Dear Mary Landrieu,

In a post 9-11 America, it is important to consider weapons like drones a major asset to our military and intelligence forces, even if they do cause great distrust between some of our allied nations, like Pakistan. Drones can be sent without putting US soldiers in direct danger. They can be navigated with great accuracy and can have small destruction areas. They can be used as surveillance on foreign and domestic threats. Considering the benefits of using drones in battle, it is not a question of whether or not they should be legal, but when they should be used.

Without immediate threat, launching any sort of high level destruction weapons should be prohibited. There is an expression that goes “There is no need to stir up the hornets’ nest”. This expression relates to how the situation with Al-Awlaki should have been handled. Right now the world perceives America as an aggressive force. The people who attack the US are attacking out of fear. They see us as a threat. Many Americans will argue that this is a good thing. You might even be thinking this right now. But, think about it like this, other nations may want to eliminate the threat in their lives like we might want to eliminate the threat of a hornets’ nest in our yard. America should become a nation that is seen as strong, but not aggressive. We should keep defensive methods high, but a plan should be devised to slim our presence of offensive systems, such as ground troops. Many people would argue that in making people see America this way that we would become an easy target. In reality, being seen this way will make us look like less of a threat. It is easier to trust someone who does not have guns pointed your way. This is a part of a puzzle to end the war on terror. When everyone becomes less threatened by other countries, it is much easier for everyone to be at peace.

As a United States citizen, it has been engraved in our brains that we are entitled, by right, to a certain amount of privacy and liberty, due to what is written in the Constitution. The government often struggles to decide whether to put liberty over security of citizens. As an example, there are cases of the government using thermo-imaging to monitor houses suspected of growing marijuana without getting a warrant. This caused a large controversy because this can be considered a violation of privacy and the fourth amendment, but others argued that catching these people with a warrant can be difficult. For the people who are doing nothing illegal, having their homes scanned will not harm anyone in anyway. This is how the drones should be treated as well. As long as the drones are used to catch enemies, do no harm to allies or the innocent, they will be exceptional additions to the US forces.

The benefits of the drones outweigh the disadvantages; however, when using weapons like these in other countries we should be very respectful to their rules, citizens, and territory. The use of these weapons should be minimal. Specific guidelines should be put in place when dealing with enemies within allied borders. As my Congressperson, I implore you to address this gray area of the use of drones. This is an important detail that was disputed in the Al-Awlaki case, and could possibly put in danger the use of drones as a vital surveillance tool.

Sincerely,

Concerned American Citizen