- 1. Submitted by: 15th SPS; Hickam AFB, HI; SMSgt Lenart.
- 2. **Operation/Event:** B-2 Naming Ceremony/Demonstration, May 1996.
- 3. Keywords: Demonstration.
- 4. Title: B-2 Naming Ceremony.

5. **Observation:** The event was conducted Memorial Day 1996. Numerous military and civilian distinguished visitors were present. These included COMPACAF and Senator Inoyae. The event was open to the public, not just base residents. Early in the morning a group of approximately 10 "peace" demonstrators gathered at Bellows AFS. We learned of the groups plans to demonstrate at Hickam approximately two hours prior to their arrival. Coordination and notifications quickly followed this intelligence report. We informed the senior wing leadership, local OSI, and Honolulu Police Department. The group arrived at the ceremony site located on the flightline side of base operations. At first the group gathered on the side of base operations and began to hold up signs and chant slogans denouncing the ceremony. Naming a weapon of war (the B-2) the "Spirit of Hawaii" was an insult to this group, and what they stood for; and, to them, what "aloha" meant. News media was present and took notice. They guickly surrounded the demonstrators, providing a forum for their protest. The Chief of Security Police (CSP) implemented the demonstration plan, and security police formed a human chain allowing the demonstrators to move forward. However, they were prevented from reaching the aircraft. Additional security forces were posted around the aircraft as well. Shortly after the protest started, the legal office prepared a proclamation that was read by the security police in charge of aircraft security. Since the protesters continued their demonstration, the CSP gave the order to remove the demonstrators and dispatch them to the processing center located at base operations. It should be noted, within minutes of the news media coverage of the demonstration, people from the crowd started joining in. The group of 10 protesters grew to 30. Most of the demonstrators offered only passive resistance (sitting down); however, some were considerably more aggressive. During processing, barment orders were issued and protesters were escorted off the installation.

6. **Discussion:** One protester filed a congressional complaint. Specifically, aggressive use of force was alleged to have occurred by one security police person when removing demonstrators. The final report cleared the security police person and concluded minimal force necessary was used.

7. Lessons Learned: Two lessons were learned:

a. We could do little to prevent the demonstrators from entering the installation. Our information did not provide any details which would have aided our identifying them at the gate. Once the original 10 emerged they should have been detained and immediately removed. This may have prevented members of the crowd from becoming involved.

b. Second, the media should have been prevented from surrounding the demonstrators. This was the catalyst for the groups rapid growth and, of course, publicity.

8. **Recommended Actions:** Whenever an open house is considered, don't just have a plan; commit people in advance for it. Pre-identifying who will make up the confrontation management team and pre-positioning the processing unit can result in a swift resolution of the incident. Lastly, make sure senior leadership appreciates the risk of demonstrators so they can make sound decisions and give the necessary support to security police.

9. OPR Comments: None.