Dear Senator Vitter,

We are aware that you did not support the filibuster that was opposed to the use of military drones to kill American citizens within United States borders. Although you do not state your position on the use of drones outside of U.S. borders, we ask that you reconsider your entire policy regarding the usage of drone technology to kill American citizens. We would advise you against supporting the president’s current policy about the use of drones. We strongly believe that our constitutional rights as citizen of the United States protect us from drone attacks, whether it occurs on foreign or American soil. We do, however, agree that under extreme circumstances, drone technology is vital for the protection of our nation. For example, if we knew for certain that al-Awlaki was threatening the immediate safety of American citizens, drone action should be carried out instantaneously. We understand why the president took immediate action, but given that we are not certain he was endangering American citizens in the near future, we believe that the drone attack should have occurred at a later date. Because al-Awlaki was an American citizen, he also has the constitutional right to trial by jury. He was not given this opportunity due to the president’s deployment of the drones. Not to mention, al-Awlaki’s sixteen-year-old son was also killed in the attack. Given that he was an American citizen with no criminal record, we are forced to believe he was an innocent casualty. In the United States, someone charged with a crime is innocent until they are proven guilty. Taking this into consideration, if the president decides to kill American citizens on foreign soil, there is nothing keeping him from taking action upon American citizens within our borders.

We believe that you should investigate the legality of the president’s decision to use drone technology to kill al-Awlaki, an American citizen. As we have previously stated, the president’s decision to use drones to kill American citizens prior to them being tried before a jury completely ignores an American’s constitutional rights. Laws cannot be ignored by anyone, especially the president. If he breaks laws, he is seen as unpredictable and does not appear to have our country’s best interests in mind.

Regarding the current drone policy, we would recommend that we legalize the use of drones on American citizens outside our borders only of the suspect in question is threatening the immediate safety or national security of the United States. In addition, someone who is endangering the current safety of our country waives their constitutional right to a trial by jury. This would prevent the violation of constitutional rights and the breaking of laws by the president and other parties involved. In conclusion, although we do not believe this is the most ethical solution, we see the dire circumstances in which the drone action was taken and believe something could be done to prevent the violation of constitutional rights in the future.