

“I Have a Drone”. Obama’s “Military Dream” Is Backfiring

By [Washington's Blog](#)

Global Research, January 09, 2013

[Washington's Blog](#)

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Military and WMD](#), [US NATO](#)

[War Agenda](#)

John Glaser [notes](#):

Michael Boyle, who was on Obama’s counter-terrorism advisory group in the run-up to the 2008 election, [writes](#) in a study for the Chatham House journal International Affairs that Obama abandoned his pledge to restore respect for the rule of law following the Bush administration.

Obama “has been **just as ruthless and indifferent to the rule of law as his predecessor** [\[maybe worse\]](#) ... while President Bush issued a call to arms to defend ‘civilisation’ against the threat of terrorism, President Obama has waged his war on terror in the shadows, using drone strikes, special operations and sophisticated surveillance to fight a brutal covert war against al-Qaida and other Islamist networks,” Boyle writes.

The study concludes that the Obama administration has been “successful in spinning the number of civilian casualties” downward by counting [all military-age males](#) they kill as combatants. Civilian casualties are likely to be far higher than so far acknowledged, Boyle said, and government claims to the contrary are “based on a highly selective and partial reading of the evidence.”

“The result of the ‘**guilt by association**’ approach has been a gradual loosening of the standards by which the US selects targets for drone strikes,” the study says.

“The consequences can be seen in the targeting of mosques or funeral processions that **kill non-combatants and tear at the social fabric of the regions where they occur. No one really knows the number of deaths caused by drones in these distant, sometimes ungoverned, lands.**”

Stanley McChrystal, the former military general that Obama fired after he made disparaging remarks about the President to a reporter, is also [speaking out against the drone war](#) now.

“What scares me about drone strikes is how they are perceived around the world,” McChrystal said in an interview. “**The resentment created by American use of unmanned strikes...is much greater than the average American appreciates. They are hated on a visceral level,** even by people who’ve never seen one or seen the effects of one.”

McChrystal added that drones exacerbate a “perception of American arrogance.”

The retired general has a history of bluntness in this respect. McChrystal has also explained matter-of-factly to the [New York Times](#) how **the US military**

“have shot an amazing number of people [in Afghanistan], but to my knowledge, none has ever proven to be a threat.” He also, rather adroitly, explained the logic of what he called “insurgent math.” That is, **“for every innocent person you kill, you create 10 new enemies.”**

Boyle says there is an urgent need for greater transparency because most Americans remained “unaware of the scale of the drone programme...and the destruction it has caused in their name”.

He added that **drones are having “adverse strategic effects” by causing hatred among the local populations where US bombs fall** and also by “encouraging a new arms race that will empower current and future rivals and lay the foundations for an international system that is increasingly violent.”

A [report](#) by researchers at the Stanford and NYU schools of law [found](#) in September that the drone program is “terrorizing” the people of Pakistan and that it is having **“counterproductive”** effects.

The US drone war in Pakistan not only kills and injures civilians, the report finds, but [it traumatizes the population](#) and has led people to keep their children home from school and to avoid any large grouping of people, however innocent. It also says the drone war has helped recruitment efforts of extremist groups like al-Qaeda.

[Nice job](#) creating [more terrorists](#) ... [you morons](#).

Obama might be our first black president, but - as [William Banzai](#) shows in graphic form - [Obama is no Martin Luther King Jr](#):







The original source of this article is [Washington's Blog](#)
Copyright © [Washington's Blog](#), [Washington's Blog](#), 2013

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Washington's Blog](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca