

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4
Bundesministerium für Landesverteidigung
z. Hd. General Mag. Robert Brieger

Roßbauer Lände 1
1090 Wien

Innsbruck, 02.08.21

Sehr geehrter Herr General Mag. Robert Brieger,

ich möchte Ihnen zu meiner Eingabe vom 23.07.21 noch Folgendes anmerken:

Wie die CIA bzw. das Pentagon wissentlich **den Terror enorm steigerte und immer weiter steigert**. Textausschnitt aus dem Buch: Bush und Cheney wie sie Amerika und die Welt ins Verderben stürzten, vom Autor Prof. Dr. David Ray Griffin.

*„Laut einem weiteren Artikel von 2015 heißt es: „Der Drohnenkrieg in weiten Teilen des Großraumes Naher Osten und Teilen Afrikas steckt in einer Krise: Drohnenpiloten kündigen in Rekordzahlen“, wobei **in einem Jahr 240** von ihnen wegen **Posttraumatischer Belastungsstörungen** kündigten.“*

„Neben dem Töten und Terrorisieren von Menschen hat das Drohnenprogramm Haß gegen Amerika erzeugt, der den Wunsch nach Rache weckt. Als Antwort auf die Tatsache, dass ein US-Drohnenangriff seinen Freund und die Geschwister und den Vater seines Freundes getötet hatte, sagte ein junger Mann namens Abdullah:

Sie haben sie ins Visier genommen, einfach, weil sie Muslime töten. Ich hasse Amerika einfach. ... Es ist, als ob sie ihre Macht zeigen und wir hilflos sind. Aber eines Tages werden wir Macht haben und es ihnen zeigen.

Dieser Haß wird sicherlich dadurch verstärkt, wenn man erfährt, dass die Vereinigten Staaten sich bei Familien von Zivilisten einem Amerikaner, einen Italiener – die durch einen Drohnenangriff getötet wurden entschuldigt und diese finanziell entschädigt haben. Die American Civil Liberties Union sagte: „Keine andere Opferfamilie erhielt eine offizielle Anerkennung und Entschuldigung, geschweige denn, dass ihnen eine Unterstützung oder Entschädigung zugesagt wurde. Das ist grundsätzlich unfair und erhöht die Feindseligkeit gegenüber den Vereinigten Staaten.“

*Es scheint daher, dass der Versuch, den Terrorismus mit Terrorismus zu bekämpfen – der von der Bush-Cheney-Regierung begonnen und von Obama intensiviert wurde – völlig kontraproduktiv (und auch völlig unmoralisch) ist. Während eines Zeitraums, in dem Drohnenangriffe etwa **15 Terroristenführer** in Pakistan töteten, töteten sie **mehrere hundert Zivilisten**, sagte David Kilcullen, ehemaliger Berater von General David Petraeus. Auch Andrew McDonald Exum, ein ehemaliger Armeeeoffizier, schrieb, dass „jeder dieser toten Nicht-Kombattanten eine entfremdete Familie, eine **neue Rache-Fehde** und mehr Rekruten für eine militante Bewegung darstellt.“ Diese Beobachtung wird durch die Titel zahlreicher Artikel bestätigt. Beispielsweise:*

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4

„*Wie Drohnen mehr Terroristen hervorbringen*“ (The Atlantic)

„*Obamas Drohnenkrieg, ein „Rekrutierungswerkzeug“ für ISIS, sagen Whistleblower bei der US-Luftwaffe*“ (Guardian)

„*Wie Drohnen al-Qaida helfen*“ (New York Times)

„*General im Ruhestand: Drohnen bringen mehr Terroristen hervor, als sie töten*“ (The Intercept)

„*Geheimer CIA-Bericht: Drohnenangriffe und gezielte Tötungen fördern die Unterstützung von Terrorgruppen*“ (International Business Times)

Wie Tom Egelhardt beobachtete, „hat die Drohne keinen wirksamen Krieg gegen den Terror hervorgebracht, sondern **einen Krieg, der Terror zu fördern** scheint.“ Wenn also die US-Regierung wirklich den Terrorismus reduzieren will, sollte sie das Drohnen-Attentatsprogramm abschaffen. Natürlich können wir nur hoffen, dass die Regierung wirklich den Terrorismus aus der Welt schaffen will, anstatt, wie einige Kritiker behaupten, das Budget des Pentagons und die Gewinne der Kriegsindustrie zu schützen.“

„Im Jahre 2008 begann die Regierung, Oari Hussain, einen Offizier der pakistanischen Taliban, ins Visier zu nehmen. Nach mehreren Versuchen, bei denen 128 Nicht-Zielpersonen (darunter 13 Kinder) getötet wurden, wurde er 2010 schließlich eliminiert.“ Aus dem Buch Bush und Cheney wie sie Amerika und die Welt ins Verderben stürzten, vom Autor Prof. Dr. David Ray Griffin.

Das bedeutet einen **KOLLATERALSCHADEN von 99,22%!**

„Etwa 24 in Pakistan anvisierte Männer führten zum Tod von 874 Menschen, darunter 142 Kinder“ aus dem Buch Bush und Cheney wie sie Amerika und die Welt ins Verderben stürzten.

Das bedeutet **97,25 % waren KOLLATERALSCHADEN!**

„Im Jahre 2006 begann die Regierung, Drohnen in Pakistan einzusetzen, um den al-Quaida-Führer Ayman Zawahiri zu töten, doch während 105 Menschen, die nicht ins Visier genommen wurden – 29 Erwachsene, **76 Kinder** – getötet wurden, ist er noch am Leben.“

Das bedeutet **100,00 % waren KOLLATERALSCHADEN!**

Im Jahre 2016 verurteilten die Vereinten Nationen einen Angriff in Afghanistan auf etwa 15 schlafende Männer, die sich „in einem Dorf versammelt hatten, um die Rückkehr eines Stammesältesten von der Hadsch-Pilgerfahrt nach Mekka zu feiern.“ Dieses Abschlagen geschah „fast ein Jahr nach dem Tag“, berichtet der Guardian, „als ein anderer US-

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4
Luftangriff ein Krankenhaus der „Ärzte ohne Grenzen“ in Kunduz zerstört und 42 Menschen getötet hatte.“ (Ende Buchausschnitte)

Und nachdem ich annehmen, dass Sie Englisch können hier noch ein paar diesbezügliche, oben erwähnte Artikel, zu Ihrer Information.

<https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2013/08/how-drones-create-more-terrorists/278743/>

How Drones Create More Terrorists

Militants take advantage of fearful communities to draw new recruits.

By Hassan Abbas



Drone strikes may create more jihadi militants. (Ibraheem Abu Mustafa / Reuters)

AUGUST 23, 2013

Recently, strong evidence has begun to suggest that terrorists use drone strikes as a recruitment tool. Of course, the value of drones in the arena of intelligence-gathering and secret surveillance of foes (and even friends) is unmistakable. In warzones too, it can support ground operations in significant and even decisive ways. None of this is controversial, though the ones on the receiving end will certainly not like it. What is debatable is its use as a counter-terrorism instrument in theaters that are not declared war zones, or in cases where a sovereign state is not fully and publicly on board with this policy. Lack of transparency in regulations that govern this new type of warfare, the unverifiable nature of targets, and questions over the credibility of intelligence only complicates the matter.

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4

Mark Bowden's important contribution to the drone debate raises critical questions that policy makers will be wise to consider for the future use of this new tool of war. One of the important arguments mentioned in the piece revolves around the notion that drone strikes might be less provocative than ground assaults for terrorists, meaning that standard warfare might create more terrorists than drones do. Lets first accept what is obvious: more civilians are killed in standard warfare, and the history of warfare in the 20th century sufficiently proves the point. When it comes to drones strikes, the ratio of civilian deaths is certainly lower, but the issue is not about the number of civilian casualties alone. The inherently secret nature of the weapon creates a persistent feeling of fear in the areas where drones hover in the sky, and the hopelessness of communities that are on the receiving end of strikes causes severe backlash -- both in terms of anti-U.S. opinion and violence.

Response to drone strikes comes in many varieties. First, revenge is targeted at those within the easy range of the insurgents and militants. The victims of those revenge terrorist attacks also consider the drone strikes responsible for all the mayhem. Consequently, terrorists and ordinary people are drawn closer to each other out of sympathy, whereas a critical function of any successful counter-terrorism policy is to win over public confidence so that they join in the campaign against the perpetrators of terror. Poor public awareness -- which is often a function of inadequate education -- about terrorist organizations indeed plays a role in building this perspective. Public outrage against drone strikes circuitously empowers terrorists. It allows them space to survive, move around, and maneuver. Pakistan is a perfect example of this phenomenon.

Many in Pakistan now believe that drone strikes tend to motivate Al Qaeda and the Pakistani Taliban to conduct terrorist attacks that target Pakistan's security forces as well as civilians. The duplicity of Pakistan's political and military elite in giving a green light to the U.S. drone policy proved to be counterproductive. The sponsors and supporters of drone strikes in U.S. policy circles apparently ignored the wider socio-political impact and indirect costs when evaluating its efficacy.

Supporters of drone strikes are only grudgingly acknowledging now that affiliates of Al-Qaeda are alive and kicking in various parts of the world, even though its founder is dead and its top layer of leadership is disabled and dysfunctional. Drone strikes that specifically target hardcore terrorists can work effectively provided they are supported by a parallel public relations endeavor that challenges the ideas projected by those terrorists.



A special report

Terrorists and their misguided sympathizers often expose and market civilian casualties -- particularly women and children -- quite effectively. Meanwhile, those who direct and authorize these strikes rarely provide any justification and rationale for it. This is simply seen as arrogance by those whom the U.S. expects to be on their side in this battle.

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4

The crux of my viewpoint is that drone attacks cannot be compared to "boots on ground" operations. They are two different methods of battling enemies. Wars are mainly about national interests -- resources, territory, the balance of power, and religion. Drone strikes directed at terrorists perform a comparable but different role. In battling terrorism, physical elimination of the enemy matters but is not decisive. Hitting at the mindset of the terrorist and discrediting the ideas that generate terrorism is the big prize. A law enforcement action that flows out of a "rule of law" paradigm, involving meticulous investigations and prosecution in courts, is likely to be far more damaging for the ideas that terrorists stand for. Limited and internationally regulated use of drones targeting the most wanted terrorists can be a part of this comprehensive approach -- it may take longer to deliver, but it will be more sustainable and the results will be more durable.

[Hassan Abbas](#) is a senior advisor at Asia Society and the author of the forthcoming book *The Taliban Revival*.

<https://www.nytimes.com/2012/06/14/opinion/how-drones-help-al-qaeda.html>

OP-ED CONTRIBUTOR

How Drones Help Al Qaeda

By Ibrahim Mothana

- June 13, 2012

Sana, Yemen

"DEAR OBAMA, when a U.S. drone missile kills a child in Yemen, the father will go to war with you, guaranteed. Nothing to do with Al Qaeda," a Yemeni lawyer [warned on Twitter](#) last month. President Obama should keep this message in mind before ordering more drone strikes like Wednesday's, which local officials say [killed 27 people](#), or the May 15 strike that [killed at least eight](#) Yemeni civilians.

Drone strikes are causing more and more Yemenis to hate America and join radical militants; they are not driven by ideology but rather by a sense of revenge and despair. Robert Grenier, the former head of the C.I.A.'s counterterrorism center, [has warned](#) that the American drone program in Yemen risks turning the country into a safe haven for Al Qaeda like the tribal areas of Pakistan — "the Arabian equivalent of Waziristan."

Anti-Americanism is far less prevalent in Yemen than in Pakistan. But rather than winning the hearts and minds of Yemeni civilians, America is alienating them by killing their relatives and friends. Indeed, the drone program is leading to the Talibanization of vast tribal areas and the radicalization of people who could otherwise be America's allies in the fight against terrorism in Yemen.

The first known drone strike in Yemen to be authorized by Mr. Obama, in late 2009, [left 14 women and 21 children dead](#) in the southern town of al-Majala, according to a parliamentary report. [Only one](#) of the dozens killed was identified as having strong Qaeda connections.

[Misleading intelligence](#) has also led to disastrous strikes with major political and economic consequences. An American drone strike in May 2010 [killed Jabir al-Shabwani](#), a prominent

sheik and the deputy governor of Marib Province. The strike had dire repercussions for Yemen's economy. The slain sheik's tribe attacked the country's main pipeline in revenge. With [70 percent](#) of the country's budget dependent on oil exports, Yemen lost [over \\$1 billion](#). This strike also erased years of progress and trust-building with tribes who considered it a betrayal given their role in fighting Al Qaeda in their areas.

Yemeni tribes are generally quite pragmatic and are by no means a default option for radical religious groups seeking a safe haven. However, the increasing civilian toll of drone strikes is turning the apathy of tribal factions into anger.

The strikes have created an opportunity for terrorist groups like Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula and Ansar al-Sharia to recruit fighters from tribes who have suffered casualties, especially in Yemen's south, where mounting grievances since the 1994 civil war have driven a strong secessionist movement.

Unlike Al Qaeda in Iraq, A.Q.A.P. has worked on gaining the support of local communities by compromising on some of their strict religious laws and offering basic services, electricity and gas to villagers in the areas they control. Furthermore, Iran has seized this chance to gain more influence among the disgruntled population in Yemen's south.

And the situation is quite likely to get worse now that Washington has broadened its rules of engagement to allow so-called [signature strikes](#), when surveillance data suggest a terrorist leader may be nearby but the identities of all others targeted is not known. Such loose rules risk redefining "militants" as any military-age males seen in a strike zone.

Editors' Picks

Certainly, there may be short-term military gains from killing militant leaders in these strikes, but they are minuscule compared with the long-term damage the drone program is causing. A new generation of leaders is spontaneously emerging in furious retaliation to attacks on their territories and tribes.

This is why A.Q.A.P. is much stronger in Yemen today than it was a few years ago. In 2009, A.Q.A.P. had only a few hundred members and controlled no territory; today it has, along with Ansar al-Sharia, at least 1,000 members and controls substantial amounts of territory.

Yemenis are the ones who suffer the most from the presence of Al Qaeda, and getting rid of this plague is a priority for the majority of Yemen's population. But there is no shortcut in dealing with it. Overlooking the real drivers of extremism and focusing solely on tackling their security symptoms with brutal force will make the situation worse.

Only a long-term approach based on building relations with local communities, dealing with the economic and social drivers of extremism, and cooperating with tribes and Yemen's army will eradicate the threat of Islamic radicalism.

Unfortunately, liberal voices in the United States are largely ignoring, if not condoning, civilian deaths and extrajudicial killings in Yemen — including the assassination of three American citizens in September 2011, [including a 16-year-old](#). During George W. Bush's

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4

presidency, the rage would have been tremendous. But today there is little outcry, even though what is happening is in many ways an escalation of Mr. Bush's policies.

Defenders of human rights must speak out. America's counterterrorism policy here is not only making Yemen less safe by strengthening support for A.Q.A.P., but it could also ultimately endanger the United States and the entire world.

<https://theintercept.com/2015/07/16/retired-general-drones-create-terrorists-kill-iraq-war-helped-create-isis/>

RETIRED GENERAL: DRONES CREATE MORE TERRORISTS THAN THEY KILL, IRAQ WAR HELPED CREATE ISIS

Retired Army Gen. Mike Flynn, a top intelligence official in the post-9/11 wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, says in a forthcoming interview on Al Jazeera English that drones do more harm than good.



[Murtaza Hussain](#)

July 16 2015, 7:09 p.m.

Retired Army Gen. Mike Flynn, a top intelligence official in the post-9/11 wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, says in a [forthcoming interview](#) on Al Jazeera English that the drone war is creating more terrorists than it is killing. He also asserts that the U.S. invasion of Iraq helped create the Islamic State and that U.S. soldiers involved in torturing detainees need to be held legally accountable for their actions.

Flynn, who in 2014 was [forced out](#) as head of the Defense Intelligence Agency, has in recent months become an outspoken critic of the Obama administration's Middle East strategy, calling for a more hawkish approach to the [Islamic State](#) and [Iran](#).

But his enthusiasm for the application of force doesn't extend to the use of drones. In the interview with Al Jazeera presenter Mehdi Hasan, set to air July 31, the former three star general says: "When you drop a bomb from a drone ... you are going to cause more damage than you are going to cause good." Pressed by Hasan as to whether drone strikes are creating more terrorists than they kill, Flynn says, "I don't disagree with that." He describes the present approach of drone warfare as "a failed strategy."

"What we have is this continued investment in conflict," the retired general says. "The more weapons we give, the more bombs we drop, that just ... fuels the conflict."

Prior to serving as director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Flynn was director of Intelligence for the Joint Special Operations Command (JSOC) during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. During his time in Iraq, Flynn is credited with helping to transform JSOC into an intelligence-driven special forces operation, tailored to fight the insurgency in that country. Flynn was in Iraq during the peak of the conflict there, as intelligence chief to Stanley McChrystal, former general and head of JSOC. When questioned about how many

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4

Iraqis JSOC operatives had killed inside the country during his tenure, Flynn would later [say](#), “Thousands, I don’t even know how many.”

In the upcoming interview, Flynn says that the invasion of Iraq was a strategic mistake that directly contributed to the rise of the extremist group the Islamic State. “We definitely put fuel on a fire,” he told Hasan. “Absolutely ... there’s no doubt, I mean ... history will not be kind to the decisions that were made certainly in 2003.”

Over his 33 years in the Army, Flynn developed a reputation as an iconoclast. In 2010, he published a controversial [report](#) on intelligence operations in Afghanistan, stating in part that the military could not answer “fundamental questions” about the country and its people despite nearly a decade of engagement there. Earlier this year, Flynn [commended](#) the Senate Intelligence Committee report on CIA torture, saying that torture had eroded American values and that in time, the U.S. “will look back on it, and it won’t be a pretty picture.”

He echoed these statements in his Al Jazeera appearance. Before his tenure at JSOC, operatives of the force had already become notorious for operating secretive prison facilities in Iraq where the torture of detainees had become routine. In his interview, Flynn denied any personal role in these abuses, while calling for accountability for U.S. soldiers who had been responsible. “You know I hope that as more and more information comes out that people are held accountable,” Flynn says. “History is not going to look kind on those actions ... and we will be held, we should be held accountable for many, many years to come.”

<https://www.ibtimes.co.uk/secret-cia-report-drone-strikes-targeted-killings-boost-support-terror-groups-1480149>

Secret CIA report: Drone strikes and targeted killings 'boost support for terror groups'



By [Jack Moore](#)

December 18, 2014 15:53 GMT

-

Drone strikes and "targeted killings" of terror targets by the United States can be counterproductive and bolster the support of extremist groups, the CIA has admitted in a secret report released by WikiLeaks.

The document, by the intelligence agency's Directorate of Intelligence, said that despite the effectiveness of "high value targeting" (HVT), air strikes and special forces operations had a negative impact by boosting the popular support of terror organisations.

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4

The CIA report is dated 2009 and talks of operations conducted in countries such as Iraq, Pakistan, Somalia, Afghanistan and Yemen.

Operations against terror targets "may increase support for the insurgents, particularly if these strikes enhance insurgent leaders' lore, if non-combatants are killed in the attacks, if legitimate or semi-legitimate politicians aligned with the insurgents are targeted, or if the government is already seen as overly repressive or violent," the report said.

The US has used drone strikes on terror targets in the Middle East and south Asia, in areas considered too dangerous to send a large number of ground troops to eliminate those considered a threat to US national security.

The report spoke of how Israel's "targeted-killing campaign" was limited in its effectiveness because of "decentralised command structures, compartmented leadership, strong succession planning, and deep ties to their communities, making the[se] groups highly resilient to leadership losses".

"Israeli HVT efforts from 2000 to 2002 strengthened solidarity between terrorist groups and bolstered popular support for hard-line militant leaders, according to US Embassy officials in Jerusalem and clandestine reporting," the study says.

It also documents the problems faced when launching a targeting campaign against various groups, such as the Taliban and al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI).

"Senior Taliban leaders' use of sanctuary in Pakistan has also complicated the HVT effort," it reveals.

"Moreover, the Taliban has a high overall ability to replace lost leaders, a centralised but flexible command and control overlaid with egalitarian Pashtun structures, and good succession planning and bench strength, especially at the middle levels."

It speaks of drone strikes also having limited effect in Iraq on AQI, who "initially lost several iterations of its senior leadership and numerous local emirs, but these losses initially did little to slow AQI's momentum".

According to the Bureau of Investigative Journalism, US drone strikes have killed between 2,400 and 3,888 people in Pakistan in the years 2004 to 2014 and between 371 and 541 people in Yemen in the years 2002 to 2014.

Es ist **ZEIT**

zu reden!

Österreichs aktive Beteiligung am
US-Drohnenmordprogramm!

Ihr Mörder!



**STAATLICHE BEIHILFE
ZUM US-DROHNEN-
MORDPROGRAMM**

**Österreich feiert 20 Jahre aktive
Beteiligung am illegalen
US-Drohnenmordprogramm,
welches bis 98 % unschuldige
Menschen ermordet!**

Finde den Fehler.





Gewissenlos, skrupellos, morallos und unmenschlich steckt das HNaA als US-Vasall-Spion im Arsch der CIA und aktiv Teilnehmer eines außergerichtlichen, menschenverachtenden, menschenrechtswidrigen, illegalen, terroristischen, terror-erzeugenden, feigen, hinterhältigen und unmenschlichen Attentatsdrohnterrorerkollateralschadenprogramm, welches bis 98 % unschuldige Menschen ermordet.

Am 15. September 2001 sagte Bush im Gespräch mit Reportern, aus dem Buch Bush u. Cheney ...: **„Dieser Kreuzzug, dieser Krieg gegen den Terrorismus, wird eine Weile andauern.“** Der Begriff „Kreuzzug“ rief natürlich eine Assoziation hervor, dass der Krieg gegen den Terror **eine Fortsetzung der mittelalterlichen Kreuzzüge der Christen gegen Muslime** sein. Bush achtete deshalb darauf, den Begriff „Kreuzzug“ nie wieder zu verwenden.“

„Die allumfassende Bedrohung durch den „islamischen Terrorismus“, so Kumar, „bietet eine nützliche Tarnung für (Amerikas) imperiale Ambitionen.“ :“Im Krieg gegen den Terror geht es nicht nur um Terror“, sagte Arundathi Roy. „Es geht um den selbstzerstörerischen Impuls der Supermacht hin zur Vorherrschaft, zum Würgegriff, zur globalen Hegemonie.“

„Obwohl diese sieben Länder (die in fünf Jahren von der USA ausgeschaltet werden sollten, (Irak, Iran, Syrien, Libanon, Libyen, Somalia u. Sudan) angeblich ausgewählt wurden, weil sie Terroristen beherbergen, umfaßte die Liste nicht, wie Clark anmerkte, einige der Länder wie Saudi-Arabien, Ägypten und Pakistan (Anmerkung: und Katar), die alle als US-Verbündete galten und **die den Terrorismus am meisten unterstützten**. (ANMERKUNG. **Wie auch die USA!**) Diese Ausnahmen deuten darauf hin, dass der „Krieg gegen den Terror“ **in Wirklichkeit ein Vorwand dafür war, Länder anzugreifen**, die abgesehen vom Besitz von Öl und Gas, **nicht im Einklang mit der US-Politik stehen**.“

Klaus Schreiner, 6020 Innsbruck, Kaiser Franz Joseph Str. 4

Diese Liste von Ländern wird auch durch einen Kommentar von Bacevich erklärt: "Das Führen eines „globalen Kriegs“ sollte die Grenzen für die Ausübung amerikanischer Macht beseitigen."

Zu Syrien: Ab 2012 gab die CIA auf alle Fälle 1 Milliarde Dollar pro Jahr aus und trainierte etwa 10.000 „moderate“ Rebellenkräfte." (Ende Buchausschnitte)



Mit freundlichen Grüßen, aus dem friedliebenden Widerstand, Klaus Schreiner