The multifarious methods of oppression employed by an oppressor state would fill an encyclopedia. One general method is the control of language, including rhetorical devices. A specific figure is euphemism, one of many effective linguistic devices designed to hide the truth. For example, our government has rebranded US state assassination as “high value targeting.”

If any subject links these drone newsletters with other newsletter subjects, it is violence, particularly US violence, its complexity, and how to reduce it. “Make World Less Violent, New UA Graduates Told.” (ADG 12-16-12). OMNI, you and I, are engaged in basic work of proselytizing, of converting people, especially people with power, from violence to nonviolence.

Write or Call the White House
President Obama has declared his commitment to creating the most open and accessible administration in American history. That begins with taking comments and questions from you, the public, through our website.

Call the President

PHONE NUMBERS
Comments: 202-456-1111
Switchboard: 202-456-1414

TTY/TTD
Comments: 202-456-6213
Write a letter to the President

Here are a few simple things you can do to make sure your message gets to the White House as quickly as possible.

1. If possible, **email us!** This is the fastest way to get your message to President Obama.

2. If you write a letter, please consider typing it on an 8 1/2 by 11 inch sheet of paper. If you hand-write your letter, please consider using pen and writing as neatly as possible.

3. Please include your return address on your letter as well as your envelope. If you have an email address, please consider including that as well.

4. And finally, be sure to include the full address of the White House to make sure your message gets to us as quickly and directly as possible:

   **The White House**
   1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
   Washington, DC 20500

My blog:  War Department/Peace Department  
http://jamesrichardbennett.blogspot.com/

My Newsletters:  
http://www.omnicenter.org/newsletter-archive/

Index:  
http://www.omnicenter.org/omni-newsletter-general-index/

Peace, Justice, Ecology National Days  
Visit OMNI’s Library.

“Act in such a way that the principle according to which the action is performed can be accepted as a universal law.”  Immanuel Kant’s Categorical Imperative.  Ahimsa.  Nonviolence.  Reverence for life.
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1. **Arkansas Delegation Questions Plan For 188th Drones | The Times ... swtimes.com › News**

Feb 29, 2012 - WASHINGTON — U.S. Sen. Mark Pryor, D-Ark., said Wednesday that the Air Force should expand Fort Smith's 188th Fighter Wing mission to ... 

2. **AR Nat'1 Guard to shift to drones - FOX16.com**

Feb 3, 2012 - The Fort Smith-based fighter wing of the Arkansas National Guard will shift from fighter planes to drones next year.

3. **Welsh reassures Womack that 188th Wing will get its drone mission ... arkansasnews.com › News › Arkansas**

May 9, 2013 - “The intent is to have (the drone mission) operational in the first quarter of Fiscal '16, ... 

March in Washington, D.C., demands an end to drone warfare

Demonstration draws participants from across U.S. and around the world

The ANSWER Coalition joined CodePink and other anti-war organizations on Nov. 15 for a march from the White House to General Atomics in protest of the U.S. government’s use of drones. The protest was the kick-off event for a weekend of anti-war activities focusing on drone warfare, including the 2013 Drone Summit.

Speakers at the White House included a delegation from Yemen who spoke about the impact of U.S. drones on their country. The group then marched to the D.C.
office of General Atomics, the company that manufacturers the Reaper and Predator drones flown by the U.S. government. A reading of names of drone victims from Yemen and Pakistan took place at both the White House and General Atomics, and the event was concluded with a symbolic die-in at General Atomics.

Click [here](#) to view a slideshow of photos from the demonstration!

Organized, focused and fighting back

Your contributions are needed to sustain the work of ANSWER

Moyers: "Obama's Cold-Blooded Use Of Drones" Shows ...
www.realclearpolitics.com/.../moyers_obamas_cold--...
Feb 10, 2013
By the standards of slaughter in Vietnam the deaths by drone are hardly a blip on the consciousness of official ...

Robert Greenwald, Brave New Foundation

GREENWALD'S UNMANNED AVAILABLE AT PRESENT FREE STREAMING

1. [Unmanned](#) America's Drone War | Brave New Films
unmanned.warcosts.com/
Stream Unmanned: America's Drone Wars for FREE. Robert Greenwald's newest full-length feature is now available to stream for free. The documentary will ...
2. **Video - "Unmanned: America's Drone Wars"** Robert Greenwald

[www.informationclearinghouse.info/article36704.htm](http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article36704.htm)

5 days ago - "Unmanned: America's Drone Wars" Hidden Truth Behind US Drone Program Video

One of the most anticipated documentaries on drones,

3. **'Unmanned: America's Drone Wars' Documentary Premieres in NYC** ...


5 days ago - A new documentary film, called "Unmanned: America's Drone Wars," ...

4. **News for Greenwald, Unmanned**

---

Thank you for signing up to stream "Unmanned: America's Drone Wars"

War Costs [<info@bravenew01.org>](mailto:info@bravenew01.org)

Dick --

We are glad you have joined us in the fight to expose America's Drone Wars.

[Here is the link for you to stream the film.](http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article36704.htm)

Like all of our previous films, this one is made to help create social change. From Outfoxed to Wal-mart to Rethink: Afghanistan to Koch Brothers Exposed, we have worked together using these films to change hearts, minds and policy.

Thanks to a generous donor, we're able to provide this film for FREE for a limited time! Who else do you think needs to see this film? Can we count on you to send them [this link](http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article36704.htm) and ask them to sign up to watch this important film? Are there friends or family members that can help us spread the word, people in the media, elected officials, people who disagree with us on this issue? With your help we can educate and engage enough people and work to change the U.S. drone policy.

**The documentary is available to stream for FREE for a limited time.** Let's work together to make sure others are receiving this documentary for FREE. Thank you for your support. War Costs
Focus on the first part of the film: Tariq Azez, his cousin killed by CIA drone, then Tariq killed. Neither by judge or jury. Primacy of killing the enemy inevitably results in killing innocent people. Write to Moyers at BillMoyers.com.

"Wounds of Waziristan": Exclusive Broadcast of New Film on Pakistanis Haunted by U.S. Drone War

The Pakistani government is warning of a new rift with the United States after a CIA drone strike that killed the head of the Pakistani Taliban. Hakimullah Mehsud and six other militants died on Friday when U.S. missiles hit their vehicle in North Waziristan. Mehsud had a $5 million bounty on his head and was accused of responsibility for thousands of deaths. The attack came just as the Pakistani government had relaunched peace talks with the Taliban.

In a broadcast exclusive, Democracy Now! airs a documentary that highlights the stories of civilians directly impacted by drone attacks in Pakistan: "Wounds of Waziristan," directed by Madiha Tahir. "Waziristan is only half the size of New Jersey. How would it feel if bombs rained over New Jersey for nine years?" asks Tahir in the film. "Would you be frightened? If they killed your son, your cousin or your husband, and got away with it, would you be angry? You probably couldn’t forget about it if you tried. You’d be haunted."

© 2013 Democracy Now!
But the drone strike that killed Pakistani Taliban leader Hakimullah Mehsud Nov. 1 stopped the peace talks before they could begin.

After a drone strike had reportedly killed Pakistani Taliban leader Hakimullah Mehsud Nov. 1, the spokesperson for the U.S. National Security Council declared that, if true, it would be “a serious loss” for the terrorist organization.

That reaction accurately reflected the Central Intelligence Agency’s argument for the strike. But the back story of the episode is how President Barack Obama supported the parochial interests of the CIA in the drone war over the Pakistani government’s effort to try a new political approach to that country’s terrorism crisis.

The failure of both drone strikes and Pakistani military operations in the FATA tribal areas to stem the tide of terrorism had led to a decision by Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif to try a political dialogue with the Taliban.

But the drone strike that killed Mehsud stopped the peace talks before they could begin.
Pakistani Interior Minister Chaudhry Nisar Ali Khan immediately denounced the drone strike that killed Mehsud as “a conspiracy to sabotage the peace talks.” He charged that the United States had “scuttled” the initiative “on the eve, 18 hours before a formal delegation of respected ulema [Islamic clerics] was to fly to Miranshah and hand over this formal invitation.”

An unidentified State Department official refused to address the Pakistani minister’s criticism, declaring coolly that the issue was “an internal matter for Pakistan”.

Three different Taliban commanders told Reuters Nov. 3 they had been preparing for the talks but after the killing of Mehsud, they now felt betrayed and vowed a wave of revenge attacks.

The strategy of engaging the Taliban in peace talks, which was supported by the unanimous agreement of an “All Parties Conference” on Sept. 9, was not simply an expression of naivete about the Taliban as was suggested by a Nov. 3 New York Times article on the Pakistani reaction to the drone strike.

A major weakness of the Tehreek-e-Taliban Pakistan (TTP) lies in the fact that it is a coalition of as many as 50 groups, some of whose commanders are less committed to the terrorist campaign against the Pakistani government than others. In the aftermath of the Mehsud killing, several Taliban militants told Reuters that some Taliban commanders were still in favour of talks with the government.

Join NationofChange today by making a generous tax-deductible contribution and take a stand against the status quo.

The most important success achieved by Pakistan in countering Taliban violence in the past several years has been to reach accommodations with several militant leaders who had been allied with the Taliban but agreed to oppose Taliban attacks on government officials and security forces.

Sharif and other Pakistani officials were well aware that the United States could unilaterally prevent such talks from taking place by killing Mehsud or other Taliban leaders with a drone strike.

The government lobbied the United States in September and October to end its drone war in Pakistan – or at least to give the government a period of time to try its political strategy.
Obama had already suggested in a May 23 speech at National Defence University that the need for the strikes was fast diminishing and would soon end, because there were very few high value targets left to hit, and because the U.S. would be withdrawing troops from Afghanistan. In August, Secretary of State John Kerry had said the end might come “very, very soon.”

After the meeting with Sharif on Oct. 23, Obama said they had agreed to cooperate in “ways that respect Pakistan’s sovereignty, that respect the concerns of both countries” and referred favourably to Sharif’s efforts to “reduce these incidents of terrorism.”

Shortly after the meeting, Sharif’s adviser on national security and foreign affairs, Sartaj Aziz, said in an interview with Al Jazeera that the Obama administration had promised to “consider” the prime minister’s request to restrain drone attacks while the government carried out a political dialogue.

A “senior Pakistani official” told the Express Tribune that Obama had “assured Premier Nawaz that drone strikes would only be used as a last option” and that he was planning to end the drone war once “a few remaining targets” had been eliminated.

The official said the Pakistani government now believed the unilateral strikes would end in “a matter of months.”

But Obama’s meeting with Sharif evidently occurred before the CIA went to Obama with specific intelligence about Mehsud, and proposed to carry out a strike to kill him.

The CIA had an institutional grudge to settle with Mehsud after he had circulated a video with Humam Khalil Abu-Mulal al-Balawi, the Jordanian suicide bomber who had talked the CIA into inviting him to its compound at Camp Chapman in Khost province, where he killed seven CIA officials and contractors on Dec. 30, 2009.

The CIA had already carried out at least two drone strikes aimed at killing Mehsud in January 2010 and January 2012.

Killing Mehsud would not reduce the larger threat of terrorism and would certainly trigger another round of TTP suicide bombings in Pakistan’s largest cities in retaliation.
Although it would satisfy the CIA’s thirst for revenge and make the CIA and his administration look good on terrorism to the U.S. public, it would also make it impossible for the elected Pakistani government to try a political approach to TTP terrorism.

Obama appears to have been sympathetic to Sharif’s argument on terrorism and had no illusions that one or a few more drone strikes against leading Taliban officials would prevent the organization from continuing to mobilize its followers to carry out terror attacks, including suicide bombers.

But the history of the drone war in Pakistan shows that the CIA has prevailed even when its proposed targets were highly questionable. In March 2011, U.S. Ambassador to Pakistan Cameron Munter had opposed a CIA proposal for a drone strike just as CIA contractor Raymond Davis was about to be released from a jail in Lahore.

Munter had learned that the CIA wanted the strike because it was angry at Pakistan’s ISI, which regarded the Haqqani group as an ally, over Davis’s incarceration, according to an AP story on Aug. 2, 2011. The Haqqani group was heavily involved in fighting U.S. and NATO troops in Afghanistan but was opposed to the TTP’s terror attacks in Pakistan.

CIA Director Leon Panetta rejected Munter’s objection to the strike, however, and Obama had supported Panetta. It was later revealed that the strike had been based on faulty intelligence. It was not a meeting of Haqqani network that was hit but a conference of tribal leaders from all over the province on an economic issue.

But the CIA simply refused to acknowledge its mistake and continued to claim to journalists that only terrorists had attended the meeting.

After the strike, Obama had formalized the ambassador’s authority to oppose a proposed drone strike, giving Munter what he called a “yellow card.” But despite the evidence that the CIA had carried out a drone strike for parochial reasons rather then an objective assessment of evidence, Obama gave the CIA director the power to override an ambassadorial dissent, even if the secretary of state supported the ambassador.

The extraordinary power of the CIA director over the drone strike policy, which was formalized by Obama after that strike, was evident in Obama’s decision to approve the
CIA’s proposal for the Mehsud strike. The director was now John Brennan, who had shaped public opinion in favor of drone strikes through a series of statements, interviews and leaks as Obama’s deputy national security adviser from 2009 to 2013.

Even though Obama was determined to phase out the drone war in Pakistan and apparently sympathized with the need for the Pakistani government to end it within a matter of months, he was unwilling to reject the CIA’s demand for a strike that once again involved the agency’s parochial interests.

A late July 2013 survey had shown that 61 percent of U.S. citizens still supported the use of drones. Having already shaped public perceptions on the issue of terrorism, Obama allowed the interests of the CIA to trump the interests of Pakistan and the United States in trying a different approach to Pakistan’s otherwise intractable terrorism problem.

MEDIA REPORTING DRONES


PHILIP ALSTON, REPORT BY UN SPECIAL RAPPORTEUR FOR EXTRA-JUDICIAL KILLING

State policies permitting the use of targeted killings are often justified as a necessary and legitimate response to "terrorism" and "asymmetric warfare," but have had the very problematic effect of blurring and expanding the boundaries of the applicable legal frameworks. This report describes the new targeted killing policies and addresses the main legal issues that have arisen.

In the legitimate struggle against terrorism, too many criminal acts have been re-characterized so as to justify addressing them within the framework of the law of armed conflict. New technologies, and especially unarmed combat aerial vehicles or "drones", have been added into this mix, by making it easier to kill targets, with fewer risks to the targeting State.

The result of this mix has been a highly problematic blurring and expansion of the boundaries of the applicable legal frameworks – human rights law, the laws of war, and the law applicable to the use of inter-state force. Even where the laws of war are clearly applicable, there has been a tendency to expand who may permissibly be targeted and under what conditions. Moreover, the States concerned have often failed to specify the legal justification for their policies, to disclose the safeguards in place to ensure that targeted killings are in fact legal and accurate, or to provide accountability mechanisms for violations. Most troublingly, they have refused to disclose who has been killed, for what reason, and with what collateral consequences. The result has been the displacement of clear legal standards with a vaguely defined licence to kill, and the creation of a major accountability vacuum.
In terms of the legal framework, many of these practices violate straightforward applicable legal rules. To the extent that customary law is invoked to justify a particular interpretation of an international norm, the starting point must be the policies and practice of the vast majority of States and not those of the handful which have conveniently sought to create their own personalized normative frameworks. It should be added that many of the justifications for targeted killings offered by one or other of the relevant States in particular current contexts would in all likelihood not gain their endorsement if they were to be asserted by other States in the future.

This report describes the publicly available information about new targeted killing policies and addresses the main legal issues that have arisen. It identifies areas in which legal frameworks have been clearly violated or expanded beyond their permissible limits; where legal issues are unclear, it suggests approaches which would enable the international community to return to a normative framework that is consistent with its deep commitment to protection of the right to life, and the minimization of exceptions to that constitutive principle.

**Full Text of Document**

**REPRIEVE**

riˈprēv/

verb.

cancel or postpone the punishment of (someone, esp. someone condemned to death).
"under the new regime, prisoners under sentence of death were reprieved"

_synonyms_ grant a stay of execution to, pardon, spare, grant an amnesty

to, amnesty; More

noun

a cancellation or postponement of a punishment.

_synonyms_ stay of

execution, remission, pardon, amnesty; More

1. **Reprieve**

[www.reprieve.org.uk/](http://www.reprieve.org.uk/)

Reprieve delivers justice and saves lives, from death row to Guantanamo Bay.

Reprieve is a 501(c)(3), non-profit organization established to provide direct services to
people facing the death penalty in United States through a volunteer...

Reprieve
From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Reprieve is any of a number of not-for-profit organisations around the world which work against the death penalty, with a particular focus on legal support for those facing the death penalty or held in secret prisons around the world. The founding Reprieve organisation is in the UK, and there are also organisations in the United States, Australia and the Netherlands, with additional supporters and volunteers worldwide.

- 1 Reprieve UK
- 2 Reprieve US
- 3 Reprieve Australia
- 4 Reprieve Netherlands
- 5 References
- 6 External links

Reprieve UK[edit]

Reprieve aims to use the law to enforce the human rights of prisoners, from death row to Guantánamo Bay.

The first and largest of the Reprieve organisations, Reprieve UK, was founded in 1999, one year after the death penalty was officially abolished in the UK (although having not been exercised since 1964), by human rights lawyer Clive Stafford Smith.[1] Smith has represented over 300 prisoners facing the death penalty in the southern United States and has helped secure the release of 65 Guantánamo Bay prisoners as well as others across the world detained in places such as Bagram Theatre Internment Facility, Afghanistan, who claim to have been tortured[2] by the United States government.

Reprieve currently works to represent 15 prisoners in Guantánamo Bay, as well as an evolving caseload of death row clients around the world. It investigates international complicity in renditions[3] and most recently, has started working with the Foundation for Fundamental Rights[4] in Pakistan, aiming to create conversation around the use of drones there.[5][6]

Reprieve UK has twenty-five staff in London and seven Fellows in the US and Pakistan. Its patrons include Martha Lane Fox, Jon Snow, Alan Bennett, and Julie Christie.

Current cases include Libya’s Sami al-Saadi,[7][8] stateless Palestinian Abu Zubaydah,[9] Linda Carty,[10] Yunus Rahmatullah,[11] and Krishna Maharaj.[12]

Reprieve US[edit]

Reprieve US was founded in 2001 by anti-death penalty lawyers in New Orleans, Louisiana, inspired by the UK organisation.

Reprieve Australia[edit]

Reprieve Australia was founded in 2001 by a group of Melbourne lawyers. It works to support those facing the death penalty around the world, with a particular focus on work in the Southern states of the US.

Reprieve Netherlands[edit]

Reprieve Netherlands is a new organisation, founded in 2006, twenty-four years after the Netherlands abolished the death penalty, by a group of Dutch people who had previously worked in capital defence offices in the United States. It shares the goals of the other Reprieve organisations.

References[edit]

4. Jump up About Foundation for Fundamental Rights
7. Jump up Government pays Libyan dissident's family £2.2m over MI6-aided rendition. Sami al-Saadi, wife and four children were secretly flown from Hong Kong to Tripoli where he was tortured by Gaddafi police. By Richard Norton-Taylor. The Guardian, 13 December 2012
8. Jump up Case Sami al Saadi
Hina Shamsi (@HinaShamsi) is the Director of the ACLU’s National Security Project, which is dedicated to ensuring that U.S. national security policies and practices are consistent with the Constitution, civil liberties, and human rights. She has litigated cases upholding the freedoms of speech and association, and **challenging targeted killing**, torture, unlawful detention, and post-9/11 discrimination against racial and religious minorities.

Her work includes a focus on the intersection of national security and counterterrorism policies with international human rights and humanitarian law. She previously worked as a Staff Attorney in the National Security Project and was the Acting Director of Human Rights First's Law & Security Program. She also served as **Senior Advisor to the U.N. Special Rapporteur on Extrajudicial Executions**.

Hina appears regularly in the media and has been quoted as a national security expert by numerous outlets including The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Associated Press, and Reuters, and has appeared on MSNBC, Fox News, CNN, NPR, ABC News, and the BBC. She is the **author and coauthor of publications on targeted killing**, torture, and extraordinary rendition, and has monitored and reported on the military commissions at Guantánamo Bay. She is also a lecturer-in-law at Columbia Law School, where she teaches a course in international human rights. Hina is a graduate of Mount Holyoke College and Northwestern University School of Law.

**CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS**

**Dear Dick,**

For the past several years, CCR has been working to challenge one of the most extreme claims of executive authority of the past decade: that the government may kill its suspected enemies as it would in wartime, anywhere in the world, based on its own say-so. The exercise of this unprecedented assertion of power has, by conservative estimates, left over 3,000 people dead outside of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq—in Pakistan,
Yemen, Somalia, and perhaps elsewhere. But exactly how many have been killed or harmed, who they were, where they were killed or injured, and why, we do not know, because the government will not say.

A ruling could come any day in *Al-Aulaqi v. Panetta*, the lawsuit we have brought together with the ACLU challenging the legality of U.S. drone strikes in Yemen that killed three U.S. citizens.

If you are in Washington, D.C., join us on November 16 and 17 for *Drones Around the Globe: Proliferation and Resistance*, an international summit where you can learn more about, and organize to end, unlawful killings by the United States. CCR’s lead attorney in the *Al-Aulaqi* case, *Pardiss Kebriaei*, will be one of the speakers at the conference. If you can’t join us in D.C., join us by watching the event through [live video stream](#).

This gathering will also include the stories of people in Pakistan and Yemen who have survived U.S. drone strikes or lost their loved ones to them, and bring together grassroots activists, human rights advocates, lawyers, writers, technology experts, artists, and musicians. Learn more about the conference and register on [CCR’s event calendar page](#).

Unlawful killings aren’t the only “War on Terror” violations that CCR is fighting. For several years, we have worked on behalf of Abu Ghraib torture victims and sued the private military contractors involved in their abuse. On October 29, we appealed a lower court’s dismissal of our lawsuit by four Iraqi former detainees against CACI. Following the Supreme Court decision in *Kiobel v Royal Dutch Petroleum*, limiting the ability of foreign victims of human rights abuses to seek redress in U.S. court, the judge in the CACI case dismissed it largely based on the argument that the torture took place in “Iraq, a foreign sovereign.” Then, shockingly, CACI, a multi-billion dollar corporation, asked that our clients – survivors of severe, sadistic torture living on limited incomes – pay some of their legal costs. Unfortunately, this request was granted.

We appealed because the unlawful actions undertaken by a U.S. corporation, in a U.S.-run detention center, during the U.S. occupation of Iraq in 2003-4, sufficiently “touch and concern” the U.S.—the legal standard set by *Kiobel*. As we [blogged](#), “The U.S. invaded Iraq, overthrew its government and created the Coalition Provisional Authority (CPA) which was answerable to President George W. Bush and directed by U.S. diplomat Paul Bremer. The CPA directed all aspects of the Iraqi government and Iraqi society, including its prisons.” Therefore, U.S. courts must assert jurisdiction over the torture that took place at Abu Ghraib prison. Last week, we were joined in our demand for justice for torture survivors from Abu Ghraib by six groups of experts who filed amicus briefs in support of the appeal.

Whether it’s the U.S. government’s assertion of sweeping lethal executive power or military contractors’ role in torture, CCR is committed to holding
those who abuse power accountable. Please consider donating to CCR to help us in this critical work.

Thank you for your continued support.

Sincerely,

Vincent Warren
Executive Director

About Us

The Center for Constitutional Rights is dedicated to advancing and protecting the rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Universal Declaration of Human Rig
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