Drone Warfare

Dear Bill Cassidy and David Vitter,

To many people, drone warfare is considered very immoral, but for others it is very effective and can save many lives at the cost of others. The act of using drone warfare is to hunt down wanted targets in other countries without putting soldiers at risk of being killed. This tactic in my opinion is very good because it spares US soldiers so that they can return to their families. I think that drone warfare should be a more frequently used tactic than sending soldiers to go kill wanted targets.

So the main question that people ask is if sending attack drones is even legal. According to [www.heritage.org](http://www.heritage.org), individual terrorists should be arrested and tried as common criminals. This means that if the United States is not engaged in conflict, they cannot just send a drone to go off and kill a target. In my opinion, I disagree about the idea of terrorists being tried as a common criminal rather than being killed by a drone because if the terrorist is not an American citizen, why should they be tried as a common criminal? Even though I say this, I’m not saying that whoever promotes terrorism should be brutally murdered. Is sending drones to kill people just a way for the C.I.A to go against the ban of assassinations?

Many people think that drone attacks don’t work because collateral damage is always a factor in an attack with a drone no matter what. For example, an article on cnn.com stated that one American hostage and one Italian hostage were killed in an air strike against a terrorist group. This was probably unavoidable because if the hostages were in the vicinity, the drone could not wait until later to take out the targets. This links with the idea that, “where civilian casualties cannot be avoided, they must be minimized.” No matter how many civilians are killed in a drone attack, it will have fewer casualties than by sending troops to attack. So, drones actually are effective and do work.

Sending drones is great for protecting the security of the US citizens and soldiers because soldiers don’t have to put their lives in risk while they have UAVs that can do the same job without losing a life. Citizens are protected because the drones can prevent terrorist groups from any planned future attacks on the US or even other allied countries. This one idea raises the question of, “does more security mean less freedom?” Senators, more security does not mean that there is less freedom because all the drones do is protect the lives of American citizens. In my opinion, drones keep the people of America safe.

In conclusion, drones do cause collateral damage and are technically illegal if we are not in conflict, but they actually work and kill their targets.