Ethical Analysis:

Using Rule Deontology we’re able to analyse the morality behind these ethical issues. In Rule Deontology the main rules behind a morally just act can be broken down into two questions; is the act impartial (No individual should be favored over another; no one should be treated as a means to an end) and is the act universal (do the rules must apply to everyone?). In order to answer these questions first we must identify the parties involved. In this case we have the US military, terrorist groups and civilians. If the US military wishes to replace drone pilots with autonomous drones this can be seen as a movement towards impartiality since drone pilots are no longer a necessary means for killing. Instead, a drone is now being used as a means to an end and since a drone isn’t technically an individual, impartiality still applies in this case. However, the act of killing someone for the purpose of winning a war or protecting your country is not considered an impartial act since the US is gaining from someone else's loss of life. How about universality? In this case the US military wants automated drones to kill only the people they target. This act breaks the rules of universality since it treats its targets differently than how it treats civilians. In a twisted sense of justice, Rule Deontology says that autonomous drones would be unethical if they didn’t target civilians. On the other hand, drones that don’t do any kind of killing would also be considered ethical. This could justify the use of automated drones used for surveillance, but it does not justify the targeted murder of anyone. Since the act of using automated drones fails to be impartial and universal, Rule Deontology finds the act to be immoral.