign policy, a policy that arguably has as its primary goal the maximization of profits for transnational corporations. This condition has existed since the founding of the nation and was powerfully explained by Marine General Smedley Butler in 1935 in his book *War is a Racket*; he described himself in the military as “a high class muscle man for Big Business.”

Martin Luther King Jr. said in his prophetic 1967 speech “Beyond Viet Nam”:

“This need to maintain social stability for our investments accounts for the counterrevolutionary action of American forces in Guatemala. It tells why American helicopters are being used against guerrillas in Cambodia and why American napalm and Green Beret forces have already been active against rebels in Peru...Increasingly, by choice or by accident, this is the role our nation has taken, the role of those who make peaceful revolution impossible by refusing to give up the privileges and pleasures that come from the immense profits of overseas investments.”

Examples of drone use in support of transnational goals include Afghanistan, where secure pipeline and electrical line routes and access to mineral deposits are sought, and Yemen, where the United States is fighting a war to suppress a movement that is seen threatening by those now controlling Saudi Arabian oil.

The drones, engendering a false sense of United States military superiority, not only increase the amount of gross human suffering but postpone the time when transnational corporations must reach equitable agreements for resources. Such agreements have greater stability and economic predictability and may incorporate national wishes to conserve national resources, which have positive

environmental impacts.

Thus drones are the latest military advance to not only increase suffering but to destabilize national and regional economies, and in the case of oil, the global economy and contribute to the gross exploitation of resources.

13. Your constituents in Ohio's 3rd Congressional District have paid about \$2.3 billion in federal taxes to support the Afghanistan and Iraq Wars since 2001, according to the National Priorities Project (NPN)¹².

NPN estimates that \$5.58 billion would provide nearly two years worth of groceries for each of your constituents. Or, it would pay the salaries of 34,666 elementary school teachers for a year.

In FY 2013, the Obama Administration is budgeting \$2.6 billion for drones; this is part of \$26 billion spent on drones since 2001, according to the Congressional Research Service¹³

The Dayton unemployment rate was 7.5 percent in July 2012, less than the national average but still too high. The jobless rate is dramatically higher among people of color. A 2009 report by economists at the University (Amherst) finds that defense spending creates less jobs than spending for such other non-defense work such as health care, education, mass transit and construction for home weatherization and infrastructure. For example, spending on education created over 100 percent more jobs than defense spending and higher wages and benefits.¹⁴

¹² CostofWar.com – National Priorities Project.

¹³ “U.S. Unmanned Aerial System”, Jeremiah Gertler, Specialist in Military Aviation. January 3, 2012

¹⁴ “The U.S. Employment Effects of Military and Domestic Spending Priorities” page 6, by Robert Pollin and Heidi Garrett-Peltier, Department of Economics and Political Economy Research Institute (PERI) University of Massachusetts. October 2007.

In “Wired for War,” a book on robotic warfare, P.W. Singer observes: “...we have to start questioning into what exactly we want to invest our society’s collective intellect, energy, drive and resources.”

ATTACHMENT B

2012 Campaign Contributions to Rep. Michael Turner (R-OH) from Organizations Doing Drone-Related Work - \$147,525.

Radiance Technologies	\$18,250
Deloitte LLP	\$11,000
Greentree Group	\$10,250
Lockheed Martin	\$10,000
Boeing Co	\$10,000
Raytheon Co	\$10,000
North Grumman	\$8,500
Honeywell International	\$8,500
SAIC Inc	\$8,275
Design Knowledge	\$7,500
Projects Unlimited	\$7,500
General Dynamics	\$6,000
Alliant Techsystems	\$5,000
Alion Science & Technology	\$4,500
General Electric	\$4,000
University of Dayton	\$4,000
Computer Sciences Corp	\$3,000
Macaulay Brown Inc	\$2,750
Ball Aerospace	\$2,500
ATIC	\$2,000
BAE Systems	\$2,000
Harris Corp	\$2,000
Total	\$147,525

Total campaign contribution receipts - \$846,518.

Source – The Center for Responsive Politics – OpenSecrets.org

The organizations listed above did not themselves donate, rather the money came from the organizations' political action committees, their individual members or employees or owners, and those individuals' immediate families. The organization totals include subsidiaries and affiliates.

The numbers for the organizations are based on Federal Election Commission data available on August 21, 2012; the overall campaign contributions total is based on information filed September 3, 2012.

ATTACHMENT B – TOUR FLYER

WHERE ARE DRONES TAKING US?

1. Endless Wars for Resources?

The Race for What's Left, by Michael Klare describes intensifying struggles among industrialized nations for access to oil, clearly with the full intention of industrialized nations to burn up as much of it as possible. **Klare calls for a crash plan to develop renewable energy sources and other basic materials.** A dramatically urgent program to cut burning of fossil fuels is needed, not only for peace but to stop global warming.



AMERICAN LEGACY by Steve Fryburg www.missingpeaceart.org

Currently, the US government is bent on using its military (at more than \$1 trillion a year) to gain and hold access to oil and other resources worldwide. The drone has a unique role in this drive for control because, unlike any other weapon, it can monitor the lives of individuals and groups for days on end and kill by remote control at a moment's notice, without any accountability.

US drones are attacking now in Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen, Somalia, Uganda and the Philippines, in absolute disregard for international law and the US Constitution. Thousands of people have been killed by drones and tens of thousands are living drone-terrorized lives.

If we are to begin a serious, effective mobilization to get off fossil fuels, we must first close the door to the use of the military to "capture" oil. Military action for access to oil must no longer be an option.

The removal of the military option for acquiring resources would, of course, be revolutionary in the history of the world.

A ban on drone surveillance and killer drones worldwide can be and must be the first step in that direction, and by describing the ban as such, we may be able to encourage people to think about the existential choices that we are now making on a daily basis. The advent of the drone may help us to understand where we are headed and where we want to go.

2. What Impact Do Drones Have on Democracy?

The United Nations calls on all nations to respect the right of their citizens to peacefully assemble, a right the US violates daily around the world with its drones.

Statement of a survivor of a March 17, 2011 drone attack on the village of Datta Khel in Pakistan:

“Everyone is now afraid to gather together to hold jirgas (assemblies of elders) and solve our problems. Even if we want to come together to protest the illegal drone strikes, we fear that meeting to discuss how to peacefully protest will put us at risk of being killed by drones.”

Mass protests and strikes are essential to protecting human and civil rights and achieving greater economic and social justice around the world. Drones give governments, often working with corporations, new power to suppress not only independence movements but worker movements and wages, maintaining low wage zones that, in turn, suck in jobs and depress global wage rates.

Here in the US, as personal debt increases, unemployment continues at current rates or rises, food and gasoline costs rise, public services are reduced and pensions are lost, we the people must be able to go into the streets. However, we are seeing cities curtailing rights of protest, and there are reports of police wanting to use drones to watch protesters, an outrageous violation of our Constitutional right to peacefully assemble and seek redress for our grievances. (Police forces are now permitted to fly drones in the US weighing up to 25 lbs, and in September, 2015 drones of any size will be permitted to fly in US airspace if the safety issues can be worked out.) Drones are being marketed to police that can carry 12-gauge shotguns, tear gas projectiles and other anti-personnel weapons.

3. Drone Jobs Are Booming, But What Kind of Jobs Do We Want?

The question of jobs in drone-making goes beyond employment into the area of ethics. As with researchers who developed the first atomic bomb, those building drones face deep ethical questions involved in the creation of drone technology, a technology that will revolutionize war-making to become more and more automated, and constant, and a technology that will challenge all concepts of privacy and individuality that are now viewed as personal and societal rights.

The Dayton/Springfield area is dense with drone activity, and there is a drive by local businesses and in academia for more drone work and jobs.

Here is some of what is going on in drones:

1. **Wright – Patterson Air Force Base:**

- Air Force Research Laboratory – “Micro-aviary of small drones; sensors to help drones avoid other aircraft; voice control of drones.
- Air Force Life Cycle Management Center – Oversees the development and improvement of the Predator, Reaper and Global Hawk drones.
- Tests small drones at Wilmington (OH) Air Park.

2. The **Ohio Air National Guard** operates an MQ-1 Predator drone control center at the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport.

3. Ohio announced in August 2012 that it will create the **Ohio Unmanned Aircraft Systems Center and Test Complex** that will “serve as a single-point resource for government, industry, and universities seeking to conduct research, train personnel, and develop the technologies and procedures to safely integrate unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) in the National Airspace.” The state said the UAS center will use airspace test range that will extend from Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport, south to Wilmington Air Park. Ohio taxpayers will put \$1.5 million into the center’s start-up.

3. **Dayton Development Coalition** and some local academia are pushing for the Federal Aviation Administration to establish a drone test zone in either the Springfield or Wilmington area that will be one of six in the U.S. where tests will be conducted intended to lead to the introduction of drones into general airspace in the U.S. in September, 2015. The Buckeye-Brush Creek military operating air zone south of Wilmington is also being considered for the test zone. Ohio has persuaded Indiana to join it in seeking one of the FAA test ranges.

3. **Scientific Applications International Corporation (SAIC)** does drone construction and assembly work in Springfield. SAIC also supplies personnel in the operation of US attack drones, according to the Los Angeles Times (12/29/2011) “who work in the so-called kill chain before Hellfire missiles are launched...” The US has a shortage of military drone personnel and is contracting them out from SAIC and other firms.

SAIC received a \$1.35 million contract from the Dayton Development Coalition “to assist in executing a strategy focusing on attraction of UAV (Unmanned Aerial Vehicle or drone) development and production companies and the establishment of UAV-compatible airspace in Ohio, which requires Federal Aviation Administration approval,” according to the Dayton Business Journal (12/1/11). In November 2011, the Coalition got \$7 million in Ohio taxpayer money to promote aerospace business for the state.

4. **Defense Research Associates in Beaver Creek** has a \$24.1 million contract for drone camera software and collision avoidance technology.

5. There are **50 firms in the Dayton-Springfield area** doing drone-related work, according an article in the Dayton Daily News (3/23/12).

6. **Sinclair Community College** in Dayton has a drone piloting program, and Cooperative Engineering Services Inc. in Dayton makes a “Spear” drone for use in the Sinclair program. Sinclair hosted a drone conference in 2012 and will do so again in 2013.

7. **Wright State (University) Research Institute** has a \$5 million US Air Force contract that is intended to help a single drone operator manage several drones at one time. The Institute announcement of the grant said: “The Air Force envisions turning human operators into supervisors of, or perhaps even teammates of, highly automated UAVs. This project will also be supported by at least \$750,000 from Ohio taxpayers “for capital expenses including facilities and lab equipment.” The Institute got a \$6.4 million grant in 2010 that is partially related to drone research.

The WSU Research Institute has also received an Air Force \$4.9 million contract to work with SAIC Inc on developing ways of handling the large amounts of data that are being gathered by new technology, including drones. A WSU press release says: “...as technology has made it possible to gather more intelligence information than human can handle...analysts struggle with an increasing and complex workload, and the Air Force is looking for ways to boost their training and performance, as well as determine the impact of new technologies on the human.”

8. **The University of Dayton’s Institute for Development and Commercialization of Advanced Sensor Technology (IDCAST)** has developed a drone control system that involves moving a finger across a computer screen rather than using a “joystick.” The Summer 2012 issue of University of Dayton Magazine says: “IDCAST is using the system in conjunction with the Dayton-based Woolpert and Israeli company Titan Engineering on a situational awareness system that will help law enforcement personnel ‘virtually manage protection of its citizens...’”. The system can combine the input from surveillance cameras on the ground as well as on drones.

The Best Alternative to Drone Jobs is Green Jobs

“Channeling funds into clean energy, health care and education in an effective way will ... create significantly greater opportunities for decent employment throughout the U.S. economy than spending the same amount of funds with the military.” - Robert Pollin and Heidi Garrett-Peltier, of the Department of Economics and Political Economy Research Institute at the University of Massachusetts-Amherst in their 2009 report “The U.S. Employment Effects of Military and Domestic Spending Priorities: An Updated Analysis.”

Green Energy Ohio provides basic information about development of green energy business and jobs .
www.greenenergyohio.org.

Learn More About Stopping Drone Killing and Spying

and ORGANIZE.

If you want to stop the advance of drone killing, spying and repression, you will have to organize locally.

In the Dayton area – Be in touch with Steve Fryburg – Email: Steve@missingpeaceart.org

In the Columbus area – Mark Stansbury – Email: walk@igc.org

In the Bethlehem, PA area – Lepoco Peace Center – Email: lepoco@fast.net

These websites will help you learn about drones and no-drone actions.

www.knowdrones.com
<http://nodronesnetwork.blogspot.com>
www.codepink4peace.org
www.vcnv.org
www.worldcantwait.net

And every day you can go to Google News, type in drones and click.

This flyer was produced by The Know Drones Tour, www.knowdrones.com, which is endorsed by:

American Civil Liberties Union (Philadelphia), American Friends Service Committee, Brandywine Peace Committee, Bryn Mawr Peace Coalition, Brooklyn For Peace, Bryn Mawr Peace Coalition, Catholic Peace Fellowship (Philadelphia), Central Ohioans for Peace, Central Ohio Peace Network, Coalition for Peace and Justice (Southern New Jersey), Code Pink, Columbus (Ohio) Campaign for Arms Control, Daytonians Against War Now, Delaware Pacem in Terris, Free Press, Faith Communities United for Peace (Columbus, Ohio), Franklin County (Ohio) Green Party, Interfaith Peace Network of Western New York, Granny Peace Brigade (Philadelphia), Green Party of West Central Ohio, International Action Center, LEPOCO Peace Center (Bethlehem, PA) Missing Peace Art Space – Dayton, Ohio, National Campaign for Nonviolent Resistance, Occupy Fredrick (MD), Occupy Wall Street – Anti-War, Pakistan Solidarity Network, Pax Christi – Greensburg, PA, Peace Action New York, Peace Center of Delaware County (PA), Peace Resource Center (Frederick, MD), Pledge of Resistance-Baltimore, Progressive Peace Coalition, (Columbus, Ohio), Sinclair Peace Club (Dayton, Ohio), Unitarian Fellowship for World Peace – Dayton, Ohio, United National Antiwar Coalition (UNAC), Upstate NY Coalition to Ground the Drones & End the Wars, Veterans for Peace, Chapter #128 (Buffalo, NY), Veterans for Peace – Dayton, Ohio, Veterans for Peace (Philadelphia), Voices for Creative Non-Violence, War Resisters League, WESPAC Foundation, Western New York Peace Center, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (Philadelphia), World Can't Wait, Wright State University (Ohio) Chapter of Young Democratic Socialists of America

ATTACHMENT C – RECRUITMENT CONSIDERATIONS

(1) Effective recruiting

Your key conclusion is: "There is a critical need to create recruitment plans, and our experience suggests that community colleges, then four-year schools, may be the most productive places to recruit. "

Can you provide a more detailed set of conclusions/recommendations? It seems to me that this could be extremely useful to people nationwide as they recruit others to their "no drones" efforts.

One possible approach would be to frame your recruiting encounters on this trip within the "pyramid" or "ladder" of roles you might expect to find in such a series of appearances, e.g.

- 1 - top of the pyramid - one or two new leaders (e.g. someone who might start a campus "No Drones" chapter)
- 2 - prospective activists - a handful (e.g. prospective members/supporters of a campus chapter)
- 3 - engaged people - a dozen or more? (people who will spur the conversation forward)
- 4 - general openness - several dozen? (curious/searcher/conscientious people at an "entry level" of engagement)
- 5 - neutral - hundreds of people who are neutral or even mildly antagonistic

Further comments with respect to each category:

(1) New Leaders

A specific example who comes to mind is Philip Logan at Wright State. What is the follow-up with this category of recruit? What support needs to be provided to this category of recruit?

(2) Prospective Activists

For example, people "who said they might want to join the Sinclair Peace Club". You also mentioned OSU: "About 20 people were attracted by the replicas, and several were very eager to work on ending drone war and surveillance."

Where can they be plugged in? (Can we hope that there is some "no drones" organization that can be relied upon to do the necessary follow-up? and to give the necessary support?)

(3) Engaged People

I imagine there are probably 5-10 categories of people who have specific ideas about drones and could be followed up with a specific recommendation for further study/thought/discussion. For instance, the people who talked about PTSD with you. Could a set of recommendations be assembled for use, depending on the interests of the potential recruit? For instance:

(4) Searchers

What's our single best follow-up approach for the person with an open mind? For instance, can we follow up with some specific article that we can ask them to read that we believe will make them a true convert to our cause? How can we get people "hooked"?

(5) Neutral People

What is the desirable approach with these people? (This bears some real thought.)

(2) Audience members: Attentive vs. overloaded

(a) A key point you make about the best places to do events is your recommendation "to focus on medium-sized cities with community colleges and four-year schools because our message may be heard more in the community, the schools and by the local press that it is in major cities."

You also mention is that in certain situations people often seem distracted and overloaded, and can't be bothered to attend to what the drone tour is saying. (I am thinking, in particular, of the kids in the student center and the plaza at Wright State, and the OSU students who were "oblivious to our presence and to the drones ... and refused the handouts." The reception at Lehigh seemed mixed: "Most students ignored us, as at OSU. But a few did stop and several were opposed to drone warfare, particularly a male student from Turkey.") I sense, then, that the larger point is that we must be very intentional about how to get in front of people who are in the best position to attend to what we're saying. I'm wondering if there is more to this than just size of city or type of school. Are there other factors that determine success or failure? Time of day? Day of week? Physical setting? Hosting arrangement? Target audience demographics? The positive experience at Columbus State CC -- a stop which seemed quite ad hoc -- is intriguing.

(b) Of course, there are times that we all do outreach to audiences who may not be receptive -- they may even be hostile. You did some of that and had some interesting interactions. Are you advocating doing less of this?

(c) What - if anything - is the relevance of the press? You got some good press coverage. How does that interact with points (a) and (b) above? Part

of me thinks that it is far more important to have good interactions with attentive people, as discussed in (a), and the press be damned. Another part of me thinks that some of the payback for getting out in highly public places -- even if the public isn't being receptive -- is that you get press, and that, in turn, influences some readers. Where do you believe the priority should be placed? Why?

Note: I think this section, in combination with your observations about recruitment, may be the most influential part of the report, so it bears careful consideration of all the factors.

(3) American-centrism

(a) A clear theme of the report is the weight of American-centrism, and the importance of transcending this during the public assemblies on the tour: "the majority to people we encountered approve a drone warfare and drone surveillance as long as this happens outside the United States."

(i) What can be put forward about the most effective ways to accomplish this? (I am thinking of the testimony of the woman from Yemen at Lehigh as one example. Was it effective? And, obviously, there is not always such an effective speaker to rely upon. So, can we provide guidance to people doing "no drones" events, in the form of a *range* of tactics?)

(ii) Would you go so far as to say that it is a necessary condition of an effective event that there be some kind of way of "bursting the American-centrism bubble"?

(b) You make a very good point about the need to support "local action to ban weaponized drones and surveillance drones from municipal airspace." However, this *is* more an appeal to the American-centric set of interests, i.e. the hope that if people can see the ways in which drones threaten them here, it will "enable the public to understand what drone warfare is doing overseas."

What did you learn about the best way to balance these two ways of thinking? Are they in contradiction?

(4) Lack of frame

(a) Give me a frame - any frame!

You give one specific example of how the drone problem may be framed:

"Framing drone killing and drone spying within the context of the struggle over non-renewable resources helps people to understand why our wars seem endless and why current wars must be ended and new wars avoided."

The larger issue for me, if I am understanding it correctly, is the urgent need for ANY kind of frame for understanding. I got the distinct impression that people are not coming to these meetings with any kind of frame in which to understand drone attacks (and other current events). I would expect that at least in college/university settings, the young people would be prepared to enter into robust discussions using a range of frames, e.g. history, political science, economics, ethics/philosophy, etc. You did mention that at Sinclair, "the students who were attracted to us by the drone replicas were very open to talking about the history of US military engagement in today's war zones." But I sense -- and I may be getting this wrong -- that much of the audience doesn't know how to get their arms around these problems.

You have already stated that you see the need to put forward the "resource" frame. Is there a larger need to strategically stimulate the discussion within a *range* of frames that the audience is able to relate to? (I am thinking this goes to the ability of audiences to feel "agency" with respect to this problem.)

(b) The people have bought the propaganda

The reverse side of this, of course, is your observation that so many people have bought the propaganda. (Their failure to relate to events through any intentional frame of reference is accompanied by passive acceptance of the frame foisted on them by the government, e.g. at Wright: "The strong belief that the United States can simply kill it way out of 'the war on terrorism'. There was a complete ignorance of why people in other countries may decide to attack US civilians and military, which of course stems from a complete ignorance of how the US has been engaged around the world.")

Must our efforts include some simple, straightforward exercise to shake people out of this passive acceptance of government propaganda? What might we do to accomplish this?

(5) "A Need to Talk"

I thought the section entitled "A Need to Talk" was extremely important: "the profound need that a number of people have for face-to face, personal conversations about their ideas and feelings not only about drones but about politics, the economy and the environment/global warming. These conversations start with drones but often move into what people are pondering about their own futures."

In other words, straight-ahead delivery of the facts is important, but there is a step that people need that involves working through the facts in conversation with others.

Can you prescribe how such opportunities might be effectively written into the plans for events in the future?

+++++ 30 +++++

