



(Ferguson)

# Military Drones

Thesis: We must support funding the use of military drones for most scenarios so that we can save the lives of United States soldiers and reduce civilian casualties.

Audience Analysis: Most people in this class seem to dislike the idea of people dying. This presentation will inspire those in this class to save the lives of United States' soldiers who are fighting in militant areas by using drones instead of soldiers.

## I. Introduction

- A. Hook: If a death could be prevented by utilizing technology we already have, what is one good reason we are not doing it?
- B. Background: According to an article entitled, "**Preface to 'What Principles Should Guide America's Conduct of War?' on Opposing Viewpoints**", The ethical nature of drone strikes is one prominent debate in America's conduct in the war on terror. (Preface)
  - 1. There are many arguments both for and against the use of drones, although the argument usually turns into one that is against/for war, rather than drones.
  - 2. Bush, Obama, and Trump have all used drone strikes, with the first drone use occurring in 2004.

C Thesis: We must support funding the use of military drones for most scenarios so that we can save the lives of United States soldiers and reduce civilian casualties.

**Save  
their  
lives.**



## II. Saving soldier's lives

- A. As we sit here now, many US soldiers are dying in foreign countries.
- B. According to an article entitled, "Military Drones Help Keep US Troops Safe", by Opposing Viewpoints in Context, Drones have been more successful than the conventional [wars](#) in Iran and Afghanistan... Their results have been better, with many fewer casualties" (Burris)
  - 1. Sending a drone in place of American soldiers keeps our soldiers safe
  - 2. A drone can be shot down with no loss of life, but when a soldier is killed, they are dead

# Drones **save** soldiers.



(Pratt)

## C. Using drones to target people hostile to Americans (Burris)

1. The US made plans to assassinate Hitler, but they did not work. Could a drone have worked?
2. Drones could have also been used to take out Saddam Hussein
3. This would have saved many American lives had it worked

## D. Drones reduce the chance of all military servicemen dying except for one group: the operators

1. The drone control centers could become major targets for people hostile to our country
2. Drones would have to be controlled from secure bunkers which would have to be resilient from enemy attack
3. If these were to be compromised, our drone program would become useless.

## E. Drones would keep almost all US Servicemen much more safe

## Drones save civilians



(Johns)

### III. Saving the lives of civilians

- A. The only people who aren't evil that are in more danger than our soldiers are the innocent civilians of war torn countries.
- B. The article, "Military Drones Reduce Civilian Casualties" from *Opposing Viewpoints*, says that drones "have the potential to dramatically reduce civilian casualties in armed conflicts" (Lewis)
  1. Between January 2012 and July 2013, only 1.5% of people killed in drone strikes were civilians.
  2. This number is FAR lower than would be achieved by using normal military tactics
- C. Drone also have the ability to follow a specific target for days or weeks (Lewis)
  1. This significantly lowers the chance of a civilian casualty.
  2. This can also be used to determine the patterns of other suspected terrorists so that they can be targeted as well

## The unfortunate effect



IV: The article, “Military Drone Use Makes War More Likely”, from *Opposing Viewpoints*, says that main problem with drone warfare is that more carnage could be waged upon these already ruined countries which could possibly turn more civilians against us (McCauley)

- A. While it is true that drones could cause death and destruction, those two things are really a staple of any war
1. Drones will kill some civilians, that is unavoidable, but far fewer innocent bystanders are killed by the use of drones than by other forms of warfare
  2. Drones are also more accurate than planes so the chance of a rogue missile hitting a building is lower.
  3. With lower levels of accidental destruction than would be achieved with normal warfare, drone warfare is obviously a good option.

B. There are some areas in which drones might not be the best answer however.

1. Having humans in war zones gives a “human” element to our side of the conflict.
2. More people are willing to join our side if we appear to be human than if we appear to just be metal birds flying around shooting people
3. Once an area is mostly on our side, using humans to help rebuild is very important.
4. Unfortunately, it is getting to this state that is the problem and is

1. where the drones would be useful



## V: Conclusion

- A. Drones will save the lives of both soldiers and civilians when used properly in missions that suit a lack of humans
  - 1. They will keep soldiers out of danger which will keep our servicemen alive
  - 2. Drones will kill less civilians than planes and ground troops would
- B. While they might cause some destruction, it would be far less than the level that could be inflicted upon these countries by bombing runs by planes
- C. There are no good reasons to not use this technology in order to save the lives of many soldiers and civilians.
- D. Some of you may be thinking, as 9th graders, what can we do to help?
  - 1. The best way would be to develop an interest in engineering and robotics and eventually get a career developing this technology
  - 2. This might not always be possible so we can also write letters to our Congressmen arguing against sending soldiers into combat and using drones where possible instead
  - 3. Finally, we could always turn to publicizing these ideas on the internet to convince others about the benefits of drone warfare.

#### Works Cited

- Burris, Keith. "Military Drone Use Makes War More Likely." *Drones*, edited by Tamara Thompson, Greenhaven Press, 2016. Current Controversies. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*, link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EJ3010977214/OVIC?u=rich82127&xid=505ce8b4. Accessed 23 Oct. 2017. Originally published as "Military Experts: Killer Drones Will Trigger 'Slippery Slope' into Endless War," *CommonDreams.org*, 26 June 2014.
- Ferguson, Brian. *MQ-9 Reaper In Flight*. 17 Dec. 2007. *Wikipedia*, 17 Dec. 2007, upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/b/b0/MQ-9\_Reaper\_in\_flight\_%282007%29.jpg. Accessed 19 Oct. 2017.
- Johns, Larry. *US specialist helping Afghani nomads*. *U.S. Department of Defense*, www.dodmedia.osd.mil/Assets/Still/2004/Army/DA-SD-04-14066.JPG. Accessed 23 Oct. 2017.
- Jones, William A. *Rukhshana School*. *U.S. Department of Defense*, archive.defense.gov/dodcmshare/newspphoto/2002-03/020311-A-8773J-901.jpg. Accessed 23 Oct. 2017.
- Lewis, Michael W. "Military Drones Reduce Civilian Casualties." *Drones*, edited by Tamara Thompson, Greenhaven Press, 2016. Current Controversies. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*, link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EJ3010977212/OVIC?u=rich82127&xid=8d9cca26. Accessed 23 Oct. 2017. Originally published as "Guest Post: Do Drones Cause Fewer Civilian Casualties Than Traditional Combat?" *OpinioJuris.org*, 23 Aug. 2013.
- McCauley, Lauren. "Military Drones Help Keep American Troops Safe." Edited by Tamara Thompson. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*, Gale, 2016, ic.galegroup.com/ic/ovic/ViewpointsDetailsPage/ViewpointsDetailsWindow?disableHighlighting=true&displayGroupName=Viewpoints&currPage=&scanId=&query=&docIndex=&source=&prodId=OVIC&search\_within\_results=&p=OVIC&mode=view&catId=&u=rich82127&limiter=&display-query=&displayGroups=&contentModules=&action=c&sortBy=&documentId=GALE%7CEJ3010977214&windowstate=normal&activityType=DocumentWithCommentary&failOverType=&commentary=true. Accessed 19 Oct. 2017.
- Pratt, Leslie. *MQ-9 Reaper on Patrol*. *U.S. Air Force*, www.af.mil/News/Photos/igphoto/2000608254/. Accessed 22 Oct. 2017.
- "Preface to 'What Principles Should Guide America's Conduct of War?'" *War*, edited by David Haugen, Greenhaven Press, 2014. *Opposing Viewpoints*. *Opposing Viewpoints in Context*, link.galegroup.com/apps/doc/EJ3010237168/OVIC?u=rich82127&xid=e09a69d8. Accessed 23 Oct. 2017.
- SOFREP. *Soldier in Afghanistan*. *Pinterest*, i.pinimg.com/originals/18/1f/25/181f25e11af9b572bf36144545a22e06.jpg. Accessed 23 Oct. 2017.

## Bibliography