

[Previous post](#)  
[Next post](#)

22

44

Tweet

Share

# DHS Doesn't Want Its New Spy Drones

· By [Katie Drummond](#)  
· [Email Author](#)  
· November 1, 2011 |  
· 6:39 pm |  
· Categories: [Drones](#)

Follow [@katiedrumm](#)

Like

Send

234 likes. [Sign Up](#) to see what your friends like.

It was a really thoughtful gesture, but officials with the Department of Homeland Security kinda wish Congress had held onto the gift receipt for those spy drones.

In a gift-giving mix-up that outdoes any of your worst Christmas sweater stories, Congress this past August approved a very generous \$32 million appropriation to the DHS for the acquisition of three new Predator drones, meant to bolster the Department's border-monitoring efforts.

Department officials were surprised, to say the least. See, new Predators weren't exactly on their surveillance gear wish list.

"We didn't ask for them," an unnamed official told the [Los Angeles Times](#).

DHS is already struggling to operate their seven existing drones. Officials acknowledge that they are short on pilots and maintenance — right now, they can only pay to fly the drones five days a week. So now DHS is in a mad scramble trying to figure out how they can successfully incorporate three more vehicles into the roster.

That means more than just pilots: Each drone also requires a maintenance crew, intelligence analysts and pricey satellite bandwidth.

"That is year-by-year, hand-to-mouth living," another unnamed official said of hard-knock times at the department, which has been forced to move money from other projects just to keep their surveillance initiative, which will eventually boast 18 to 24 drones [monitoring U.S. borders](#) and waterways for everything from illegal immigrants to drug runners, operational. One of the drones is scheduled to be delivered to Corpus Christi, TX today. The other two will be dropped off in Arizona and Florida later this year.

The DHS might not be happy, but the drone endowment will no doubt have some parties squealing with delight: The appropriation was the result of ongoing lobbying from the so-called "[Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Caucus](#)," a group of several dozen congressmen, many of whom hail from Southern California — a hot-bed of drone development and home to [General Atomics Aeronautical Systems](#), the company that makes the Predator drone in question. Already, General Atomics has scored \$240 million from DHS' Customs and Border Protection since 2005 for the manufacture of the unmanned aerial vehicles — and generously enough, they've handed \$1.6 million of it over to the campaign funds of several Congressional members on the drone caucus.

"This is a symptom of how surveillance technology is spreading around the U.S.," Jay Stanley, a senior privacy and technology analyst with the American Civil Liberties Union, said. "A lot of times it is not being pulled by people on the ground. It is being pushed from above by people who want to sell it."

Speaking of selling, we here at Danger Room have one suggestion for how DHS make the most of their \$32-million gift-gone-wrong: [eBay](#).

· [Related](#)

· [You Might Like](#)

· [Related Links by Contextly](#)



· [\\$356 Million Later, The Justice Department's Wireless Network Still Sucks](#)



· [Angry Birds, Meet Jailbirds: New App Helps You Snitch on Your Friends](#)



· [Oops! Air Force Drones Can Now \(Accidentally\) Spy on You](#)



Even DHS Is Freaked Out by Spy Drones Over America



What Not to Sell on eBay: Drones



U.S. Drones Are Now Sniffing Mexican Drugs



Border Drone Flights Suspended After Comms Breakdown



Show More  
Drones to Keep Watch on U.S.-Canada Border



Apple Continues Record Streak in Q2: 35M iPhones, 12M iPads Sold



Nissan Hacked; Employee Credentials Stolen



Neal Stephenson Releases a Book Trailer That Mocks Book Trailers



U.S. Amasses Stealth Jet Armada Near Iran



Osama is Confused by E-mail, and 5 Other Revelations from the Bin Laden File



Katie Drummond is a New York-based reporter at Danger Room, covering the wild world of military research, and a contributing editor at The Daily.

[Read more by Katie Drummond](#)

Follow [@katiedrumm](#) on Twitter.

Tags: [Cash Rules Everything Around Me](#), [Department of Homeland Security](#), [Drones](#), [Homeland Security](#), [Politricks](#)

[Post Comment](#) | [111 Comments and 114 Reactions](#) | [Permalink](#)

[Back to top](#)

[Twitter](#) 234

22

[Share](#)

44

[Reddit](#) [Digg](#) [Stumble Upon](#) [Email](#)

Like



and 1 other liked this.

Comments for this page are closed.

Sort by popular now ▾

**Showing 80 of 111 comments**



**DeathandGravity**

Those were not the drones they were looking for?

6 months ago 64 Likes

[Like](#)

**dcx\_2**

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.

This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children.

The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: a modern brick school in more than 30 cities. It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60,000 population. It is two fine, fully equipped hospitals. It is some fifty miles of concrete pavement.

We pay for a single fighter plane with a half million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8,000 people.

This is, I repeat, the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking.

- Excerpt from The Chance for Peace by Dwight D. Eisenhower

April 16, 1953, Washington, D.C.

More butter, less guns.

6 months ago 42 Likes

Like



**BigGuy97**

And we can kill those that wish us harm with cholesterol.

6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2 8 Likes

Like



**dcx\_2**

Hooray straw man! Did I say "no guns, all butter"?

Consider the US spends almost as much on "defense" as the rest of the world \*combined\*.

6 months ago in reply to BigGuy97 13 Likes

Like



**Shane L Harris**

ROFL. dcx\_2, BigGuy97 is in no position to "consider" a damn thing. He has his marching orders.

6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2 2 Likes

Like

**BigGuy97**

Actually, I responded last night, but included a link and my comments have been awaiting moderator approval ever since.

The US spends 43% of the pie when combining the top 11 countries in the world. There are 196 countries to examine, so dcx\_2's comments about "almost as much as the rest of the world" is subjective. Our economy is massive compared to "the rest of the world", so try to remember that. Removing the link, my point is that the comment about "more butter, less guns" is extremely short sighted. I am not arguing the point that there is wasteful spending in the defense industry, or that our government is full of corrupt, self serving individuals, but there are so many other areas to cut in our budget as well.

The rhetoric from both of you is lacking accurate facts and the "straw man" and "marching orders" comments are baseless and just a way to avoid the topic.

By the way, I have been reading this site for over a year, and created this account yesterday just to respond. I have commented before, when there was a guest option, but that seems to be gone.

Put the tin foil hats away, I don't work for a political party, a defense contractor, the CIA, the Tea Party or anyone else. I am just a regular guy with an interest in defense topics, which is why i visit this site.

6 months ago in reply to Shane L Harris 5 Likes

Like

**stevo205**

So in your opinion, how is this article not displaying a wasteful form of military spending?



6 months ago in reply to BigGuy97 3 Likes

Like

**lostviking**

Hey stevo205, where is this defense spending you speak of. Did you notice that the article is not about any part of the DoD?

6 months ago in reply to BigGuy97 1 Like

Like

**stevo205**

Well, even though I didn't say defense... I guess I can do this for you.

Throughout this comment thread which I have replied to, there have been multiple instances of users commenting on "defense" spending in particular.

"Consider the US spends almost as much on "defense" as the rest of the world \*combined\*."

"I am not arguing the point that there is wasteful spending in the defense industry"

"I am just a regular guy with an interest in defense topics"

In fact, doing a quick control+f shows 17 instances of the word "defense" coming up, and until this thread, I haven't used it once.

As for whether or not the the Department of Homeland Security is a "defense" industry, I would like you explain what exactly the DOH's intended purpose is, if not for "defending" the homeland. In fact, let us look up the word "security" in a thesaurus and you will see the word "defense" listed as a synonym.

If you would like to nit-pick over my choice of words, you should probably choose the word I used, and make sure you aren't making a fool of yourself.

6 months ago in reply to lostviking

Like



**Mike Mathew**, Retired, small business owner, heavy equipment operator,

Defence of who, the border is bottom of the list, and effects the US taxpayer directly.

5 months ago in reply to dcx\_2

Like



**Rob**

You can't hug someone with nuclear arms.

6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2 5 Likes

Like



**Billy\_\_\_Bob**

You can get much further with a kind word and a gun than with just a kind word.

6 months ago in reply to Rob 2 Likes

Like



**MightyMolecule**

*insert shirt idea here*

6 months ago in reply to Rob

Like

**retroz**

The money spent to buy these drones didn't simply disappear. The vast majority of it was spent on salaries for engineers, programmers, machinists, project managers and office staff. Much of the rest was spent on raw materials, office and manufacturing space, training and so on.

I'm not saying that spending millions on surveillance drones is desirable, but it shouldn't be equated to simply burning it. That's overly simplistic.



6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2 3 Likes

Like



**dcx\_2**

Eisenhower never said the money just evaporated into thin air, as if burnt. "spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists". It's called opportunity costs. When someone spends their time and raw materials doing one thing (i.e. making guns, warships, rockets, fighter planes), they can't spend their time and resources doing other things (i.e. building schools, power plants, hospitals, roads, houses).

6 months ago in reply to retroz 11 Likes

Like



**TomcatTCH**

An awful lot of effort better be put into defense, or that effort will be spent at the direction of other masters.

6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2

Like



**MightyMolecule**

...what standing army is invading the united states again? domestic police officers in riot gear using tear gas on unarmed neolithic hippies doesn't count...

6 months ago in reply to TomcatTCH 5 Likes

Like



**Shane L Harris**

So you are a Keynesian? Are you big into government spending to stimulate the economy?



6 months ago in reply to retroz

Like

**retroz**

No, definitely not. But I worry because we've outsourced so much of our manufacturing capabilities already, and losing the ability to

complicated autonomous vehicles and other high tech devices would leave us in a precarious position.

6 months ago in reply to Shane L Harris 2 Likes

Like

**Mike Greco**

You say "we've outsourced" as though the people have anything to do with it. Forgive me if it sounds like I'm attacking you here, I'm not. I'm just pointing out something I think everyone reading this thread should consider.

Large corporations spearheaded the push for off-shoring production capability because the driving force in capitalism requires constant profit. When the financial world operates on a model where flat growth (say 0% as an example - company A made a net profit of \$100 million last year but they only made the exact same net profit this year) constitutes some sort of failure then it becomes a necessity for these large corporations to look for ways to increase profit. And their search for profit is driven strictly by consideration for their shareholders. There is absolutely no thought given to national goals. If anything, in the search for increased profits, national borders, environmental laws, labour rights and a ton of other things only serve as massive barriers to profit.

Right now, people in North America (and Europe) are looking at China and going "Holy #\$%" because their economy is growing at something absurd, like 15%. And everybody is pissed because the stuff we want to buy is all being made there. But it won't be made there forever. As the standard of living increases in China they'll experience all of the things the American economy faced since 1900; the rise of the middle class, the rise of labour unions, increased manufacturing costs (mostly due to labour expense and demands) etc. etc. And, at that point, all those big companies we loathe for selling out western workers to build shit in China will shutter their Chinese factories and move everything to some backwater country in Africa (or wherever



they think will serve to generate the most profit). Regardless, it won't be back here. Not when a unionized full-time line worker at a factory or warehouse here is getting paid \$20 - 30 an hour (or more) and that exact same job can be done by someone on the other side of the world for a tiny fraction of that. Large corporations don't care about the fact that \$20 / hr. is in line with the cost of living over here. They just don't care.

So "we" haven't outsourced anything. "We" have been screwed over by big business. So, yeah, Occupy Wall Street is pretty much on the money.

6 months ago in reply to retroz 5 Likes

Like



**retroz**

I run a relatively small consumer electronics company and we fab and assemble our circuit boards in Shenzhen because we'd be out of business if we tried to do it in the United States. It's that simple.

That said, our ABS cases, packaging and panel overlays are made in California and Washington state and final assembly takes place in Chicago. We pay decent wages and our team does an excellent job -- they're high quality, adaptable people.

There are advantages to keeping as much of the process in North America as possible: we can make changes very quickly, without language barriers. Shipping is quick and inexpensive. There's no danger that the factories will "accidentally" start producing our design for unscrupulous third parties.

As transportation prices increase and China becomes less attractive, I think our approach will become more common. We outsource as little as possible and send as little money as possible overseas.

6 months ago in reply to Mike Greco 3 Likes

Like

**Mike Greco**

@ JeffreyCross (below)

Do you really think the retail price of anything has gone down because the corporation who makes it has transferred the production of that item overseas? You're delusional. The retail prices stay the same. The profit margins go up.

6 months ago in reply to Mike Greco 2 Likes Like

**JeffreyCross**

Corporations aren't the ones who rush to the store to buy whatever has the lowest price. They simply give the consumer what it wants.

6 months ago in reply to Mike Greco 1 Like Like

**MightyMolecule**

Indeed, and one can argue further with dynamic observations of the global market economies of such outsourced nations. take Mexico or China for example.

with such capitalistic incentives of moving such business off-shore, it is paramount to maintain the quality of life standards (which entails all the conceivable variables that result in profit margins) as they are and not as they should eventually become with the influx of employment positions and opportunities. China is perhaps considered a failure (only offset by the temporary purchase power saturation of new consumers) due to them being "more on the ball" with trade agreements and currency values...and that is why you have generation y of 22 year olds buying brand new

GM vehicles in cash with their debit cards whereas gen y kids in the States are going into debit for education instead to become more competitive in a job market that is at the same being dissolved.

stymying such discrepancy changes that should otherwise equalize themselves between donor (US) and acceptor (Mexico) nations permits an extended duration of profit growth and experience for those corporations involved. colleagues involved in setting up foreign offices for various industries there never complained about security moreso than employee competency. a skill set level and ignorace which contributes to lower wages and benefits, which barely change as the employee is brought up to speed. of course those with foil hats can cook up any US government involvement with arms deals and associations with drug cartels or paramilitary factions within Mexico. but the fact remains, unrest within a centralized Mexican government and the consequential ripples towards infrastructure benefits such coroprations moving certain operations there and who else is more "involved" with current US policy legislation/creation than corporate interests.



6 months ago in reply to Mike Greco

Like

**maddcribbage**

All true, but most of these corporations could be considered "American" corporations. They were founded in America. Most of their executives are Harvard and Wharton trained Americans, who live in America. Their buildings have always been in America, and their main market has always been America. So to the average person, I think it looks like "we" are outsourcing "our" jobs.

It's going to be very tough for average people to grasp the fact that as the BRIC's rise, America will be replaced. We have served as nothing more than consumers, and yet people here feel some kind of connection or kinship. They feel like we've been betrayed somehow, when in fact from the beginning the only corporate goal has been profit.

In fact I'm very interested in the "connection" formed between people and corporations. In the modern age, selling a product is all about building an emotional connection, convincing someone a company and product represent them. There's almost a feeling of friendship or something. As a result, people tend to think corporations will behave like emotionally connected people. I helped Nike with my dollars, why won't Nike help me now? Don't they know we're connected and we're practically the same?

The wake up call is incoming, soon computers will be advanced enough to replace nearly all non-highly skilled jobs in my opinion.

As for the future of China's epic growth, I wouldn't jump the gun on assuming history will repeat itself. China is vastly different from America in a multitude of ways. Even with a rise of the "middle class", there will still be another 400 or so million saps to work the factories. The sheer number of people they have changes any system that's developed here in the U.S. In such a tightly controlled society, unions and various workers "rights" will be a long, long time coming if at all. In addition, we are talking about a hollowing out of the middle class here. How can a "middle class" develop as strongly as it did in America with no economic footing to support a middle at all? China is still a big question mark.



6 months ago in reply to Mike Greco

Like

**maddcribbage**

We have lost blue collar manufacturing. Advanced weapons manufacturing is obviously alive and well.

6 months ago in reply to retroz 1 Like

Like

**thomas vesely**, AGCTGCATTAGCAGTC .....

its sad to watch skills disappear. its like the film running backwards.

6 months ago in reply to retroz

Like

**thomas vesely**, AGCTGCATTAGCAGTC .....**Max Flight**

i take your point, the worrying thing is that todays unemployed are the best educated ever, every where.

6 months ago in reply to thomas vesely

Like

**Max Flight**

It might be "sad to watch skills disappear," but I look at it as being "exciting to watch new skill bases emerge" to replace the old buggy whip industries. If you spend less time looking backward and more time planning for the future, your business will thrive and you just might have a job. Otherwise, you can sit around unemployed longing for the "good old days."

6 months ago in reply to thomas vesely

Like

**cat**

Big government spending does stimulate the economy. The economy of the Red states depends on military spending - they take in more Federal spending than they pay in tax. Of course we are Keynesians. The economy went to hell starting 31 years ago, when

neo-cons declared Keynesian economics dead. "Cut everything" obviously doesn't work. It doesn't matter who's spending, as long as someone is. What you are spending \*on\* is key. In this case, trillions for yet another Forever War, against anything - doesn't matter what. What if we spent it on, oh, I dunno, building solar energy farms in the southwest capable of powering the US forever?

6 months ago in reply to Shane L Harris

Like

**Allen Moore**

Big government spending can only stimulate the economy temporarily at best, and evidence shows that what it really does is allocate capital in bad investment creating and inflating a bubble that invariably POPS! This is known as a business cycle F. A. Hayek characterized this at the same time that John Maynard Keynes became the inventor of his thieving of the middle class economic system, and yet F. A. Hayek wasn't the greatest of his economic theorems of his time that credit goes to Ludwig von Mises and both Hayek and Mises were students of the Austrian School of Economics or better characterized as true free market laizze-faire economic theory.

Keynesian economics never died and the "new-cons" only claimed it dead, but they have been some of the biggest profiteers of the Keynesian-ism, they knew they would then and love that fact now.

Have Keynesian economics not run its course these economic tenets began being implemented in the U.S. starting in 1913 with the Federal Reserve Bank and I.R.S. being created in the same year. It has been shown time and time again that Government spending cannot take the place of consumer spending, a good example of that is the WWII. Yes the country began to see an uptick due to the spending of the war, but austrian school economists hardly credit this as the recovery. They credit the recovery at the unraveling of





government spending and the re-allocation of private funds into the private enterprise and saving.

The Keynesian model destroys savings, because the only way the government can spend money is by creating money out of thin air that due to the laws of supply and demand only serves to devalue the money that is already in circulating. This process has only become easier because now it is a groupings of 1&0 moving from a computer to the nex not even a piece of paper that has a signature on it which serves as a record of I.O.U.

Now you would get less argument from me if inflation was disseminated "fairly" meaning to everyone one who has a dollar when the new money comes in they now all have more of the dollars immediately, however this is not what happens the money is allocated to insiders for political pay-off or {insert reason here} and those insiders get the capital goods by using the power of new money to purchase them at the cost of the pre-devalued price. This is the reason why goods and services have incrementally rose and the excuse is more government spending.

See in order to change the system you must recognize where the malignancy originates. Occupy Wall Street (the mainstream media version) has it incorrect, it is not the corporations on wall street that are the problem they symptoms of the disease. Diagnosing and curing diseases is what is needed in a sick patient, and right now the U.S. economy is the sick patient.

The current state of affairs in our government is the problem, not the form of government because unless you have specifically read the Constitution it is hard to comment that it is or is not something without sounding foolish when asked for a specific quote that states as you may have been initially inclined to believe. The two thirds are coming together and devouring the middle class this cannot be argued, but the poverty welfare queens are the least of our

problems it is the corporate welfare queens eating QE1, 2 and up receiving special money from the Federal Reserve Bank because they are shareholders. FYI the Federal Reserve is a Privately held bank who the included shareholders are but not limited to The Queen of England (but she has not power) and Dutch Royalty. Recognize that the system has become malignant and where they malignancy stems and then work to destroy that malignancy. END THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANK, RON PAUL 2012.



6 months ago in reply to cat

Like



**Billy\_\_\_Bob**

"Every gun that is made..."

Dwight D Eisenhower - Killer of millions. (And some of them deserved it).

6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2 1 Like

Like



**QAZZY, 2RBn**

Damn. All this money, and over one million guys aren't getting paid shit. Good job, USG!

6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2 1 Like

Like



**tdave1234**

Ike was such a softy. :) Wouldn't it be great to see him and Michelle Bachmann debate this?

6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2 1 Like

Like

**delahaya**

I am torn. I believe in defense, but also realize it has become just one more bloated Big Government program. It has the benefit of at least being constitutional and one of the core functions of government, but it - like most US

government programs - has become a gravy train. The only problem is most people who want defense cut just want to spend it on more welfare. Cut ALL programs back to appropriate levels and pay down the debt.

6 months ago in reply to dcx\_2 1 Like

Like



**YourLittleBrother**

Invalid Application ID: The provided Application ID is invalid.

6 months ago 24 Likes

Like



**BuzzCoastin**, Paid Observer on the Path of Least Resistance

Wasting \$32 million on "defense" drones is a drop in the bucket of wasteful spending.

The US spends every dime it collects in taxes and duties on "defense" contractors.

The US spends more on "defense" than all the countries of the world combined.

The US Air Force is larger than the 9 next biggest air forces combined.

The US Navy is larger than the combined navies of China, Russia, India and the UK.

There are over 2000 military bases outside US borders,  
the other world militaries have less than 100.

The US spends \$2 billion a day to lose a war against a small gorilla group in  
Afghanistan.

Yet when Congress considers how to best solve the deficit problem,  
it starts with social entitlements

because the entitlements for the Military-Industrial-Bankster Complex are sacrosanct.

6 months ago 11 Likes

Like

**kecker**



Why you need to resort to weird conspiracy theories I don't know. But here's reality, the amount we spend on defense is VASTLY overshadowed by the amounts we spend on entitlements. We could cut defense to 0 and it still wouldn't solve our deficit problem.

Everyone concentrates on entitlement spending because it's the only slice of the pie big enough to make a difference.

6 months ago in reply to BuzzCoastin

Like



**Matthew Mason**

Wait, we're fighting gorillas in Afghanistan? And small ones? I mean, if they were big like King Kong I would understand.

But seriously, they cut social entitlements first because they're an unsustainable pyramid/ponzi scheme. Military budgets should (at the least) not significantly increase every year. There is the opportunity to save money in the defense department by more efficient spending, but that doesn't mean you cut the budget all at once.

To actually discuss the topic, however, this is just pork-barrel spending by congressmen, which we can pretty much all agree needs to go away.

6 months ago in reply to BuzzCoastin

Like



**chuckjaeger**

Matthew,

Just one more thing.

Why does congress need more pork barrels? They have enough already and in field tests consistently underperformed against superior steel and wood barrel designs.

When will this crazy spending end?



6 months ago in reply to Matthew Mason

Like

**chuckjaeger**

Matthew,

I think that the U.S is fighting a small group of large Gorillas in Afghanistan not a large group of small Gorillas and they are King Kong sized.

I read a recent report where troops were trying to unsuccessfully choke off the local banana supply with no luck. These drones should be used in Afganistan to stop illegal shipments from the Chiquita rebels.

6 months ago in reply to Matthew Mason

Like



**JeffreyCross**

I'm sorry, I couldn't read your entire post, because your first two "points" were factually incorrect.

Please do some basic research the next time your flaming liberal college professor tries to brainwash you with left wing drivél. Seriously, did you get that info off of OWS signs?

6 months ago in reply to BuzzCoastin

Like



**maddcribbage**

The government collected 2.4 trillion dollars in revenue in 2010, and spent only 600 or 700 billion. That is not "every dime". You're other points are spot on.

I don't think people in government are total crack smoking lunatics though. Perhaps they think that when it all comes down to it, and in 20 or 30 years the oil and water are running low, our military might will save us? All the nations of the world will owe us for maintaining "peace" through our use of power?

Or maybe they're all just sipping the kool aid and being corrupt cronies. Who really knows, and that's disgusting.

6 months ago in reply to BuzzCoastin

Like



**BuzzCoastin**, Paid Observer on the Path of Least Resistance

The missing money from your calculation is the secret funding of the CIA and NSA, which are not just part of the Military-Industrial-Bankster Complex,

they are the tail that wags the dog.

And the "budget" is often exceeded by cost over-runs.

So in fact, but not provable by gov docs, is that all the 2.4 trillion goes to "defense."

It's also important to note that "defense" spending has doubled since 911 and if you talk to anyone at lower levels of the military, they will tell you about the wanton waste of money in "war zones." (No one has found the \$2.3 trillion money missing from the Pentagon announced by Rumsfeld of Sept. 10, 2001.)

At the employee levels of the government bureaucracy are many decent people

but the minute they blow the whistle on the corruption, they vilified in the press, fired from their jobs and sometimes killed or imprisoned.

(e.g. Bunnatine H. Greenhouse, Gary Webb, Deborah Jeane Palfrey, etc etc etc)

6 months ago in reply to maddcribbage 2 Likes

Like



**lostviking**

As usual vague comments about things you have no facts to support.

6 months ago in reply to BuzzCoastin 5 Likes

Like

**BuzzCoastin**, Paid Observer on the Path of Least Resistance

google it, Rumsfeld 2.3 trillion missing  
[cbsnews.com/stories/2002/01/29...](http://cbsnews.com/stories/2002/01/29...)



Defense budget for 2011 \$903 billion  
Cost overruns 2010 \$400 billion  
subtotal 1.2 trillion

CIA & NSA budgets and expenditures are top secret  
but its likely >400B <1T, lets split the diff at 700B  
subtotal 1.9 tillion

also spends 326B on Homeland protection  
<http://www.usgovernmentspendin...>  
subtotal 2.26 trillion  
so yer right  
they're not spending everything on defense

6 months ago in reply to lostviking

Like



**delahaya**

Dude, you can want to cut defense without resorting to weird conspiracy theories.

6 months ago in reply to BuzzCoastin 2 Likes

Like



**maddcribbage**

What are you talking about. Yes, defense spending has been rising 10% every year. Yes there is extreme waste, fraud, and cronyism. But no, they are not spending 2.4 trillion dollars per year. They are spending 700 billion at the DOD, and from what I've read around 100-200 billion at the CIA. The dollars are accounted for, what they are spent on is not. If they are spending 3.5 trillion per year, more than 2.5 trillion of it on things that are NOT defense and are fully accounted for (entitlements, discretionary spending), how can they be spending 1.4 trillion dollars on the CIA and NSA after dropping 700 billion at the DOD? It's called math bro, get on my level.

As for 2.3 trillion dollars "going missing", that's the most ridiculous thing I've ever heard. Show me the proof, and explain what happened. It's just damaging to the national conversation to make up crap like that.

6 months ago in reply to BuzzCoastin

Like

**Mike Greco**

Don't math me, bro!

;)

6 months ago in reply to maddcribbage

Like



**Shane L Harris**

What deficit problem?

6 months ago in reply to BuzzCoastin

Like



**Hlaode**

I am not at all comfortable with using these against US citizens.

6 months ago 8 Likes

Like



**maddcribbage**

There are so many things our government does...if that is what makes you uncomfortable, you need to read up.

6 months ago in reply to Hlaode 1 Like

Like



**Hlaode**

I do not follow the logic here. Somehow the existence of further abuses are supposed to remove my outrage at the one in front of me now?


6 months ago in reply to maddcribbage 1 Like

Like



**maddcribbage**

Yes. You should be numb and cynical when it comes to ludicrous government behavior, like me.

No but really, I guess I mistakenly extrapolated from your comment that you were not aware of other things the government does that suck. Perhaps you are, and if so, focus your disgust on  acts (like spying on citizens, arresting them without trial, and siezing their property without court order/consent). A few drones flying over our heads is nothing to really worry about.

6 months ago in reply to Hlaode 1 Like

Like



**ron2mc**

If the DHS doesn't want the drones, I'm sure that Sheriff Arpaio would love to use them.

He would not use them against American citizens.

6 months ago 5 Likes

Like

**Michael Langford**

Almost everything Arpaio does is against American citizens... the rest is hot air.

6 months ago in reply to ron2mc 3 Likes

Like

**maddcribbage**

So who builds the drones? I'd really like to see how connected that company is, because this is a perfect example of sheer cronyism. Paying millions of dollars for things we literally don't even need, simply to give some contractor another 34 million.

Please do an article on the recent rise to power in Washington of whoever makes the drones Wired. That would very cool.

6 months ago 4 Likes

Like

**yahoo-IXAAY6TSMG54TTRFKEZ57NLG3Q**

don't expect cool or true on w!r3d

5 months ago in reply to maddcribbage

Like

**stevo205**

I really don't understand why there isn't a publication that covers strictly "lobbying news".. and if their is, please point me towards it.

6 months ago in reply to maddcribbage

Like

**Hlaode**

I typed a long reply to this. It was in part serious and in part insinuating that such publications as charmin and quilted northern handle the subject perfectly. Unfortunately it contained a relevant link, and the spam filters here send any post with a url to "awaiting moderation" where they never actually get reviewed. Unwilling to retype the entire comment I will just leave this rant.

edit- I mean its not even like they managed to cut down on the amount of spam. Their methods are completely ineffective and it would be better to just switch to a different comment system.

6 months ago in reply to stevo205 1 Like

Like



**stevo205**

Yep, is it not ironic that we try and have a discussion about the state of media today... and we aren't even allowed use citations ourselves... haha, you can't make this stuff up. sad

6 months ago in reply to Hlaode

Like



**maddcribbage**

Now that I think about it, that publication would inform the American people way too much! Can't exist.

6 months ago in reply to stevo205

Like



**Bruce Staeb**

If you ask me the republicans just found another way to funnel more money into the pockets of the rich when the DHS clearly doesn't need them. The smart thing to do would be to ask the DHS what is needed so they don't blow a wad of cash that could be used in other areas like social security the deficit. and they piss and moan about Obama that's a little like the pot calling the kettle black.

6 months ago 4 Likes

Like



**solomonshv**

Half of the members of UAV Caucus are Democrats, just saying. I personally don't give a shit about any political party since they are all equally worthless. Obama is like a black George Bush.

6 months ago in reply to Bruce Staeb 4 Likes

Like



**Joe the Plumber's neighbor**

I'm not paying for this kind of thing anymore, let the 1% foot the bill for these boondoggles, they're the fearful sissy's who are so security conscious.

6 months ago 4 Likes

Like



**madlyb**

This is why the checkbook should be taken away from Congress. They are obviously not fit to manage our money.

6 months ago 4 Likes

Like



**cat**

They are YOU. Not an occupying force - they are your elected government. Collectively, the US wants to spend money on wars. The reps respond.

6 months ago in reply to madlyb 1 Like

Like



**maddcribbage**

False. I'm pretty sure a majority of Americans have wanted cut backs in military spending for a long time now. Where are you getting your "facts"?

6 months ago in reply to cat 1 Like

Like

**madlyb**

Thanks madd.



Cat, I hate to break it to you, but we the people don't control Congress anymore. They are bought and paid for many times over by big business.

I especially like how it has become a conversation about jobs instead of managing our finances. Next time I want to spend more money than I have I will just tell the bank I am creating jobs.

6 months ago in reply to maddcribbage

Like



**William**

This sounds like a place where the tealeafers could cut a few dollars off of wasteful spending, but maybe not if one of their backers are selling these things...

6 months ago 3 Likes

Like



**Michael Langford**

Maybe they could save some money if they stopped using hundreds of staff to spy on and discredit peaceful protesters and focused on their ACTUAL jobs.

6 months ago 3 Likes

Like



**delahaya**

I agree - leave those Tea Party people alone!

6 months ago in reply to Michael Langford 1 Like

Like



**maddcribbage**

No one is spying on the Tea Party, because no one cares what the Tea Party does. Radical right wingers are nothing new, and they have been nicely incorporated into the Republican party and the current socio economic system.

6 months ago in reply to delahaya

Like



**ChristopherRaff**

I'll take on off their hands.

6 months ago 3 Likes

Like

**Ritchie The Riveter**, I'm a somewhat-seasoned citizen ... and high-tech redneck ... who holds fast t...

1998: Extra C-130's that the DOD didn't ask for, put in the defense budget by Newt and Trent.

2011: Extra Predators that DHS didn't ask for, put in the budget by the UAV Caucus.

Pork, like technology, marches on into smaller and smaller packages as time goes by ...

6 months ago 2 Likes

Like



**Bob Gort**

Remember, with expensive weapons the point is not to actually use them, but to spend the money to build them.

6 months ago 2 Likes

Like



**Joe Boyum**

Wow now we can track the number of border jumpers illegally entering our country. This will help the budgeting process for the Dream legislation...and people say congress is not doing any good. I would say we are flying the armed predators over the wrong countries.

6 months ago 1 Like

Like

**shinny\_head**

Memo to DHS:

You can remove the new drones from you property list by completing a Property Control Receipt.

The one we use is ENG FORM 4900-R. When you transfer the property to my organization we will trade it to the regular army for some well needed equipment. This transfer will remove the added liability from your already strained O & M budget.

We are happy to assist you in you time of need especially since the Senate refuses to pass budgets funding federal department operations.

We will also pay of the cost of property removal from your location.





N E D Analytical Equipment  
DoD Army

6 months ago 1 Like

Like



**Duncan Morrow**

I NEVER ASKED FOR THIS

6 months ago 1 Like

Like



**boldeagle3**

Stop complaining robotic limbs are awesome

6 months ago in reply to Duncan Morrow 6 Likes

Like

 [Subscribe by email](#)  [RSS](#)

Load more comments

## Reactions

