

# **Chapter 2**

## **Drone Identification**

Jesus said “you shall know them by their works<sup>1</sup>”. This is a time honored drone recognition technique, as drones do not work. For quick identification, look to the suspect drone’s occupation. Drones turn up to work, whinge, dither, generally waste time and do as little as possible. This is not so much because drones are by definition lazy, it is because the drone is always out of its depth, and does not want to reveal this by making a mistake. Drones always make sure they collect their pay. Drones rarely work in occupations where a tangible outcome is readily discernible as drones are attempting to operate at a competency level they are not up to, results are avoided as they may demonstrate inadequacy. Drones make a great appearance of being busy but very little ever seems to get done. Drones on phones are a commonplace as drones can appear both busy and important, when they have just rung to get the time. The one great invention of the drone was to pass the buck. There is a conflict here because on the other hand drones like to think that they really are important, so they are obsessive about being involved in decision making. The outcome is that decisions are dragged out by going through a phony drone consultation process. It matters not that consultation is invariably mere appearance and an extra cost, because that is the very nature of the drone. If an organisation is characterised by muddle and endless delay, you can be sure it is drone infested.

The other major reason drones achieve little is because they are typically engaged in drone make-work ‘activity’. Make-work activity is the art-form of the drone. Because drones seek out occupations which are either overrated or truly pointless, the drone is obliged to make more of it than there really is. For a drone the challenge is to turn simple tasks into complex ones. The greatest achievement of the drone is to make a mountain out of a molehill. Drones glory in pointless exercises such as staff meetings, team building, conferences and all the other drone social events masquerading as work. Whenever you see an

---

<sup>1</sup> The Bible.

organisation indulge in a meaningless name change you know it is drone infested, as this shows that the drones have got so much influence they can waste money and put their stamp on things, without actually doing anything. Appearances are everything to the drone. The first and simplest way to identify a drone is to see if it actually ever accomplishes anything real.

Like the veroa mite, drones are parasitical. This means they must find a host they can leach. Drones tend to avoid small business as the host may simply collapse under the weight of the drone. It is for this reason that drones are most commonly found hiding in large organisations and the larger the organisation the more likely it is drone infested. The natural habitat of the drone is government organisations, as the byzantine labyrinths of bureaucracy provide so many nesting sites. Not only that, but as government operates on the principle that; ‘it is easy to spend other people’s money’<sup>2</sup>, there is no real fetter on how infested a bureaucratic department can become. It is tempting simply to equate bureaucracy with drone-dom but strange as it may seem there are some non-drones left in government departments and it is even fabled that the bureaucracy once had a public service ethic, but I think that this is a myth on a par with Camelot.

One would think that business, with its lean, hard, economic efficiency model, would be relatively drone-free, but this is not the case. Certainly, business is ruthless towards working class drones, as it is to workers generally, but businesses are run by upper and middle class families, and families have to find a place for their drone children. Businesses generally try to put drones in places where they can do the least damage. Peripheral departments, such as ‘Personnel’, particularly in medium sized businesses, are comprised almost exclusively of drones. While it is true that in general there is a smaller proportion of drones in business than in government, business drones are much fatter.

---

<sup>2</sup> This is not in the Bible but should be.

If the work test is not definitive, there are other means to reliably identify a drone. The core methodology I have utilised is adapted from that developed by Andrzej Łobaczewski and his co-workers, as set out in his groundbreaking work, *Political Ponerology*. Ponerology is the study of evil, which Łobaczewski identifies as systemic psychopathy in a psychocratic state. Łobaczewski says that the reason for societal blindness to systemic psychopathy is the psychological mechanism of transference; that is the projection of one's own worldview onto others. Applying Łobaczewski's analysis to the present situation, the fundamental error that non-drones make is that as they are genuine, authentic well meaning and productive human beings, they assume drones are also authentic and as they appear, and that the drone's rank and/or qualifications actually mean something and that the drone is a competent and productive member of society. Proceeding from this mistaken premise, the non-drone will excuse even the most obvious drone behaviour. This is a terrible mistake. In fact it is such a monumental error that it brings into question just why non drones are letting themselves be so obviously leached, but as this puzzling condition is not the topic of this book, I will give just one example, significantly of the teacher drone. A friend of mine taught at an English language school for adult migrants. At the school there was one teacher who did almost nothing. This teacher spent most of her time in the staffroom drinking coffee and complaining about how hard her life was. Clearly this was a drone. The students distraught at learning nothing, finally complained to the principal. As a response the other teachers rallied round the drone. My friend related that other teachers came to her and asked her to support the drone saying that, 'so and so is a good teacher'. My friend, a woman of integrity and conviction, declined her support, saying that the drone was not a good teacher, as all she did all day was sit around the staffroom drinking coffee and complaining. Why would other teachers, who were apparently competent at their work, rally around a complete drone who

was palpably failing her students, particularly when the drone's inadequacy impacted on vulnerable people who needed to learn English so as to be able to function in a new land? There are a number of reasons for this. First there is Łobaczewski's mechanism which I have adapted to dronism. The other teachers projected their own good natures and good intentions onto the drone. Putting themselves in the place of the drone they then advocated for the drone, as if it was themselves. Clever and competent people will find all sorts of crafty ways to overbear the more reflective. This central mechanism works synergistically with other mechanisms. Within the mix there would also have been teachers who were not pulling their weight, to a greater or lesser extent, for a number of reasons. Foremost among these reasons is that there is not a black and white division between mediocrity and competence. Ability is strung out on an infinitely graduated continuum. This means that while some will be complete drones, others will be dronish, to a greater or lesser degree. The dronish and the lazy will join forces with the drone lest their own performance be questioned. If the drone faction is big enough and loud enough, it will attract those in the general group who aspire to leadership. Leaders love drones as they make such good followers. Unless the drone cause is decidedly unpopular or there is a strong core in the group who are not easily stampeded, those aspiring to leadership will take up the drone cause, just to build their own power base. Where it goes from here depends on whether there are contending leadership groups and the general power dynamics within the herd, but if a pro-drone majority is formed, it is only the particularly strong willed who can hold out. In the macrocosm, lowest common denominator teachers' associations defend drone infestations despite the cost to their vocation.

The most important lesson for drone investigators is to understand Łobaczewski's utilization of the psychological mechanism of transference. Do not fool yourself. Drones are not like us. Drones are poor Gollum-like creatures

who are driven by more powerful forces and the need to perform and succeed in a stratum of society they just do not have the equipment for. This leads them into every deceit. While one can have sympathy, they are a parasitic growth which can destroy civilisations. I am not one who advocates fumigation but drones need to be outed before society collapses under their weight.

The psychological mechanisms that play upon drones arise from them being placed above their competence. Drones in this situation have to make out they are something they are not. Everyday life becomes a pretence. Maintaining a pretence is psychologically stressful. Wilhelm Reich, in his book *Character Analysis*, wrote that people deal with psychologically stressful situations by adopting set physiological responses and facial expressions, which he called '*character armour*'. I saw something of an example of this in two little girls, aged between 3 and 5. They had both been given matching toy cardboard Native American masks for Christmas. This was in the era of Cowboys and Indians, and these were the bad guys. Although of simple construction, the masks were quite graphic, so they were real but unreal and the stern faces had a dramatic sense of implacability about them. If both were masked, the girls played happily but if one put on a mask, while the other was unmasked, the other would run off screaming, genuinely frightened, until she donned her mask, and so armoured could confront the other. For Reich armouring is a natural response, which only becomes a problem when armouring becomes habitual and develops into a morbid condition he called rigidification. Rigidification is almost inevitable for drones. Advanced rigidification creates a semi schizoid personality where a person's public persona is inauthentic. An authentic person is animated by feelings, whereas an inauthentic persona, being a construct, is separated from feeling and so is relatively inanimate, in the sense that it is an object, a thing. Drones know they are trapped in this façade but they lack the strength to break free. Some struggle to maintain a sense of decency but eventually most drones become bitter and

twisted. At this point the only way the drone can normalise their social situation is to bring others down to their level. It is for this reason that the domain of the drones is all about reducing authentic human beings to things.

When investigating a potential drone, the next issue is whether the suspect drone is helpful or unhelpful. Drones are always unhelpful. Drones will generally try to off you of as they regard work as beneath them and because they shun responsibility in all its forms. Some drones will treat the investigation as drone ‘make-work activity’ and will drone on endlessly rather than do what they are supposed to be doing. A skilled investigator will soon recognise droning, it is similar to the chatter of monkeys, but less intelligent.

Hysteria is a very commonly a feature of drones. In regard to hysteria and the mechanism by which the privileged psychologically assuage their parasitism, Łobaczewski wrote<sup>3</sup>:

*... children of the privileged classes learn to repress from their field of consciousness the uncomfortable ideas suggesting that they and their parents are benefiting from injustice against others. Such young people learn to disqualify and disparage the moral and mental values of anyone whose work they are using to over-advantage... They grow up to be somewhat hysterical adults who ... thereupon transmit their hysteria to the next generation, which then develops these characteristics to an even greater degree.*

This is all the more true for drones. Competent members of the privileged classes can at least maintain some sort of pretence that their contribution matches their reward. For drones this is a much more difficult exercise. Not only that, but the drone secretly knows that their real ability is menial. This terrifies the drone as not only has the drone’s entire familial conditioning taught

---

<sup>3</sup> Political Ponerology p124.

them to despise menial activity, but also they have no ability in this sphere, as they have developed no practical skills.

Drones entirely lack commonsense, as commonsense is practical intelligence and not found in the mediocre. Because the drone's only real skill is to do what it was taught, drones rely exclusively on rules, regulation and policy. Drones are unable to comprehend principle and so do everything by the book. A simple test is to ask the suspected drone a relatively simple question, that admits of a commonsense answer but which is outside of routine enquiries. If the suspect drone becomes flustered, needs to refer to someone else, or tries to squeeze the answer into a standard response, then you have a drone.

As drones are forever worried about being found out as incompetent, they are completely risk averse. This would have no great moment if drones were just given some play-dough and left to amuse themselves, but their social status puts them into positions of authority. In positions of authority drones strangle productive activity with endless red tape, as drones are oblivious to the risk/progress relationship and will always play safe. Drones are completely blind to the negative effect that they have on society and have a wildly overestimated sense of self importance, which is clearly compensatory behaviour. As it is beyond the drone to see the big picture, drones do not understand that the costs they impose allocate resources needed elsewhere and so create more harm than they could ever prevent. Have you noticed that road works now largely consist of troops of labourers putting out and collecting up miles of cones, and very little else? Near my office some minor road-works are in process. To show how important they are, the drones in charge have put up signs, which obstruct the footpath. As the footpath has been obstructed the signs are surrounded with obligatory cones, which further obstruct. As drones are so stupid they are in danger of walking straight into parked work vans, they assume real people are also this stupid, so these vans are also surrounded with cones. Drones with

cones are the clearest sign a society is infested. Once this point is reached, society is in grave danger as the next step is for the drone to decide that the cone itself is a hazard. Then they will need another cone to mark the first one and then another to mark that one... As drones do not have the intelligence to understand the concept of infinity they will go on with cones forever.

Officiousness is the mark of the drone. This is because the drone is pretending to be more able and important than it really is. Whenever you come across a person who is acting as if the trivial function they are performing is significant and important, you know you are dealing with a drone. This is all the more true if the drone is trying to exercise authority, meaninglessly.

Like the termite, drones hate the light and are habitually creatures of the shadows. It is for this reason drones are implacably opposed to transparency. If shining a light on a suspected drone infestation arouses a flustered and furious response it is likely you have disrupted a hive of drones. The fact that *dronus europensis* and *dronus united nationus* are both now commonly seen in daylight means that they are ready to swarm. As activity is counter intuitive for the drone, drones only swarm when the drone hive is in peril. So perhaps the drone can sense a technological shift which will obsolete them as radically as it has the industrial worker.

Tracking drones is difficult as there are two vectors to plot. Raw intelligence is one vector and the other is the drone's occupation. Raw intelligence is not at all straightforward. Our society, and drones in particular, skew appreciation of intelligence towards linguistic intelligence, as this is more readily instructed and drones excel in being instructed. Linguistic definition of intelligence, built in to almost every IQ test, screens out practical intelligence, the arch-foe of the drone. Drones despise and devalue practical intelligence as the drone's advantage lies in education and more particularly the educational status that their privileged position provides. As to drone occupation, this is infinitely varied and

dependent on the familial matrix of the drone. Moreover there is professional advancement. The drone may be obliged by their social standing to advance in their occupation, to a level that their ability cannot match. It is placement above ability that creates a drone.

Being out of its depth, or worse still, having to advance into a position it knows it cannot cope with, means that the drone is almost always under stress. Aside from brief periods of joy, when it is able to make other people's lives more difficult, the drone is invariably unhappy. This gives rise to two responses, long drawn out moaning and clustering. The moaning of drones is horrible but it is the clustering of drones which is the more pernicious. Drones cluster to exclude competent persons from their environment. This reduces the general skill level to the mediocre, where the drones are comfortable. This phenomenon, if left unchecked, tends towards the lowest common denominator and drones, by their sheer weight of numbers, can eventually bring down whole civilisations.

When a drone thinks it is about to be recognised its normal reaction is panic. Like the psychopath it can handle a small amount of stress, as a normally competent person would, but once a threshold is reached, it goes ballistic. At this point the drone will commence evasive action, commonly pretending it has something else to do and becoming rude and offensive. Higher order drones will attack so be careful. The form of the attack will usually be a barrage of words, as semantically confusing as the drone can muster, immediately followed by hurried retreat so there can be no rejoinder. Note some higher order drones who are self deluded may make a stand after such a barrage. The best response is to calmly deconstruct the gibberish they have just blurted out. Recording them or taking notes will terrify the drone as it is unlikely to have the ability to remember what it has just said. At this point the drone will flee or call in security if it has the status to do so.