The Honorable Bill Cassidy  
United State Senate  
Washington, DC 20510  
  
Dear Senator Cassidy,

Through the years, the people of this nation have toiled through such ethical issues such as Watergate and the implications of long bloody wars on foreign and domestic soil. Some of these problems have been dealt with well, but some have been debacles for us as a people. The issue now in question is the handling of American terrorists. The fate of our world is dependent on how we react to this situation.

We as Americans value equality, liberty, fairness across boundaries of race, sex, religion, orientation, and borders. These values are rights, not privileges, for everyone. It does not matter what one has done, he or she is still entitled to these inalienable rights. After the drone strike in Yemen that killed Anwar al-Awlaki and his son, critics rightly questioned the decision to launch the attack because of the target and his son’s rights as United States citizens. This violates several fundamental rights of Americans, namely the right to a fair trial with a regular law procedure. Besides the ethical issues, the legal logistics of the operation were not carried out well.

Even though national security is very valuable to the United States, it must be considered that there is no legal framework in place to regulate drone strikes of any kind, much less attacks against American citizens. In fact, the aforementioned strike in the Yemen is likely illegal. Assassination is defined as the murder of a high profile person suddenly done in secret, and according to Executive Order 12333 issued by President Reagan, no person working on behalf of the federal government “shall engage in, or conspire to engage in, assassination” of any nature. Clearly, al-Awlaki’s death was an assassination, and military action is prohibited in countries in which combat forces are not engaged in active war. The U.S. military used two technicalities to get around these rules. Firstly, they only moved through airspace, which can be considered neutral “soil.” Secondly, they only used drones, which are not technically military personnel because they are unmanned. Because of these loopholes, the illegal use of drones flourished.

I recommend that our government attempt to use nonviolent options. One option would be diplomacy because collaborating with other states would help to promote a culture of cooperation on the world stage. In addition, extraditing the target would maintain a drone program for emergency use, but attacking Americans must be prohibited without giving our citizens the due process of law. Each citizen, no matter the crimes they have committed or the place they reside in is entitled to a fair trial by jury of peers in order to conform to United States values. While I recognize the usefulness of drones in such fields as reconnaissance and emergency situations, I believe it would be better if we limited use to those fields.

Drone attacks on United States citizens must be stopped because they violate fundamental U.S. morals. Moreover these strikes can cause egregious civilian casualties. If our government continues to use strikes on people outside the U.S., when will the drones be turn on those in this country?

Thank you for your consideration on this matter. I believe it is an important issue, and would like to see legislation to ensure effective drone policy.

Sincerely,  
A Concerned Constituent,
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