Help Wanted: American Drone Program Needs Multifaceted Support to be Effective

S. Hall
Bellevue University, hsm8857@gmail.com

Help Wanted: American Drone Program Needs Multifaceted Support to be Effective

Abstract

The U.S. drone program in Pakistan faces strong resistance in Pakistan. Because the program solely seeks to eliminate terrorist groups and leaders through bombing campaigns, with no built in social support, the local population's anti-American sentiment has reached the highest level in history. This angry mood against U.S. drone programs is spreading throughout the Islamic world. To counter this anti-American sentiment, and increase the drone program's effectiveness, the U.S. must invest in multifaceted, socio-economic support efforts to educate the population and rebuild the gratuity, trust, and commitment of Pakistan's people to the "War on Terror."

Introduction

With the current situations in Iraq and Syria, air strikes and bombing campaigns are a popular solution for the U.S. military to hinder terrorist groups such as the Islamic State of Iraq in the Levant (ISIL) that threaten the Middle East. Drone programs are touted by political heavyweights such as President Obama and U.S. Rear Admiral John Kirby (Pentagon Press Secretary) as the best way to monitor terrorist groups, assess their growing threat, and weaken their positions without ever threatening an American life. This is because the drones can be flown from pilots safely ensconced thousands of miles away on their U.S. military base. Unfortunately, we know from a decade of drone campaigns in Pakistan, Yemen, and Afghanistan that the air campaign must be a beginning step in a more extensive nation-building plan supplemented by rebuilding efforts because air-only campaigns cannot address cultural and systemic issues that raise anti-American sentiments and contribute to terrorist cell recruitment.

Drone technology has allowed more accurate targeting of individuals, better reconnaissance collection, and protected troops; Drones have also killed innocent civilians, destroyed villages, raised levels of anti-American sentiment while failing to reduce terrorism in countries such as Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Yemen. Despite a decade of drone campaigns to counter anti-American efforts, the hostility against the United States in these areas has increased and groups such as ISIL have emerged. This has to raise the question, "do air-only campaigns really work to combat terrorism?" The answer is no and it can be demonstrated by analyzing the weaknesses of the U.S. drone program in Pakistan. For the last decade, the United States has engaged in a drone campaign in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) to combat terrorist groups that pepper the region. Despite the deaths of terrorist leaders and years of destruction, terrorism is still a pervasive problem in Pakistan and anti-American sentiment is at an all-time high. This article attempts to highlight the shortcomings of the U.S. policy around the drone program in Pakistan and ways in which drone programs could be strengthened with socio-economic programs to address systemic problems in the country. These supplemental programs should mitigate resentment and hostility against the United States before it is permanently engrained in the population.

Brief History of the Insurgents and United States-Pakistan Relations

The United States has always had a volatile relationship with Pakistan. In the 1950s-1970s, Pakistan was part of the containment effort to stop the spread of the Soviet Union. In the 1970s the United States equipped and supported Pakistani mujahedin fighters along the border who fought against the Soviet Union occupation of Afghanistan. This eventually helped to force Russia's withdrawal

from Afghanistan. No longer useful and radically religious, these former U.S.-sponsored, mujahedin fighters became well-armed guerrilla groups that spawned Islamist jihadists, the Taliban, and al-Qaida in the border area between Afghanistan and Pakistan. This territory is the FATA today.[1]

After Pakistan tested nuclear weapons in 1998, the United States imposed sanctions. Despite this, Pakistan has maintained a working relationship with the United States since the 1950s. The incentive for Pakistan was more than $73 billion in military aid from the United States and their partners (World Bank's International Development Association, Japan, United Kingdom, European Union, Asian Development Bank, International Monetary Fund, and others).[2]

After the September 11th attacks in 2001, Pakistan became an integral partner to the United States in the "War on Terror"; Pakistan was motivated to participate in the "War on Terror" because they experienced a surge in Taliban-led violence in the FATA. A rejuvenated Pashtun Taliban, funded by drug operations and foreign investors, had gained popularity in the FATA by promising the economic recovery, improvement to infrastructure, and social services that the government had failed to provide despite all of the foreign aid money. Then-President Musharraf realized that despite different motives from the United States, something had to be done to combat the Taliban from gaining a foothold in Pakistan. He realized that the Taliban, an Afghan-bred organization, was bleeding over the border and finding support in Pakistan.[3] Musharraf agreed to work with the United States to stop the Taliban's encroachment and began working with tribal leaders to counter Taliban's efforts in the FATA. When the United States asked to base drone and intelligence operations out of Pakistan to hunt down al-Qaida, the Taliban, and Usama bin Ladin using Pakistani runways, his government was willing to work with them.[4]

Pakistan allowed the CIA and the United States military to operate drone programs out of secret airbases, move supplies through North Pakistan to support military efforts in Afghanistan, and use the Pakistani military for combat operations against Taliban and al-Qaida fighters. In exchange, they asked for more aid, military training, and arms as they sought to keep control of the

---

[1] Richard Friedman, Frank Schell and Lauren Bean, "American Foreign Policy Towards Pakistan," *National Strategy Forum Review: Strategic Challenges Near and Far* (Fall 2009), available at: *http://nationalstrategy.com/NSFReview/Fall2009Vol18Issue3USMexico/PakistanSpecialReport.aspx*.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Qasim Ilyas, "President Musharraf Interview with Charlie Rose Part 1," *YouTube.com*, January 24, 2007, available at: *https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t4lQ-_jwt8o*.
[4] Johnston, Patrick, Anoop Sarbahi, Stanford University, and Rand Corporation. *The Impact of US Drone Strkes on Terrorism in Pakistan and Afghanistan* (Stanford: Stanford University, 2014).

58

country and secure their nuclear weapons.[5] Pakistan agreed to work with the United States to target individuals suspected of militant activities and allow the United States government to use surveillance drones to help them target the insurgents in the FATA areas.

As a result of its cooperation, Pakistan has received more than $20 billion in U.S. aid since 2001.[6] The aid is primarily military funding because after the September 11th attacks, the United States needed the support of the government to run its operations, not the hearts of the people. The United States continues to be Pakistan's largest source of military and nonmilitary aid. Unfortunately, much of the aid money was used to line government and military coffers and did not make it to the impoverished village populations.

To try to address issue of misapplied aid money, in 2009, the U.S. Congress passed the Enhanced Partnership for Pakistan Act (commonly known as the Kerry-Lugar-Berman bill, or KBL). KBL was designed to separate the military efforts from the development agenda, thus facilitating longer-term planning and investment for Pakistan's people. KBL authorized an investment of more than $7.5 billion in Pakistan's development for fiscal years 2010 to 2014. The funding was to be distributed by several federal aid agencies. Distribution of the funds ran into trouble as limited capacity of local partners, concerns about corruption and security, lack of systematic reforms, and deferred aid after natural disasters, made getting money to the correct destination difficult.[7] This was in part because the United States had not invested in developing a loyal contingency of local leaders in Pakistan. After years of corruption, misuse of U.S. aid dollars, ejection of the United States military trainers, and the national government's cooperation with insurgent groups, the United States made the decision in 2011 to begin reducing the aid package by freezing nonmilitary aid efforts at the current levels, and cutting Pakistan's military aid by approximately $800 million.[8] Pakistan is still the fourth largest recipient of the United States economic and military aid after Israel, Afghanistan, and Egypt.[9]

Drones on a Global Scale

---

[5] Friedman, Schell, and Bean. "American Foreign Policy Towards Pakistan."
[6] Ibid.
[7] Staff, "Aid to Pakistan by the Numbers," *Center for Global Development*, June 01, 2014, available at: *http://www.cgdev.org/page/aid-pakistan-numbers.*
[8] Colin Cookman, Brian Katulis, Sarah Margon, and Caroline Wadmhams. "The Limits of U.S Assistance to Pakistan," *Center for American Progress* (July 18, 2011), available at: *http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/security/report/2011/07/18/10007/the-limits-of-u-s-assistance-to-pakistan/.*
[9] Staff, "Aid to Pakistan by the Numbers."

Unmanned drones were initially used as a reconnaissance tool to gather data about the terrain, locate hostile combatants, and other geospatial uses. They were first used by the U.S. military in Kosovo and Bosnia but are now widely deployed around the world by at least eighty-seven governments.[10] Saudi Arabia, the U.K., and Israel, all have drone programs of their own.[11] Drones are considered an invaluable resource because they can silently hover and watch individuals, groups, or locations for hours without putting a human pilot at risk. Advancements in technology made it possible to make drones larger to carry and launch Predator and Hellfire missiles at combatants. This makes armed air campaigns possible without risking a pilot's life in the process.

U.S. Drone Programs in Pakistan

Under President George W. Bush, the United States began fighting the "War on Terror" in Pakistan's FATA region using drone surveillance and missile strikes. Through an agreement with Pakistan's government and military, the CIA launched hundreds of attacks in Northwest Pakistan to flush out Taliban and al-Qaida guerilla training camps and forces, which were supported by (and suspected to have been hiding) Usama bin Ladin—the United States' number one target for his role in the September 11th attacks.[12]

The U.S. military and CIA designed their drone programs to target terrorist organizations and insurgent groups in territories that the United States and allies cannot or will not engage in a traditional ground campaign. Pakistan is one of these territories because of mountainous terrain, limited ground intelligence collection programs, and hostile local populations that threaten the U.S. military with a long, convoluted ground campaign. Additionally, Pakistan is generally deemed as a friendly government to the U.S. and therefore we would not invade an ally's sovereign territory without their request for help. The U.S. drone program in Pakistan was built with its government's approval and seeks to deter terrorists and insurgent organizations by killing and creating fear and uncertainty in the insurgent leadership, while minimizing the risk to U.S. military troop. However, drones also cause dread and chaos for civilian populations. After more than a decade of reconnaissance and hellfire missiles rained down from drones, the Pakistani people are pushing back against the American-led programs to clear the Taliban and insurgents out of FATA. In Pakistan, anti-American sentiment is at an all-time high.

---

[10] Guy Taylor, "U.S. Intelligence Warily Watches for Threats to U.S. Now That 87 Nations Possess Drones," *The Washington Times*, November 10, 2013.

[11] Akbar Nasir Khan, "US Policy of Targeted Killing by Drones," *IPRI Journal* 11:1 (Winter 2011): 21-40, available at: *http://www.academia.edu/225132/US_Policy_of_Targeted_Killing_by_Drones_in_Pakistan.*

[12] Ibid.

60

Individuals such as Leah Bolger, the president of Veterans for Peace, have pointed to this wave of anger against America as evidence that drone programs are creating more terrorists than they are terminating. Bolger claims that this is because the drones themselves terrorize a population and build resistance to U.S. policy and programs.[13] Nobel Peace Prize winner, Malala Yousafzai, has also spoken out against U.S. drone strikes in Pakistan, saying to President Obama "Drone attacks are fueling terrorism. Innocent victims are killed in these acts and they lead to resentment among the Pakistani people."[14] Resistance to the United States in Pakistan is not new but blaming terrorism on drones oversimplifies the regional and global conflicts that affect the global Islamic-Arab community and contribute to terrorism. Pakistanis generally relate more closely to Islamic-Arab countries rather than their Hindu and Asian neighbors. Thus, some of the conflict engulfing much of the Islamic-Arab world bleeds into Pakistan. This article will not address these conflicts individually, as they would each be extensive discussions in themselves, but the reader should take into consideration global Islamic-Arab attitudes towards U.S. military campaigns in Iraq, recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iran, U.S. policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and its alliance with Saudi Arabia. The drone program does not operate in a bubble and as such, outside global influences also contribute to Pakistan's anti-American opinion. This article only considers the U.S. drone program in Pakistan's contribution to these opinions and how the program can be supported to improve its success against terrorism.

Growing Anti-American Sentiment

While successful at disrupting the Taliban and al-Qaida activities, cracks began to appear in the partnership with Pakistan as early as 2005. Though drone strikes pose much less risk to civilian casualties and are much more accurate in their targeting abilities than previous bombing campaigns, the drone efforts inadvertently killed many Pakistani civilians, including women and children. The debate remains if this is a failure in intelligence communities to accurately screen and identify actual terrorist activities and members, or if the casualties are simply a wartime result of being in the wrong place at the wrong time, with known terrorists. One of the main weaknesses of air-only campaigns is that it is hard to identify gatherings and individual movements without individuals on the ground gathering information from local leaders and civilians. As retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Ralph Jodice discusses, without on-the-ground forces, it is difficult to tell

---

[13] Staff, "Drone attacks 'create more enemies with every innocent person killed," *Rueters*, November 19, 2013 Retrieved October 10, 2014, available at: *http://rt.com/op-edge/us-drone-attacks-killings-953/*.

[14] CNN Political Unit, "Malala to Obama: Drone strikes 'fueling terrorism'," *CNN.com*, October 12, 2013, available at: *http://www.cnn.com/2013/10/12/politics/obamas-meet-malalas/*.

"friend or foe." This is because non-state actors are widely dispersed and do not use conventional tactics or equipment. They are fighting from trucks with makeshift weaponry and no uniforms. "Its pickup truck versus pickup truck and they're wearing the same clothes. They're not flying flags or wearing insignias."[15] Therefore identifying a caravan of vehicles heading to a wedding versus a caravan of fighters from the air is incredibly difficult without intelligence from the ground. The decimation of families, civilians, and innocent children through drone strikes has led to major pushback by tribes and local villages against the drone efforts. By 2010, Pakistanis were so upset with the United States' policy that bin Laden had higher approval ratings than either President Bush in Pakistan. Many Pakistanis continue to feel their opinion of the United States would improve drastically if the United States ceased their drone programs.[16]

To monitor the public Pakistani sentiment, Pew Research Center conducted several studies since to track the mood of the Pakistani population towards the United States. In 2005, the Pew Research Center conducted a survey that revealed fifty-one percent of Pakistanis supported bin Laden and only twenty-seven percent of Pakistanis supported using their army to fight Taliban and al-Qaida militant groups in the FATA.[17] In 2008, this had shifted so that twenty-four percent of Pakistanis still supported bin Laden and thirty-eight percent of Pakistanis supported their Army confronting the Taliban and guerilla groups. After nearly a decade of drone programs, in 2010, a Pew Research Center survey showed fifty-nine percent of Pakistanis described the United States as an enemy. A mere eleven percent saw the United States as a partner in the battle against terrorism, and just seventeen percent of Pakistanis had a favorable view at all of the United States. Eight percent believed that President Obama would do the right thing in the world. This was lower than bin Laden's approval level ever fell. Sixty-four percent thought that it was important for relations with the United States to improve.[18]

A follow up survey, two years later in 2012, showed that Pakistani discontent with the United States policy had grown. Roughly seventy-four percent of Pakistanis considered the United States an enemy. President Obama's ratings were no better than the 2010 survey suggested. Only forty-five percent still said it was important to improve relations with the United States. A mere seventeen percent backed

---

[15] Kristina Wong, "Syria strikes need on-the-ground intel, say defense experts," *The Hill*, September 10, 2014, available at: *http://thehill.com/policy/defense/217328-syria-strikes-needs-on-the-ground-intel-say-experts.*
[16] Pew Research, "Pakistanis See US as an Enemy," *Pew Research Center*, August 12, 2010, available at: *http://www.pewresearch.org/daily-number/pakistanis-see-u-s-as-an-enemy/.*
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.

American drone strikes against leaders of extremist groups.[19] The 2013 another Pew Research Study, revealed only slightly better opinions of the United States. Approximately sixty-four percent of Pakistanis now see the United States as more of an enemy than a partner. To compound this issue, the percentage of Pakistanis who think having better relationships with the United States is important has also declined in recent years. Extremist groups remain unpopular; the percentage of people who believe the Taliban is a very serious threat is up from thirty-seven percent in 2012 to forty-nine percent in 2013. Albeit this concern, the majority of the population does not think that the U.S. drone program is actually combating terrorism. Roughly sixty-eight percent oppose the drone strikes and only a third of the respondents believe the drone strikes are necessary to defend Pakistan from extremist groups. The majority of respondents, (seventy-four percent), believe that the drones kill too many innocent people. This opposition to the drones has lowered the positive view of the United States by Pakistanis to a level lower than it was throughout much of President George W. Bush's administration.[20] Pakistanis do not like the threat of the Taliban nor al-Qaida stemming from Afghanistan, but they also object to the United States conducting operations in their area, which has impacted their daily lives, destroyed families, and killed innocents for more than a decade. These deaths create grievances against the United States and Pakistan authorities that resonate across the country.

In 2010 *The New America Foundation* and *Terror Free Tomorrow* conducted a survey of face-to-face interviews of FATA residents ages 18 years or older across 120 villages. Nearly nine out of ten people in FATA opposed the U.S. military pursuing al-Qaida and the Taliban in their region. Nearly seventy-percent of FATA residents felt the Pakistani government should tackle the problem without the help of the U.S. government. More than seventy-five percent of FATA residents directly opposed the strikes and only sixteen-percent of respondents think that the strikes accurately target insurgents. Many hold the United States partially responsible for the increase of terrorist activities in their areas. This unfavorable view of the drone program does not mean the population supports al-Qaida nor the Taliban. More than three-quarters of FATA residents oppose the presence of either group in their region and would not support them on political ballots. Like the Pew Research Studies, many respondents claim that their

---

[19] Pew Research, "Pakistani Public Opinion Ever More Critical of US,*" Pew Research Center*, June 27, 2012, available at: *http://www.pewglobal.org/2012/06/27/pakistani-public-opinion-ever-more-critical-of-u-s/.*
[20] Pew Research, "On the Eve of Elections, a Dismal Public Mood in Pakistan," *Pew Research Center*, May 7, 2013, available at: *http://www.pewglobal.org/2013/05/07/on-eve-of-elections-a-dismal-public-mood-in-pakistan/.*

opinion of the United State would improve dramatically if the United States ceased their drone programs in their area.[21]

In 2013 protests of the drone program shut down U.S. and NATO supply routes across Northern Pakistan.[22] These supply routes not only supplied the efforts of the drone program, but it also supplied the U.S. and NATO troops in Afghanistan through passes in the mountains between Afghanistan and Pakistan. When the Pakistanis blocked the roads, it paralyzed drawdown efforts to get equipment and troops out of Afghanistan. The United States and NATO halted the removal of equipment from Afghanistan through Pakistan at the end of 2013. These roadblocks resulted in millions of dollars of American equipment being temporarily stuck in Afghanistan as troops withdrew.[23]

Hostility against the drone program ensued, as the population demanded its government cease the program and change their domestic security policies. In an effort to appease protesters, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif called for a pause in the drone program at the end of 2013 as peace negotiations with the Pakistan Taliban began.[24] These peace talks proved unfruitful and in June 2014 Prime Minister Sharif announced a full-scale operation to flush out Taliban in the FATA. This is the first solo operation Pakistan has initiated in the region and they have requested help from the Afghan National Army to secure border regions. There are mixed views by civilians as to whether or not the Pakistani military can tackle the Taliban and terrorists on their factions of its own civil government is suspected to have given aid to the insurgents in the past.[25] The campaign is also seen as a military effort to drag the civilian government into the fight against the Taliban, which is creating a larger divide between civilian and military efforts. The program will not address plans to rehabilitate any internally displace persons. The civilian government has not made any budget allocations to achieve

---

[21] Peter Bergen, Patrick Doherty, and Ballen Ken, "Public Opinion in Pakistan's Tribal Regions," *New American Foundation* (March 25, 2014).
[22] Zulfiqar Ali, "The United States Halts Truck Shipments through Pakistan Amid Anti-drone Protests," *L.A. Times*, December 04, 2013, available at: *http://articles.latimes.com/2013/dec/04/world/la-fg-wn-pakistan-afghanistan-nato-truck-blockade-20131204.*
[23] Phil Stewart, "US Stops Cargo Shipments on Afghanistan-Pakistan Land Route, Citing Fears about Protests," December 03, 2013, available at: *http://www.nbcnews.com/news/other/us-stops-cargo-shipments-afghanistan-pakistan-land-route-citing-fears-f2D11691906.*
[24] Ayaz Gul, "Pakistani PM Urges Stop to US Drone Strikes," *Voice of America*, October 22, 2013, available at: *http://www.voanews.com/content/us-accused-of-unlawful-killings-pakistan-drone-strikes/1774276.html.*
[25] Kamal Siddiqi, "Our own enemies," *Tribune.com*, December 2, 2012, available at: *http://tribune.com.pk/story/474166/our-own-enemies/.*

64

goals laid out in national security policy that makes efforts to stop the Taliban unlikely to be successful.[26]

Weaknesses of the U.S. Drone Program in Pakistan

Terrorism and insurgents arise through complex situations that can involve socio-economics, religion, politics, failed states, fear, and other hybrids of issues. The drone program only seeks to disrupt insurgents' organization and communication by destroying insurgent forces, logistical facilities, transport assets, leadership targets, communication systems, and key chokepoints (such as bridges and overpasses). The program feeds civilian anxiety with no social support to mitigate emotional outrage. Their populations only see the destruction of their homes and deaths of their family members that the drones bring, which according to analysts such as Bolger, this causes them to fight harder against the attackers and join forces such as the Taliban. However, research shows that drones cannot be proven to directly increase nor decrease terror organizations' recruitment levels.

The United States continues to use drones because according to intelligence, statistically collected data, and the policy makers, the drones are effective at disrupting militant and terror groups' organizations, making it harder for them to implement large acts of violence. Then-Senator John Kerry claimed in 2009 that it had eliminated fourteen of the top twenty terrorists through this program. The Obama Administration claims the drones have eliminated twenty of al-Qaida's top thirty leaders from 2009 to 2012. *The New America Foundation* claims that the strikes have killed twenty-eight senior al-Qaida leaders, and more than fifty-one militants from 2004 to 2013.[27]

In a recent address to the 2014 graduating class of West Point, President Obama outlined the framework for foreign policy. Regarding the drones, he said "the United States will continue to take direct action using drone strikes when necessary to protect ourselves but that a drone strike should only occur when there is "a near certainty" that no civilians will be harmed."[28] The United States has not conducted a drone strike in Pakistan since December 2013.[29] This is the

---

[26] Mateen Haider, "NW Operation to continue until terrorism is eliminated," *Dawn.com*, June 17, 2014, available at: *http://www.dawn.com/news/1113129.*
[27] Bergen, Doherty and Ken, "Public Opinion in Pakistan's Tribal Regions."
[28] " Remarks by the President at the United States Military Academy Commencement Ceremony," *Office of the Press Secretary*, *the White House* May 28, 2014, available at: *http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/05/28/remarks-president-united-states-military-academy-commencement-ceremony*
[29] It is suspected, but not proven, that the U.S. drone strikes have been reactivated in Pakistan as of October 2014; Zahir Shah Sherazi and Jason Hanna, "Drone strikes kill 8 in Afghanistan, Pakistan, sources Say," *CNN.com*, October 11, 2014, available at:

65

longest pause in the program. President Obama also restated in the speech, his desire to move the drone program from the CIA to the military to improve transparency. The U.S. Congress opposes this move.[30]

The United States defends its drone campaigns by reminding international audiences that it is at war with these terror organizations and, under international war standards, it is able to target individuals plotting to do harm against the United States or its citizens. Arguments can be made for and against the success of the United States drone programs. According to a 2013 report for the Strategic Studies Institute (SSI) and Army War College by James Walsh, three conflicting academic reports have surfaced regarding the drone's effectiveness in Pakistan. One study claims that the drones reduce the number and severity of terrorist attacks in the FATA territories. Another finds that drone strikes are associated with more, not less, acts of terrorism as retaliation for the drone strikes. Finally, the third finds that civilian deaths have no consistent relationships with terrorism in Pakistan.[31]

Because of these conflicting academic reports, Patrick Johnston and Rand Corporation released study called *The Impact of the U.S. Drone Strikes on Terrorism in Pakistan and Afghanistan* in 2014. This study looked at direct correlations between the drone strikes and terrorist activities using empirical research methods. The results support the theory that the U.S. programs have succeeded in curbing deadly attacks within the targeted territory in Pakistan. The study shows that drone strikes are generally associated with a reduced rate of terrorist attacks, reduction of number of people killed as a result of terrorist attacks, and decreases in lethal or intimidating attacks (such as IEDs or suicide attacks). However, it also states that this does not suggest that groups are dispersing or leaving the territories being hit by drones.[32] The empirical evidence also cannot collaborate the claims that the drone programs have increased terror organizations' recruitment numbers, as there is no concrete way to measure the changes of levels in terrorist enlistment.

While directly linking drone strikes to terrorist recruitment is difficult, arguing that anti-American sentiment by civilians in Pakistan has increased because of the drone program is not hard. More than a decade of Pew Research studies and

---

http://www.cnn.com/2014/10/11/world/asia/pakistan-afghanistan-drone-strikes/index.html.

[30] "Obama: US Will Still Use Drone Strikes."

[31] James Igoe Walsh, "The Effectiveness of Drone Strikes in Counterinsurgency and Counterterrorism Campaigns," *Strategic Studies Institute* and *Army War College Press*, September 2013, available at:
http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pdffiles/PUB1167.pdf.

[32] Johnston, Sarbahi, Stanford University, and Rand Corporation. *The Impact of US Drone Strkes on Terrorism in Pakistan and Afghanistan.*

the *New American Foundation* surveys, prove that the general opinion of Pakistan's population is directly related to the drone program. Respondents also claimed that limiting or ceasing the drone programs could easily reverse the negative opinion. However, ceasing the programs entirely could lead to increased terrorist activity, as groups will be able to reorganize and launch retaliatory attacks. Ending the programs would not address the full problem. The anti-American sentiment could be mitigated by giving the civilian population alternative ways to be prosperous, productive, and safe, while continuing President Obama's 2013 initiative to ensure that the individuals targeted by the drones are truly connected to insurgent or terrorist groups.

One big flaw in the U.S. drone program in Pakistan is that it fails to negate terrorist abilities and recruitment because is not a well-rounded plan. Bombing campaigns and air assaults should be one part of a synergistic nation-building effort because they can disrupt insurgent operations by taking out the key facilities mentioned above. Air campaigns alone do not address systemic culture or economic issues that cause local populations to side with terrorist organizations. Drones should be part of a long-term commitment to rehabilitate a country, monitor progress, and disrupt insurgent activities but on its own will never be effective in ending terrorism. Even President Obama observed in an interview that military intervention not backed by a major effort to build a functional state afterwards would simply lead to chaos and a new set of threats to American interests.[33] Unfortunately, he has not applied systems to address his own observation in countries with drone programs such as Pakistan.

Reaction to U.S. Drone Programs in Yemen and Elsewhere

The Pakistanis people's cries of outrage are echoed in Yemen, where a similar drone campaign has been ongoing since 2002. Beginning shortly after the September 11th attacks, President George W. Bush worked with the Yemeni government to fight insurgents in Yemen using drones. Initially the Yemeni government took credit for the drones. However, evidence of U.S. missiles was discovered in the wreckage of drone strikes. An outcry emanated from the public and the Yemeni government admitted that the CIA backed their efforts. In Yemen, it is estimated that there have been more than 108 drone strikes, with the vast majority of those happening since 2010. As in Pakistan, the strikes in Yemen have been a collaborated effort between the CIA and the U.S. military, and the Yemeni military and government. Estimates put the death toll at more than 900 people. Approximately one-third of those were civilian casualties. The United

---

[33] K.M. Pollack, "Assessing the Obama Administration's Iraq-Syria Strategy," *Brookings Institute*, September 26, 2014, available at: *http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/iran-at-saban/posts/2014/09/26-pollack-assessing-obama-administration-iraq-syria-strategy*.

States claims to have killed at least thirty-five key al-Qaida leaders including Anwar al-Awlaki, a Yemeni born Imam who moved to the United States and became a naturalized citizen. Awlaki later radicalized against the United States in events after September 11th bombings. He is believed to have aided al-Qaida. He and his son were two of the few U.S. citizens targeted by the drone programs. The drones are also believed to have eliminated Fahd al-Quso, who was suspected of involvement in the 2000 bombing of the U.S.S. Cole.[34]

On December 12th, 2013, a drone strike hit a large wedding party's caravan. Between eleven to fifteen individuals were killed. It was later revealed that the U.S. and Yemeni governments thought they were targeting an insurgent's convoy but had killed innocent civilians instead.[35] Anger against the drone program hit an all-time high. Yemeni officials begin to voice apprehension and doubt of the joint program. Cries that the strikes violate Yemeni's sovereignty were loud but hard to prove since the Yemeni government and military actively involved in the planning and targeting of the strikes, and condoned the programs since inception. Nabeel Khoury, the deputy chief of mission in Yemen from 2004 to 2007, stated,

> "Drone strikes take out a few bad guys to be sure, but they also kill a large number of innocent civilians. Given Yemen's tribal structure, the United States generates roughly forty to sixty new enemies for every AQAP [al-Qaida in the Arabian Peninsula] operative killed by drones."[36]

Despite increased numbers of drone strikes, and rising civilian casualties, al-Qaida's activities in Yemen steadily increased. This led to concerns of the program's effectiveness. Local political analysts and tribal leaders claim that, in the provinces where the drone strikes occur most often, many civilians radicalize against the United States and this has spawned an increase in terrorist activity and recruitment into al-Qaida. Yemen officials have called for more limited, and specific targeting.[37] The program was paused from December 2013 through March of 2014. Strikes have since resumed at a slower pace.

---

[34] "Drone Wars Yemen: Analysis," *New America Foundation*, April 2014, available at: *http://natsec.newamerica.net/drones/yemen/analysis.*
[35] Ibid.
[36] Matt Sledge, "Every Yemen Drone Strike Creates 40-60 New Enemies, Former US Official Says," *The Huffington Post*, October 23, 2013.
[37] Adam Baron, "U.S. Drone Strikes Came Despite Yemen's Hopes to Limit Them," *McClatchy DC*, April 21, 2014, available at: *http://www.mcclatchydc.com/2014/04/21/225094/us-drone-strikes-came-despite.html.*

Many of the issues in Pakistan are problems in Yemen as well. Yemen also has a high unemployment rate for their young men and large diasporas communities with tribal loyalties. Free education is often only provided through madrasas in many areas of the country. Many madrasas indoctrinate students with anti-American messages, and radical Islam teachings. Villages lack basic amenities such as clean water and electricity, and most do not have trades to sustain an economy. The villages operate under local village leaders and the central government does not hold much power in tribal areas. In both countries, programs that give people the opportunities to be self-sustaining and avoid turning to resources provided by insurgent groups should supplement the drone program. By helping the locals build schools, infrastructure, social services, and economies, the U.S., Pakistani, and Yemeni governments can win gratitude and provide alternatives. The education institutions should be available for any boy or girl, and promote critical thinking, pro-democratic, and well-rounded curriculums including trade skills to build local economic sustainability and employment.

While the drone programs in Libya and Somalia are younger than the programs in Yemen and Pakistan, they are built on the same eliminate-but-not-support policy as their predecessors. Because Somalia and Libya share many of the same general population and social struggles of Pakistan and Yemen, they will eventually run into the same resistance and issues that are now being seen in Yemen and Pakistan. This negative sentiment can be stopped before it starts in Somalia and Libya, if the United States works with governments to invest in nation-building activities to support drone campaigns.

The Drones Can Work with Multifaceted Support

The drone program in Pakistan (and others in Yemen, Somalia, and Libya) can be effective in eliminating terrorism if it is one tactic in a larger strategic plan. In order to balance destruction, death, and radical teachings against the United States, there has to be investment in education, rebuilding, and powerful counter-narratives from moderate or public sources. As the Blitzkrieg proved in London, resistant movements and civilian populations are resilient under repeated bombings and destruction, so missiles alone will not stop terrorist organizations. However, the United States has the tools, expertise, and resources, to ensure that drones are supported by other nation-building operations that will build goodwill towards America and take steps to eliminate terrorism. A multifaceted campaign using all of the components discussed here should succeed in rebuilding the American image in Pakistan by providing people options for employment, economic sustainability, and a better life other than joining insurgent organizations. The key supplements to enhance the

effectiveness of drone programs and create a successful campaign to rebuild American support are:

- Ensuring foreign aid money is distributed to the villages by local or state officials by working with the Pakistani government
- Working within the tribal system's leaderships to build support of U.S. initiatives
- Distributing verbal and printed materials explaining and supporting U.S. programs
- Leveraging social media and Internet to counter anti-American rhetoric and repackaging the war propaganda as a secular war instead of a war on Islam by the United States.
- Educating local populations on alternatives and options available to them that do not include the Taliban, al-Qaida or insurgent paths
- Free and public education options for boys and girls to negate radical teachings in madrasas
- Building infrastructure such as water systems, power grids, medical facilities, roads, energy facilities, etc.

The United States can provide resources to the local and state officials to create a secure, educated, and economically sustainable programs in Pakistan. The drone programs should reinforce anti-terrorism efforts by destroying any reorganizing attempts the insurgent groups make. The insurgents will no longer be able to provide more attractive alternatives to the population for recruitment purposes. American sentiment should improve as civilians see the United States and their government investing in their villages and socio-economic well-being.

Working with Locals and the Pakistani Government

The United States needs to partner with Pakistan's government and local tribal governments to ensure aid is used to build education programs, economic opportunity, and infrastructure that provide alternatives to the Taliban and al-Qaida's provisions. The current drone program simply seeks to kill terrorists in the hopes that the program will eliminate them faster than organizations can recruit, train, and reorganize individuals in terror plots against the West. It depends on the Pakistani government's honesty to independently distribute aid and initiate nation-building programs to help its own people. Unfortunately, because there has been no investment by the Pakistani government in the local population's education, trade, skills, jobs, economy, or infrastructure, civilians are forced to turn to the groups who promise it these opportunities. As Robert Rotberg states, citizens naturally turn towards sectional and community loyalties in times of insecurity and state weakness because they are their main default source of economic opportunity and security. They transfer allegiances to clan

70

and group leaders, even warlords, when their government fails to produce the resources they need feel safe and to create economic sustainability.[38] In Pakistan, the Taliban and al-Qaida, which are well-funded by radical oil barons, adversarial nations, and drug trades, offer payment for martyrs, family welfare plans, schools (madrasas), employment, a purpose in life, and "security" in an area with no alternatives.

Until the Pakistani government steps up to build these institutions, or can agree on a plan to work with the United States to do so, local villagers will continue to seek refuge and help from the sources they feel empathize with their pain and burdens. The plans to negate terrorist organizations solely through drone programs and airstrikes will continue to fail because they do not address the systemic social problems. The Pakistani government will continue to feel backlash and pressure from its citizens to cease the programs. Resentment towards the United States will grow until it is an engrained psychosomatic symptom that is not easily erased from the minds and hearts of the Pakistani people.

The drone program can help Pakistan's government to secure border areas and territories in conflict to provide civilians with a sense of security needed to begin rebuilding. The Pakistani government must be pushed to provide the necessary resources to foster a peaceful environment such as medical facilities, schools and educational instruction, infrastructure, and fair judicial system to mediate disputes.[39] The United States can hasten this effort by providing expertise to the Pakistani government, and incentivizing them to appropriately distribute economic aid in order to receive their coveted military aid. The current system of freezing economic aid while decreasing military aid does not promote Pakistani cooperation because it does not give them any additional reason to distribute economic aid. The U.S. government must develop relationships on the local levels to ensure money can be properly distributed to civilians.

How Covert Operations with Local Leaders and Propaganda are Effective

Through covert operations, the United States has a long history of using multifaceted propaganda and social campaigns in combination with military efforts to combat its enemies. In 1948, following World War II, the United States used a significant covert political operation to ensure that the rising communist party in Italy did not gain the government through elections. The United States funneled millions of dollars to the Italian Christian Democratic Party and right-

---

[38] Rotberg, Robert, *When States Fail* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2004).
[39] Ibid.

wing Socialist parties. They created pro-democratic propaganda to drum up support and created a massive media campaign to mobilize Italian voters against Communist-Socialist coalitions. It kept communism out of Europe, ensured relations between Italy with Presidents Truman and Taft, and opened the door to stop communist movements in Greece and Turkey. As part two of the plan, economic aid was given to those countries that resisted communist leanings and allowed them to participate in American reconstruction efforts. This campaign shaped Italian, Greek, and to some extent Turkish, views of America.[40]

In Afghanistan in 2001, the first CIA team (supported by the U.S. military) into Afghanistan after the September 11th bombings, worked with cultural and language experts while coordinating military air and fire support. The team worked with local tribal leaders to instill good will for the Americans, paid for supplies through the mountains, encouraged education for men and women, explained the United States' reasons for being in the country including the benefits to security and stability to the individual tribal leaders, and negotiated with the government to create a U.S. support system. They went to remote areas where traditional boots-on-the-ground military campaigns were not an option, spoke with people in the villages, and determined the best course of actions while gathering intelligence and distributing verbal propaganda and monetary aid to build support. The U.S. men on the ground helped village leaders determine who the "bad guys" were (al-Qaida and Taliban) and who the "good guys" were (the United States, United Kingdom, NATO troops, certain Afghanistan tribal leaders). The U.S. operatives helped villagers identify leaders in their communities and created tribal round tables that centralized power in the region. They also monitored the progress of social programs and ensured funds were spent on approved items. This campaign worked effectively for the first eighteen months that the United States was in Afghanistan.[41] These are just two examples of how the United States has successfully run covert campaigns that could be used as complementary programs to strengthen the success of the drone programs. The United States has the resources to implement a strategy combining propaganda campaigns to educate Pakistanis about the drone campaign targeting with a cohesive plan to build relationships with local leaders while helping the Pakistani government centralize power in diaspora communities and implementing socio-economic development.

Although it must be careful that it does not appear to manipulate the government processes or circumvent the Pakistani government, the United States should use a covert propaganda campaigns to explain specifically whom they are targeting

---

[40] Miller, James E., *Taking Off the Gloves: The and the Italian Elections of 1948* (San Diego: University of California San Diego, 2007), 35-56.
[41] Schroen, Gary, *First In: An Insider's Account of How the CIA Spearheaded the War on Terror In Afghanistan* (New York, NY: Ballantine, 2005).

72

and build relationships with local populations to gain their trust. As Brookings Institute analyst, Madiha Afzal states, "Militancy in Pakistan is essentially a war of ideas and narratives and it's completely naïve to think you can 'buy' your way out of it through economic growth. What needs tackling is the radical narrative."[42]

The United States does not need to share individual names, nor give away specific operational plans but it should explain to local communities who the groups are, why they are a threat to the local and world populations, and why the drone programs are the best options to stop them through common propaganda mediums (such as fliers, matchbooks, internet, newspapers etc.). By explaining whom these groups are, the United States provides a sense of security to the general population because the people understand they will not be targeted if they do not commit certain actions and therefore should be safe. Currently, the local populations fear the drones, in part, because the targets do not make sense and they ban together to protect themselves, create mini-militias, or work with the groups that the drones are targeting. This unintentionally makes them targets.

The United States has to work with the local and state governments to help promote the drone operations. This is in part because the United States needs a supply of information and materials to conduct their missions accurately. The local tribesmen and leaders hold control on the territories, access roads, and infrastructure, and influence on their populations. They also generally know the families in their areas and can spot growing unrest or threats much faster than the United States can from the air. The United States also needs their support to reduce fear, resentment, and aggression towards the drone program as leaders of their communities. The United States will have to risk the lives of a few plain-clothed men on the ground in order to build effective relationships with these leaders but do not have to commit large military ground-troops to accomplish this goal. Without local tribal leaders, no drone program will never be a success because the local leaders will work against the program.

In countries like Afghanistan, the United States gave the money directly to individual tribal leaders to use it in their areas as they saw fit.[43] Sometimes this led to corruption or embezzlement but much of the time these leaders would help their communities with it. The United States can tackle nation development

---

[42] Madiha Afzal, "Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif: Six Month On, No Vision," *Brookings Institute*, December 11, 2013, available at: *http://www.brookings.edu/research/opinions/2013/12/11-nawaz-sharif-pakistan-afzal.*
[43] Schroen, Gary, *First In: An Insider's Account of How the CIA Spearheaded the War on Terror In Afghanistan* (New York, NY: Ballantine, 2005).

73

projects by combining both strategies. They can work from the top Pakistani authorities down but they can also build relationships on local levels and work from the bottom up. A large strategic plan must be created to unify both efforts and the United States will have to balance covert operations to influence local level efforts with national policy endeavors. If the Pakistani government will commit to improving living conditions through socio-economic development, the relationships the United States builds through the programs could help the Pakistani government regain control of the conflict territories and build diverse coalitions that will work with the government to tackle security concerns and development strategies in their regions.

Changing the Dialogue-Media and Messaging

An additional challenge for the drone program is the speed at which information travels in the digital age of flash media, instantaneous news, and easily accessible Internet. Anti-American sentiment will only continue to spread to all corners of the globe because negative sentiments spread more rapidly[44]. American foreign policy or military actions towards Islamic-Arab states continues to fuel anti-American sentiment throughout much of the Islamic world. Examples of these actions are the full support for the State of Israel, Operation Dessert Storm, Operation Iraqi Freedom, invasion of Afghanistan, and the treatment of the Koran in military detention facilities. Muslim leaders have claimed the drone campaigns are another example of Christian expansion and anti-Islamic policies. Many Muslims, such as Anwar al-Awlaki, feel their land, resources, culture, and religion are under attack by Christian-Western nation states. American policy provides radical Islamic organizations the material to persuade local, uneducated, populations of this attack against them. With few or no alternative narratives to counter it, this perception becomes the reality. To this unsupported population, drones are just another step to by America to eradicate Islam, Arab culture, and their families. The individuals who are targeted by the U.S. drones are not terrorist to Pakistan's populations; rather they are beloved relatives fighting to defend their cultural or religious beliefs that they feel are under attack. To the Pakistani civilians, their loved ones who fight against the U.S. drones and attacks are no different than the U.S. soldier who signs up to serve to defend the United States.

To counter the common belief that the drone program is a war on religious culture, practices, and ethnic beliefs, the United States needs a counter message of war for domestic security—not as a policy against radical Islam—but as a policy against any attacks on their citizens by any country or individual, foreign or domestic regardless of religion. This message has been grossly marginalized as

---

[44] "Twitter Program 'Maps Nation's Mood," *BBC*, September 7, 2013, available at: *http://www.bbc.com/news/technology-24001692.*

74

sensational reporting and more radical politicians voice their strategies for a Judeo-Christian war on Islam. The South Asian Americans Leading Together released a report claiming from 2011 to 2014, there were 160 reports of xenophobic political rhetoric directed against Muslim, Sikh, Hindu, Middle Eastern, Arab, and South Asian communities by U.S. political leaders. Ninety percent were motivated by anti-Muslim sentiment.[45] When the U.S. representatives use terms such as "fight with jihadists" as used by *The Wall Street Journal* or Michelle Bachmann's "War on Islam" describing Islamic fundamentalists as barbaric, and calling this a "spiritual warfare," they pigeon hole the United States into the religious war messaging that the terrorists are using to recruit members of the Islamic community.[46] To rebrand this message the United States has to implement a solid propaganda and media campaign that is consistently secular in language to change the messaging one delivery channel at a time. Any Administration official must uphold American values of fairness and equality, and strongly condemn hateful rhetoric by other political figures. Whether its through the education system, social media, television, radio, political propaganda, or print, official representatives of the United States must adjust their language to a security position and not a war on religion to diminish the recruitment messaging of the Muslim insurgents.

The Pakistani Muslim population already believes that they are under attack for their religion because of this common messaging. Throughout history, aggression toward cultural identity and religion has always caused populations to grow defensive and fearful for their way of life. In response, many cultures arm themselves, which causes their neighbors to increase their arms in defense and each country continues to heighten their defenses in response to the other until logical defense becomes completely illogical and causes conflict.[47] In a sense, the message of war on Islam has caused Pakistanis to go on the defense; the U.S. drone program only heightens this sense of impending attack because civilians see the United States monitoring their views and killing their loved ones in strikes; drones cause them to further seek defenses by aiding insurgent groups such as al-Qaida and the Taliban who say they will take on the United States and

---

[45] Sameera Hafiz, Suman Raghunathan, Deepa Iyer, and Victoria Meaney, "Under Suspicion, Under Attack: Xenophobic Political Rhetoric and Hate Violence against South Asian, Muslim, Sikh, Hindu, Middle Eastern and Arab Communities in the United States," *South Asian Americans Leading Together (SAALT)* (2014).

[46] Jeffrey Sparshott, "In Shift, U.S. Calls Fight With Jihadists 'War'," *Wall Street Journal*, September 12, 2014, available at: *http://online.wsj.com/articles/kerry-urges-turkey-to-join-fight-against-jihadists-1410543450*;
Lauretta Brown, "Bachmann: 'We Need to Declare War on Islamic Jihad'," *CNS News*, September 26, 2014, available at: *http://www.cnsnews.com/news/article/lauretta-brown/bachmann-we-need-declare-war-islamic-jihad*.

[47] Nelson Kasfir, "Domestic Anarchy, Security Dilemas, and Violent Predation: Causes of Failure," in Robert Rotberg, *When States Fail* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2010), 53-64.

stop the drones in defense of their religion. If the United States can change its messaging to deescalate the message of war on cultural and religious identity, it should lessen some, but not all, of the tension as Pakistanis realize the drones are a fight against those individuals who (plan to) attack the United States and not against Islam.

The United States should deliberately leverage the propaganda machine created by the Internet to spread its mission as well. In order to spread a pro-American message and overtake the negative messages, the United States must use it even more effectively and intentionally than others who take it to express their dissatisfaction. It has been proven that angry sentiment spreads faster than other emotion on the Internet and it can be used to reach and motivate thousands of people in the shortest amount of time in history.[48] Even in the remotest villages of Pakistan, people rely on the Internet to speak with loved ones, follow the news, and organize their daily lives. America must look at the Internet as investment opportunity, and leverage it to counteract the negative sentiment posted every day. It can respond to posts of outrage, exploit positive statistics, discredit the organizations using it, explain benefits of programs, and promote open dialogue with productive counter-terrorism messaging through social and print media. If done in a timely fashion, the Internet also allows the United States to post its version of events for the public to weigh in their consideration. Too often, individuals on the ground or the terrorist themselves post pictures of drone destruction with their version of the situation and the United States is slow to respond with a defense—if they do at all.[49] If the United States posted its story before the insurgents portray it as an attack on Islam or civilians than it may reduce some fear and chaos against which the general population is rebelling.

Education

Education is an incredibly important way to spread positive messaging and rebuild countries. The United States needs to encourage free-schools for boys and girls in Pakistan. Pakistan's Constitution entrusts the Federal Government with the responsibility for policy planning, and promotion of educational facilities in the federated territories. It also recognizes that education is a basic right of every citizen and crucial for economic development and poverty alleviation. The Federal Ministry of Education administers the public education system but divisions of district responsibilities decentralized the power of the programs. Reforms to abolish the British education system to educate only the elite have failed because of the weak management and supervision structure, shortage of

---

[48] "Twitter Program 'Maps Nation's Mood."
[49] Sherazi, Shah, and Hanna, Drone strikes kill 8 in Afghanistan, Pakistan, sources Say."

educators and physical facilities, and extremely low funding.[50] Generally, Pakistan's expenditure on education is less than two percent of the gross domestic product—about $2 million.[51] This is insignificant money for a country of over 180 million people.[52] The literacy rate in Pakistan is estimated to be around fifty percent for men, and thirty-eight percent for females; the gender-based discrepancy in education levels has contributed to the persistence of illiteracy and underdevelopment of Pakistan because women in the communities would generally lead education for young children in these communities; but they cannot pass on the knowledge they do not possess. Impoverished families taking young children out of school to work to provide household income also compounds the literacy population. Approximately half of the student population drops out before completing primary education and it is estimated more than four million children from ages five to nine years old never attend school. Rural communities have seen a huge decline in public school enrollment in rural communities since 1998. This is largely because public education systems have not been established or sustained in rural communities and even urban areas have seen huge privatization efforts in education systems. This privatization eliminates the impoverished populations' access to education.[53]

The Taliban and al-Qaida have quickly capitalized on this need for education and vacuum created by privatization and disorganization by creating madrasas. Madrasas are schools that teach reading and religious history based on the Koran. They are almost-always for boys only, and nearly-always radical in their fundamental religious teaching. They are a pervasive influence on the anti-American sentiment in rural Pakistani communities. Their curriculum is generally rote memorization and does not include skills to pursue trade or business. The madrasas have proved to be fertile recruitment grounds for terrorist organizations. In 2009, ninety-percent of suicide bombers in Pakistan were between the ages of sixteen to eighteen years old. Taliban commander Qari Hussein, boasts about recruiting children as young as five or six years old

---

[50] Umbreen Sabir, "Pakistan and Its Education System," *Technische Universitat Munchen*, 2008, available at: *http://www-db.in.tum.de/teaching/ws1112/hsufg/Taxila/Site/education.html.*

[51] Comparatively, Pakistan's government announced $6.8 million budget for military spending in 2014; Ismail Sheikh, and Kamran Yousaf, "Budget 2014: Govt announces 700bn defence budget," *International New York Times Tribune*, June 03, 2014, available at: *http://tribune.com.pk/story/716913/budget-2014-defence-budget-increasing-at-diminishing-rate/.*

[52] This is despite repeated commitments by governments to reach the UNESCO target of 4 percent of GDP. Regional neighbor China invests more than $117 billion in education, and India more than $44 billion;
Kate Pennington, "Republicans Debate How Much to Cut Education while China and India Invest More," *Think Progress*, August 29, 2012, available at: *http://thinkprogress.org/education/2012/08/29/757661/republican-education-china-india/.*

[53] Sabir, Pakistan and Its Education System 2008

through the madrasas to become suicide bombers and help the jihad. Many of these schools promote anti-American sentiment and that Islam is under attack by the United States. They claim the only way to stop the U.S. drone program is through guerilla tactics, violent resistance, and jihad.[54]

Providing alternatives to the madrasas, and education for women, are critical issues in most developing Arab countries. Educating women and girls, has proven to build sustainable economies in Africa, India, Lebanon, and Afghanistan, where women are traditionally excluded from education because of religious or cultural beliefs. Including them in education is a huge component to a successful, secure state because women can contribute to household incomes and economic sustainability.[55] Providing free-schooling in rural communities for boys and girls, and working with community leaders to encourage education for their children are two huge components to minimize terrorist influence on areas. Through schools and education the United States has the ability to teach information that will promote democracy, equal rights, tolerance, and critical-thinking by providing students with global perspectives, secular history, and alternative resources for information. In free, secular schools, critical-thinking can be taught through science, math, and reading courses that encourage more than rote memorization. Education is the best way to shape the youth of an area, reshape engrained beliefs by promoting positive dialogue and discussion about different governmental and cultural systems, and discourage youth from joining extremist groups. It provides students with training and skills necessary to build trade and manage businesses in their village and allows them to consider work beyond that provided by militias and radical extremist groups.

The United States has the experience to help Pakistan educate teachers and build facilities in these underserved communities. More importantly, the United States can make its military aid to Pakistan contingent upon implementing measures to strengthen its public education system and distributing U.S. economic and development aid for these programs. Development aid must extend to build basic amenities such as electric power and fresh water systems. Energy shortages are common to Pakistan and create political unrest that in turns reduces the government's ability to provide security and stability to the country; this sense of security is crucial to persuade the establishment of permanent communities as an alternative to organization of insurgent communities.

---

[54] Kalsoom Lakhani, "Indoctrinating Children; The Making of Pakistan's Suicide Bombers," *Counter Terrorism Center*, June 03, 2010, available at: *https://www.ctc.usma.edu/posts/indoctrinating-children-the-making-of-pakistan%E2%80%99s-suicide-bombers*.
[55] Kathy Matsui, "The Economic Benefits of Educating Women," *Bloomberg Media*, March 07, 2013, available at: *http://www.businessweek.com/articles/2013-03-07/the-economic-benefits-of-educating-women*.

The United States proved in Italy and Afghanistan (albeit only the initial surge), that it can effectively leverage media and propaganda, create education and social programs, and work with local leaders to stop anti-American groups (such as communists and insurgents) in their tracks. To be successful again, the U.S. government has to think offensively, constructively, and creatively to build a long-term, multifaceted policy that ensures America does not have to fight a cyclical cycle of unrest because it did not make proper investments in the first place.

Conclusion

The current U.S. drone program in Pakistan addresses a very singular goal: kill terrorists before they can recruit, regenerate, and harm the United States. This program stands alone without nation-building efforts, strategies to build local support, education programs, or even support by Pakistan to distribute nonmilitary U.S. aid. These additional support efforts are necessary to create a multifaceted strategic plan that comprehensively attacks terrorists' ability to organize and function.

The United States should be prepared for the reality that unless the Pakistani government will do its part to create this infrastructure, its aid programs at the local level will be weakened in their ability to curb terrorism. Unfortunately, the United States cannot simply walk away from the entire situation because Pakistan provides access to supply U.S. efforts in Afghanistan and has provided safe harbor for terrorists in the past. Without the cooperation of Pakistan's government to take actions aimed at preventing safe harbor for terrorists and maintaining control of their territories, it is likely terrorists will be able to reorganize in the FATA territories and in urban areas. Therefore, the United States needs to begin investing in these programs with or without full support of Pakistan's government. Without these systems, Pakistanis will continue to turn towards organizations willing to help them establish security, basic amenities, and sustainable economies in which to live. Pakistan must deliver basic services to promote security, education, and economic prosperity to strengthen their state and reduce the number of civilians turning to insurgent groups for protection, income, and services. The United States must be ready for the opportunity to help Pakistan's government deliver this as soon as it is able.

The United States has a long history of being effective in combat zones because it is able to gain the hearts and minds of the locals, while fighting the enemy. The drone program brings the fight, but building socio-economic structures through education, propaganda, aid, and local relationships builds the trust of the communities and wins them to the United States' cause. The drone programs do deter individuals to work with insurgents and terrorists because it creates fear

79

and a consequence to actions. However, the problem is that fear alone will not stop terrorist actions without a substantial balance of positive investment. Socio-economic investment creates alternatives to Taliban and al-Qaida programs that currently fill these voids. While building support campaigns around the drone program to help the Pakistani government address systemic issues, the United States should continue leveraging the drone campaign to disrupt terrorist groups' organization and communication. This provides a balance of soft power to support communities with the hard power of the drone attacks. The investment by the United States to rebuild and revitalize the Pakistani state should eventually reduce anti-American hostility and reduce the appeal of terrorist organizations to the Pakistanis. The drone program is not completely hopeless; it just needs a support by a multifaceted, long-term strategy to be truly effective at stopping terrorism and reducing hostility towards the United States.