

2017

For When the Sky is not the Limit: Non-Lethal Drone Use by Law Enforcement

Nicolette Spallanzani

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.shu.edu/student_scholarship



Part of the [Law Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Spallanzani, Nicolette, "For When the Sky is not the Limit: Non-Lethal Drone Use by Law Enforcement" (2017). *Law School Student Scholarship*. Paper 872.

http://scholarship.shu.edu/student_scholarship/872

Part I: Introduction

Michael Brown. Tamir Rice. Walter Scott. These three names gained notoriety across the United States in the past three years as unarmed African American males that died as a result of fatal police shootings.¹ In 2014, Michael Brown was shot and killed by police officer Darren Wilson, after Wilson received a call that Brown robbed a convenience store. Officer Wilson reported to the scene and, while there are differing reports of what happened that day, ultimately fired twelve rounds from his firearm, striking Brown and killing him.² Three months later twelve-year-old Tamir Rice was shot and killed by officer Timothy Loehmann after Rice pulled out a pellet gun out from his waistband. Officer Loehmann fired his own gun thinking the pellet gun was real. It was not discovered until after the shooting that the weapon was a toy gun.³ In April 2015, Walter Scott was shot and killed by officer Michael Slager who fired eight rounds into Walter's back as Walter ran away from the scene.⁴

Although the three scenarios recounted above might seem to suggest that the purpose of this article is to address police brutality or racial injustice it is not. Instead, the purpose of this article is to address the question of whether police officers would feel less inclined to discharge their weapons if they were operating a weaponized drone from above. While the thought of a police officer operating a weaponized drone might seem like a scene pulled from an action

¹ Larry Buchanan et al., *What Happened in Ferguson?*, NEW YORK TIMES, <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/08/13/us/ferguson-missouri-town-under-siege-after-police-shooting.html>; Ashley Fantz, Steve Almasy, & Catherine E. Shoichet, *Tamir Rice Shooting: No Charges for Officers*, CABLE NEWS NETWORK (Dec. 28, 2015), <http://www.cnn.com/2015/12/28/us/tamir-rice-shooting/>; Catherine E. Shoichet & Chandler Friedman, *Walter Scott Case: Michael Slager Released from Jail After Posting Bond*, CABLE NEWS NETWORK (Jan. 5, 2016), <http://www.cnn.com/2016/01/04/us/south-carolina-michael-slager-bail/>.

² Larry Buchanan et al., *What Happened in Ferguson?*, NEW YORK TIMES, <http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2014/08/13/us/ferguson-missouri-town-under-siege-after-police-shooting.html>.

³ Ashley Fantz, Steve Almasy, & Catherine E. Shoichet, *Tamir Rice Shooting: No Charges for Officers*, CABLE NEWS NETWORK (Dec. 28, 2015), <http://www.cnn.com/2015/12/28/us/tamir-rice-shooting/>.

⁴ Catherine E. Shoichet & Chandler Friedman, *Walter Scott Case: Michael Slager Released from Jail After Posting Bond*, CABLE NEWS NETWORK (Jan. 5, 2016), <http://www.cnn.com/2016/01/04/us/south-carolina-michael-slager-bail/>.

packed thriller movie, this situation is more realistic than most people think. In August 2015, North Dakota became the first state to allow police to equip drones with non-lethal weapons, including tasers and rubber bullets.⁵ While this law currently only affects a small portion of Americans, this legislation sets a precedent for other states to follow. Tennessee and South Carolina both introduced drone laws in their state legislatures at the end of last year that leave police the option to weaponize their drones.⁶

There are two theories behind the idea of weaponizing drones, but these theories developed as part of deploying drones overseas and as principles of international law.⁷ The first theory, one that opposes the deployment of weaponized drones, is a humanitarian view that holds deploying armed drones is wrong on all accounts because it dehumanizes war.⁸ It creates what is known as a “PlayStation mentality/phenomenon” and increases the likelihood that soldiers would be more willing to shoot people from a distance than up close.⁹ “Operators, rather than seeing human beings, perceive mere blips on a screen.”¹⁰ Proponents of this view believe that drones should not be weaponized or, at the least, calls for an end on using drones for indiscriminate killings.¹¹

The second philosophy is a protectionist view and supports the use of weaponized drones. The theory is that when a country is at war the less boots deployed on the ground is better

⁵ H.R. 1328, 64th Leg. (N.D. 2015).

⁶ Joe Wolverton, II, *Tennessee, South Carolina Could “Green Light” Weaponized Police Drones*, THE NEW AMERICAN (Dec. 3, 2015), <http://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/constitution/item/22238-tennessee-south-carolina-could-green-light-weaponized-police-drones>.

⁷ Frederic Megret, Symposium, *The Legal and Ethical Limits of Technological Warfare: The Humanitarian Problem with Drones*, 2013 UTAH L. REV. 1283 (2013).

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ Chris Cole, Mary Dobbing, & Amy Hailwood, *Convenient Killing: Armed Drones and the ‘PlayStation’ Mentality*, (September 2010), <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/54c00acde4b022a64cd0266b/t/5584a5d0e4b040d94305c96e/1434756560707/drones-conv-killing.pdf>.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ Hitomi Takemura, *Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: Humanization from International Humanitarian Law*, 32 WIS. INT’L L.J. 521 (Fall 2014).

because it also means fewer casualties.¹² “The idea that drones offer a low cost, low risk solution to conflict is a seductive one in military circles.”¹³ Military personnel are captivated by the fact that they can win a war without ever having to incur a single casualty.

The purpose of this article is to examine whether, under international theories of firing armed drones, deploying non-lethally weaponized drones above United States soil would make police officers more or less likely to shoot their weapon. It seeks to find whether it would create more hostilities between the American people and police or if it could decrease the building tension between the two parties. Part II of this article looks at the constitutionality of deploying armed drones above American soil. Part III delves into the history of drones, and their use in the military, and Part IV discusses current drone laws at the federal and state level. Part V discusses international policies about armed drones and applies those theories to domestic law. Part VI debates whether deploying non-lethally armed drones by law enforcement above the United States would help deescalate rising police tensions with the public or exacerbate it further.

Part II: Use of Force Under the Constitution

In *Mathews v. Eldridge* the court established framework for evaluating due process claims under the Fifth Amendment. Under the Social Security Act, George Eldridge started receiving disability benefits in June of 1968, but in March 1972, a state agency reassessed his condition and found that his disability should cease.¹⁴ Eldridge commenced an action arguing that the administrative processes used by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare were constitutionally invalid. Eldridge believed he should continue to receive benefits while his

¹² Frederic Megret, Symposium, *The Legal and Ethical Limits of Technological Warfare: The Humanitarian Problem with Drones*, 2013 UTAH L. REV. 1283 (2013).

¹³ Chris Cole, Mary Dobbing, & Amy Hailwood, *Convenient Killing: Armed Drones and the ‘PlayStation’ Mentality* (September 2010), <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/54c00acde4b022a64cd0266b/t/5584a5d0e4b040d94305c96e/1434756560707/drones-conv-killing.pdf>

¹⁴ *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

appeal was pending.¹⁵ In deciding whether the procedures in place were constitutionally adequate, the court looked at three different factors. “First, the private interest that will be affected by the official action; second, the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and [...]; finally the Government’s interest, including the function [...] and fiscal and administrative burdens that [...] procedural requirement would entail.”¹⁶ After examining these three factors, the court ruled in favor of the Secretary and held that administrative procedures fully corresponded with due process.¹⁷

The comparative case to assess the due process clause under the Fourteenth Amendment for a state claim is *Johnson v. Glick*. In *Johnson v. Glick*, Australia Johnson filed a complaint against the Warden of the Manhattan House of Detention for Men and Correction Officer John Fuller.¹⁸ Fuller had reprimanded Johnson for not following his instructions, but when Johnson explained that he was following the direction of another officer, Fuller hit Johnson twice over the head.¹⁹ After striking him in the head, Fuller left Johnson in a holding cell for two hours before returning him to his cell.²⁰ Later when Johnson requested medical attention, Fuller escorted Johnson from his cell and left him in a holding cell for another two hours before allowing him to see the doctor.²¹ The court discussed the Eighth Amendment, freedom from cruel and unusual punishment, as well as the Fourteenth Amendment, but decided that only the Fourteenth Amendment applied.²² “We assume that brutal police conduct violates the right guaranteed by the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.”²³

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ *Id.* at 349.

¹⁸ *Johnson v. Glick*, 481 F.2d 1028 (2nd Cir. 1973).

¹⁹ *Id.* at 1029.

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.* at 1030.

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.* at 1031.

However in 1989, the case *Graham v. Connor* overruled the decision of the *Johnson* court.²⁴ In *Graham*, a police officer stopped a car leaving a convenience store, after one of the passengers, in the car, Graham, was seen hastily leaving the store.²⁵ However, Graham was not robbing the store, but was a diabetic who felt the onset of an insulin reaction, and was waiting on line at the convenience store to buy orange juice.²⁶ When he realized the wait was too long, he exited the store and asked the driver of the car to drive him to a friend's house instead.²⁷ The police, however, would not listen to Graham's diabetic predicament and instead proceeded to arrest him using extreme force.²⁸ "At some point during his encounter with the police, Graham sustained a broken foot, cuts on his wrist, a bruised forehead, and an injured shoulder; he also claims to have developed a loud ringing in his right ear that continues to this day."²⁹

When the case was originally decided by the District Court, the Court held that the force used by the police violated Graham's Fourteenth Amendment right secured to him under due process of the law.³⁰ In analyzing due process, the court looked at the following factors,

(1) The need for the application of force; (2) the relationship between that need and the amount of force that was used; (3) the extent of the injury inflicted; and (4) "whether the force was applied in a good faith effort to maintain and restore discipline or maliciously and sadistically for the very purpose of causing harm."³¹

The Supreme Court decided against using the due process test to assess the violation of Graham's rights, and instead looked to the Fourth Amendment's prohibition against

"unreasonable search and seizure."³² "[A]ll claims that law enforcement officers have used

²⁴ *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989).

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989).

³¹ *Id.*

³² *Id.*

excessive force – deadly or not – in the course of an arrest, investigatory stop, or other ‘seizure’ of a free citizen should be analyzed under the Fourth Amendment and its objective ‘reasonableness’ standard, rather than under a ‘substantive due process’ approach.”³³ The Fourth Amendment analysis requires balancing the individual’s interest with the government’s stake.³⁴ Therefore, the Court determined that the district court erred in its decision, and the case was remanded to the lower court.

Part III: Drone Background

An unmanned aerial vehicle (“UAV”) or drone “is the popular description for anything that flies without a pilot at the controls, whether it is controlled directly by an operator on the ground or is capable of autonomous flight with no direct human intervention.”³⁵ Drones have received a firestorm of criticism and commentary in the past fifteen years during the “War on Terror” in Iraq and Afghanistan. However, this feat in modern technology is not as new as many people think.³⁶ “In World War II, radio-controlled B-24s were sent on bombing missions over Germany. Remotely controlled aircraft carried still cameras over battlefields in Vietnam. The Israeli Army used drones for surveillance and as decoys over Lebanon’s Bekaa Valley in 1982.”³⁷ In 1973, aerospace engineer Abe Karem created a new type of drone, known as Amber, which eventually adapted into the Gnat 750 under General Atomics.³⁸ This unprecedented piece of equipment could fly for twelve hours a time, and gave military commanders access to see as

³³ *Id.*

³⁴ *Id.*

³⁵ Mark Corcoran, *Drone Wars: The Definition Dogfight*, AUSTRALIAN BROADCASTING COMMISSION (Feb. 28, 2013), <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2013-03-01/drone-wars-the-definition-dogfight/4546598>.

³⁶ Ajoke Oyegunle, *Drones in the Homeland: A Potential Privacy Obstruction Under the Fourth Amendment and the Common Law Trespass Doctrine*, 21 *COMMLAW CONSPECTUS* 365, 370 (2013).

³⁷ Mark Bowden, *How the Predator Drone Changed the Character of War*, *SMITHSONIAN MAGAZINE* (November 2013) <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/how-the-predator-drone-changed-the-character-of-war-3794671/?no-ist>.

³⁸ *The Dronefather*, *THE ECONOMIST* (Dec. 1, 20102), <http://www.economist.com/news/technology-quarterly/21567205-abe-karem-created-robotic-plane-transformed-way-modern-warfare>.

far as sixty miles.³⁹ “By July 1994 General Atomics had incorporated satellite links into the Gnat itself, giving the drone a gently rounded nose that belied its pugnacious new name: Predator. America now had a platform that could loiter over a target area for days, provide infra-red and optical surveillance in all weathers.”⁴⁰

On February 4, 2002, the United States used a UAV in Afghanistan for the first targeted killing executed by a drone in American history. The Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) believed that the target was Osama bin Laden, but it was wrong.⁴¹ “After the February 2002 strike, military officials quickly acknowledged that the ‘tall man’ was not bin Laden. But they insisted the targets were ‘legitimate,’ although they struggled to explain why, using vague and even coy language to cover up what appeared to be uncertainty.”⁴² Since the drone strike in February of 2002, an increasingly large number of drone strikes have been carried out in the War on Terror. The Bureau of Investigative Journalism has estimated that just in Pakistan between 2004 and January 31, 2015, between 2,400 and 3,000 people have been killed, while over a thousand more have been injured.⁴³ In May of 2013, President Barak Obama acknowledged drone related deaths, especially of innocent civilians in the Middle East. He stated, “It is a hard fact that U.S. strikes have resulted in civilian casualties,” adding, “These deaths will haunt us.”⁴⁴

Drones Used to Kill United States Citizens Abroad

³⁹ Mark Bowden, *How the Predator Drone Changed the Character of War*, SMITHSONIAN MAGAZINE (November 2013) <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/how-the-predator-drone-changed-the-character-of-war-3794671/?no-ist>.

⁴⁰ *The Dronefather*, THE ECONOMIST (Dec. 1, 20102), <http://www.economist.com/news/technology-quarterly/21567205-abe-karem-created-robotic-plane-transformed-way-modern-warfare>.

⁴¹ John Sifton, *A Brief History of Drones*, THE NATION (Feb. 7, 2012), <http://www.thenation.com/article/brief-history-drones/>.

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ Jack Serle, *Almost 2,500 Now Killed by Covert US Drone Strikes Since Obama Inauguration Six Years Ago: The Bureau’s Report for January 2015*, THE BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIVE JOURNALISM (Feb. 2, 2015), <https://www.thebureauinvestigates.com/2015/02/02/almost-2500-killed-covert-us-drone-strikes-obama-inauguration/>.

⁴⁴ Fawaz Gerges, *Why Drone Strikes Are Real Enemy in ‘War on Terror’*, CABLE NEWS NETWORK (June 21, 2013), <http://www.cnn.com/2013/06/21/opinion/terrorism-gerges/>.

One of the most newsworthy stories about drones broke in May 2014 when the Justice Department made public a secret memo from 2011 that justified the killing of American terrorist suspects overseas. In September 2011, drones killed four United States citizens in Yemen, including cleric Anwar al-Awlaki, who was targeted by the CIA as the “head of foreign operations for al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula.”⁴⁵ In the years leading up to his death, al-Awlaki attempted multiple terrorist plots that were foiled. In 2009, al-Awlaki directed Umar Farouk Abdulmutallab to detonate a bomb hidden in his underwear on a Delta Airlines flight bound for Detroit on Christmas. Additionally, the instructions provided that Abdulmutallab detonate the bomb only after the plane was flying over U.S. soil.⁴⁶ Al-Awlaki was also involved in a 2010 terror plot to blow up a U.S. cargo plane by planting bombs into printers.⁴⁷ In addition to the death of al-Awlaki, three other American citizens were killed by drone strikes abroad. “Samir Kahn, Abdul Rahman Anwar al-Awlaki and Jude Kenan Mohammed were not targeted by the United States” but were killed nonetheless.⁴⁸ Abdul Rahman Anwar al-Awlaki, the 16-year-old son of Al-Awlaki, was killed about two weeks after his father in Pakistan.⁴⁹

The information about the drone strike became public after a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request was filed for the memo in the midst of the nomination of David J. Barron for a federal appeals court judgeship. Originally the federal court rejected the FOIA request, but the Second Circuit reversed and ordered the release of the memo.⁵⁰ Barron was a Harvard law

⁴⁵ Karen DeYoung & Sari Horowitz, *U.S. to Reveal Justification for Drone Strikes Against American Citizens*, THE WASHINGTON POST (May 20, 2014), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-to-reveal-justification-for-drone-strikes-against-american-citizens/2014/05/20/f607bb60-e066-11e3-8dcc-d6b7fede081a_story.html.

⁴⁶ Carol Cratty & Joe Johns, *Holder: Drone Strikes Have Killed Four Americans Since 2009*, CABLE NEWS NETWORK (May 23, 2013), <http://www.cnn.com/2013/05/22/politics/drone-strikes-americans/>

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ Andrew Westney, 2nd Circ. Releases Redacted Memo on Drone Attacks, LAW 360 (June 23, 2014), <http://www.law360.com/articles/550696/2nd-circ-releases-redacted-memo-on-drone-attacks>.

professor and authored the secret memo that legally justified the killings of American citizens abroad.⁵¹ Barron was eventually confirmed by the Senate, and currently serves on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit.⁵²

The Department of Justice White Paper entitled, “Lawfulness of a Lethal Operation Directed Against a U.S. Citizen Who Is a Senior Operational Leader of Al-Qa’ida or An Associate Force” sets out the legal reasoning for the constitutionality of killing an American citizen abroad involved in terrorist operations.⁵³

Here the Department of Justice concludes only that where the following three conditions are met, a U.S. operation using lethal force in a foreign country against a U.S. citizen who is a senior operational leader of al-Qa’ida or an associate force would be lawful: (1) an informed, high level official of the U.S. government has determined that the targeted individual poses an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States, (2) capture is infeasible, and the United States continues to monitor whether capture becomes feasible; and (3) the operation would be conducted in a manner consistent with applicable law of war principles.⁵⁴

The White Paper determined two sets of legal reasoning for the constitutionality of killing a U.S. citizen abroad.⁵⁵ The first legal basis is established under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, and the due process balancing test under *Mathews v. Eldridge*.⁵⁶ As mentioned above, under *Mathews*, the test for due process looks at three factors.⁵⁷ The test first looks at “the private interest that will be affected by the official action.”⁵⁸ Second it examines

⁵¹ Karen DeYoung & Sari Horowitz, *U.S. to Reveal Justification for Drone Strikes Against American Citizens*, THE WASHINGTON POST (May 20, 2014), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-to-reveal-justification-for-drone-strikes-against-american-citizens/2014/05/20/f607bb60-e066-11e3-8dcc-d6b7fede081a_story.html.

⁵² Adam Serwer, *Senate Confirms David Barron to be Federal Judge*, MSNBC (May 22, 2014), <http://www.msnbc.com/msnbc/david-barron-confirmed>.

⁵³ *Lawfulness of a Lethal Operation Directed Against a U.S. Citizen Who Is a Senior Operational Leader of Al-Qa’ida or An Associate Force*, Department of Justice White Paper (2011), http://msnbcmedia.msn.com/i/msnbc/sections/news/020413_DOJ_White_Paper.pdf.

⁵⁴ *Id.*

⁵⁵ *Id.*

⁵⁶ *Id.*

⁵⁷ *Mathews v. Eldridge*, 424 U.S. 319 (1976).

⁵⁸ *Id.* at 335.

“the risk of an erroneous deprivation of such interest through the procedures used, and the probable value, if any, of additional or substitute procedural safeguards.”⁵⁹ Lastly, the test examines “the Government's interest, including the function involved and the fiscal and administrative burdens that the additional or substitute procedural requirement would entail.”⁶⁰

Under the *Mathews* test, Barron justified the killing of al-Awlaki. Although there is no private interest more substantial than one’s own life, when it is balanced against the protection and lives of millions of Americans, the interest in killing one American citizen, who is also a terrorist is very compelling.⁶¹ “The realities of combat render certain uses of force ‘necessary and appropriate,’ including force against U.S. citizens who have joined enemy forces in the armed conflict against the United States and whose activities pose an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States – and ‘due process’ analysis need not blink at those realities.”⁶² The government has a substantial interest in protecting their citizens and preventing an imminent attack.⁶³

The second legal basis implemented by the White Paper is the Fourth Amendment’s unreasonable search and seizure. “The Supreme Court has made clear that the constitutionality of a seizure is determined by ‘balancing the nature and quality of the intrusion on the

⁵⁹ *Id.*

⁶⁰ *Id.*

⁶¹ *Lawfulness of a Lethal Operation Directed Against a U.S. Citizen Who Is a Senior Operational Leader of Al-Qa’ida or An Associate Force*, Department of Justice White Paper, pg. 6 (2011), http://msnbcmedia.msn.com/i/msnbc/sections/news/020413_DOJ_White_Paper.pdf.

⁶² *Id.*; *Hamdi v. Rumsfeld*, 542 U.S. 507, 531 (2004).

⁶³ *Id.*

individual's Fourth Amendment interest against the importance of the governmental interest alleged to justify the intrusion.”⁶⁴ In other words a “reasonableness test” is used.⁶⁵

In this circumstance, the reasonableness test weighs heavily in favor of killing a U.S. citizen, who is an al-Qaeda leader abroad in order to protect millions of U.S citizens living on American soil.⁶⁶

[I]n circumstances where the targeted person is an operational leader of an enemy force and an informed, high-level government official has determined that he poses an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States, and those conducting the operation would carry out the operation only-if capture were infeasible, the use of lethal force would not violate the Fourth Amendment.⁶⁷

When a U.S. citizen is a leader of a terrorist organization, it is constitutionally permissible for the U.S. government to kill that leader in another country, when they pose an imminent threat to the American people.⁶⁸

In a press conference regarding the memo President Obama was noted as saying, “For the record, I do not believe it would be constitutional for the government to target and kill any U.S. citizen – with a drone, or with a shotgun – without due process, nor should any president deploy armed drones over U.S. soil.”⁶⁹ Although no lethally weaponized drones have been approved to fly over American soil, North Dakota passed a law in April 2015 that allows law enforcement to deploy non-lethally weaponized drones against their residents.⁷⁰

Part IV: Drones Flying Over the United States

⁶⁴ *Lawfulness of a Lethal Operation Directed Against a U.S. Citizen Who Is a Senior Operational Leader of Al-Qa'ida or An Associate Force*, Department of Justice White Paper (2011), http://msnbcmedia.msn.com/i/msnbc/sections/news/020413_DOJ_White_Paper.pdf quoting *Tennessee v. Garner*, 471 U.S. 1, 8 (1985).

⁶⁵ *Id.*

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ *Id.*

⁶⁸ *Id.*

⁶⁹ Karen DeYoung & Sari Horowitz, *U.S. to Reveal Justification for Drone Strikes Against American Citizens*, THE WASHINGTON POST (May 20, 2014), https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/national-security/us-to-reveal-justification-for-drone-strikes-against-american-citizens/2014/05/20/f607bb60-e066-11e3-8dcc-d6b7fede081a_story.html.

⁷⁰ H.R. 1328(5)(1), 64th Leg. (N.D. 2015).

Until North Dakota passed their law in 2015, most state laws focused primarily on regulation of UAVs for surveillance purposes and for agricultural or hunting objectives. In February 2015, the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) under the Department of Transportation (“DOT”) set forth the federal government’s proposed rules on drone regulation.⁷¹ However, these are only *proposed* rules, and have no effect on the current states that have passed UAV legislation.

Federal Law

The FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012, which was established to decipher how to incorporate UAVs into the national airspace, prompted the formation of the “Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems.”⁷² Under the proposed rule, UAVs could be used for multiple purposes, including “crop monitoring and inspecting, research and development, educational and academic uses, power-line and pipeline inspection [...], antenna inspection, aiding certain rescue operations [...], bridge inspection, aerial photography, and wildlife nesting area evaluations.”⁷³ Operation of drones would need to adhere to strict limitations. Some of the restrictions established by the rule state that UAVs must weigh less than fifty-five pounds, be within the line of sight of the operator at all times, not fly over 100 miles per hour, and be flown only during the day.⁷⁴ Additionally, the operator of the drone would need to meet certain standards. For example, the operator would have to pass an

⁷¹ Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, 80 Fed. Reg. 9544 (proposed Feb. 23, 2015) (to be codified at 14 C.F.R. pt. 21, 43, 45, 47, 61, 91, 101, 107, and 183).

⁷² Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, 80 Fed. Reg. at 9544.

⁷³ Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, 80 Fed. Reg. at 9545.

⁷⁴ Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, 80 Fed. Reg. at 9546.

aeronautic knowledge test, the Transportation and Security Administration (TSA) would need to scrutinize the possible operator, and the operator would need to be at least 17 years old.⁷⁵

The requirements established by the FAA are an attempt to address two specific safety concerns.⁷⁶ “The first safety concern is whether the person operating the small unmanned aircraft, who would be physically separated from the aircraft during flight, would have the ability to see manned aircraft in the air in time to prevent a mid-air collision between the small unmanned aircraft and another aircraft.”⁷⁷ The second concern the rule attempts to correct is the possibility that the control link that connects the UAV with the operator’s control system would fail.⁷⁸ These are very valid safety concerns, but the proposed rule only reaches civilian operation of small UAVs. The regulations fail to reach law enforcement personnel or model aircrafts. A “model aircraft” is an “[unmanned aircraft system] (‘UAS’) that is used for hobby or recreational purposes.”⁷⁹ “To date the FAA has used its discretion to not bring enforcement action against model-aircraft operations that comply with AC 91-57. However, the use of discretion to permit continuing FAA statutes and regulations is not a viable long-term solutions of incorporating UAS operation into the [national air space].”⁸⁰ Advisory Circular 91-57 simply encourages that model aircraft flyers take precautions that do not harm those around them.⁸¹ This rule, however, is failing to work, as there are reports of drones flying in restricted airport flying space everyday on the news.⁸²

⁷⁵ *Id.*

⁷⁶ Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, 80 Fed. Reg. at 9548-49.

⁷⁷ Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, 80 Fed. Reg. at at 9548.

⁷⁸ Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, 80 Fed. Reg. at at 9549.

⁷⁹ Operation and Certification of Small Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, 80 Fed. Reg. at 9550.

⁸⁰ *Id.*

⁸¹ *Id.*

⁸² Bruce Bennett, *Report Finds Scores of Close Encounters Between Pilots, Drones*, CBS (Dec. 11, 2015), <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/drones-pilots-close-encounters-report/>.

On April 22, 2015, House Representative Michael C. Burgess from Texas introduced House Resolution 1939 to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 to prevent UAVs from operating in national airspace.⁸³ The amendment is known as the “No Armed Drones Act of 2015” (NADA). The main language of the statute says that the “Secretary of Transportation may not authorize a person to operate an unmanned aircraft system in the national airspace system for the purpose, in whole or in part, of using the unmanned aircraft system as a weapon or to deliver a weapon against a person or property.”⁸⁴ However, there is an exception for the Secretary of Transportation to permit armed public UAVs related to operations by US Customs and Border Protection, operations undertaken by the Department of Defense, and operations conducted by government entities for national defense purposes or in response to terrorism.⁸⁵ Although this bill has a long road before it is passed, if it were to pass it could preempt any state law that allows state law enforcement to equip their drones with lethal or non-lethal weapons.

State Laws

Twenty states—Arkansas, California, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia and West Virginia—have passed 26 pieces of legislation on drones.⁸⁶ States such as Hawaii, Maryland, and Illinois have not passed legislation in order to facilitate use of drones in their airspace, but have passed UAV laws to become more knowledgeable.⁸⁷ For example, Hawaii’s law discusses testing sites for drones, Illinois set up a

⁸³ No Armed Drones Act of 2015, H.R. 1939, 114th Congress (2015) *available at* <https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/house-bill/1939/text>.

⁸⁴ *Id.*

⁸⁵ *Id.*

⁸⁶ Current Unmanned Aircraft State Law Landscape, NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES (last updated Feb. 26, 2016), <http://www.ncsl.org/research/transportation/current-unmanned-aircraft-state-law-landscape.aspx>.

⁸⁷ *Id.*

task force to consider use of drones, and Maryland’s bill simply discusses the benefits of using UAVs.⁸⁸ Four other states have approved resolutions associated with drones, including Alaska, Georgia, New Mexico and Rhode Island.⁸⁹

When comparing all state drones laws, it seems a majority of the laws addressed the uses of UAVs for hunting and agricultural purposes. For example, Michigan has passed a law that prohibits operating a UAV “that uses aerodynamic force to achieve flight or that operates on the surface of the water or underwater, to affect animal or fish behavior in order to hinder or prevent the lawful taking of an animal or fish.”⁹⁰ In a similar line of thought, New Hampshire forbids conducting drone surveillance on those that are lawfully hunting, fishing, or trapping animals, unless prior written consent was given.⁹¹ Almost in direct opposition, West Virginia prohibits hunting animals with the assistance of a UAV.⁹² Louisiana is an outlier state that strictly regulates procedures of drones for agricultural purposes.⁹³

Other drone laws that have been passed address the issue of privacy. Arkansas for example has a bill that addresses the use of unmanned aerial vehicles for voyeurism.⁹⁴ The statute reads, “It is unlawful to knowingly use an unmanned vehicle or aircraft...that is concealed, flown in a manner to escape detection, or disguised to secretly or surreptitiously videotape, film, photograph, record, or view by electronic means a person” without their consent and without their knowledge for one’s own gratification.⁹⁵ California passed its law on UAVs in

⁸⁸ S.B. 661, 28th Leg. (Haw. 2015); S.B. 44, 9th Leg. (Ill. 2015); S.B. 370 (Md. 2015).

⁸⁹ *Supra* note 86.

⁹⁰ S.B. 54, 98th Leg. (Mich. 2015).

⁹¹ S.B. 22 (N.H. 2015).

⁹² H.B. 2515 (W. Va. 2015).

⁹³ S.B. 183 (La. 2015).

⁹⁴ H.B. 1770, 90th Leg. (Ark. 2015).

⁹⁵ *Id.*

response to the paparazzi's use of drones for spying on celebrities, and discusses issues of trespass and invasion of privacy.⁹⁶

“A person is liable for physical invasion of privacy when the person knowingly enters onto the land or into the airspace above the land of another person without permission or otherwise commits a trespass in order to capture any visual image, sound recording or other physical impression of the plaintiff engaging in a private, personal, or familial activity and the invasion occurs in a manner that is offensive to a reasonable person.”⁹⁷

Mississippi's law concerns privacy as well and criminalizes using UAVs for “peeping toms.”⁹⁸

Other states have chosen to strictly regulate law enforcement use of drones. Florida's “Freedom from Unwarranted Surveillance Act” is very comprehensive, and allows Florida law enforcement a wide range of uses for drones.⁹⁹ Law enforcement agencies are allowed to use drones for surveillance and investigation if they first obtain a warrant signed by a judge.¹⁰⁰ The police are also allowed to use UAVs if “swift action is needed to prevent imminent danger to life or serious damage to property, to forestall the imminent escape of a suspect or the destruction of evidence, or to achieve purposes including, but not limited to, facilitating the search for a missing person.”¹⁰¹ Additionally, law enforcement can use UAVs to counter a possible terroristic threat if deemed credible by Homeland Security.¹⁰² Utah is another state that allows law enforcement to “obtain, receive, or use data acquired through” a UAV if the information is received pursuant to a warrant or “to locate a lost or missing person in an area in which a person has no reasonable expectation of privacy.”¹⁰³ In addition, Utah's drone law, entitled, the “Government Use of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles,” statute sets forth data retention and reporting

⁹⁶ Assemb. B. 856 (Cal. 2015).

⁹⁷ *Id.*

⁹⁸ S.B. 2022 (Miss. 2015).

⁹⁹ S.B. 766 (Fla. 2015).

¹⁰⁰ *Id.*

¹⁰¹ *Id.*

¹⁰² *Id.*

¹⁰³ H.B. 296 (Utah 2015).

requirements.¹⁰⁴ Furthermore, Virginia allows law enforcement to investigate suspects with a UAV pursuant to a warrant, but also allows police to use a drone without a warrant in certain exceptions, including Amber Alerts, Senior Alerts, Blue Alerts, and where there is immediate danger to any person.¹⁰⁵ Nevada is another state that allows drones to be used by law enforcement after first obtaining a warrant.¹⁰⁶ However, they also include five exceptions to the warrant provision, which includes if “a person has committed a crime, is committing a crime, or is about to commit a crime” and if there is an imminent threat to an individual or the public.¹⁰⁷ Nevada also sets forth a provision prohibiting the weaponization of UAVs, but this section presumably criminalizes these actions for civilians.¹⁰⁸ It does not make mention of Nevada law enforcement weaponizing drones. Maine is similar to other law enforcement drones in requiring a warrant for an investigation with the assistance of a drone; however, they also set minimum standards for the operators of the drone, including training and certification requirements.¹⁰⁹

Oregon’s drone legislation discusses law enforcement’s use of drones, and it is very comprehensive. Like most states, Oregon allows drones to help the police after they have obtained a warrant or if there is an emergency situation.¹¹⁰ However, they also have a specific section discussing register requirements, and the filing of annual reports.¹¹¹ Most noteworthy is Section 9, which states, “A public body may not operate an unmanned aircraft system that is capable of firing a bullet or other projectile, directing a laser, or otherwise being used as a weapon.”¹¹² This law is in direct opposition to North Dakota’s law that has just recently been

¹⁰⁴ *Id.*

¹⁰⁵ H.B. 2125 (Va. 2015); S.B. 1301 (Va. 2015).

¹⁰⁶ Assemb. B. 239, 78th Leg. (Nev. 2015).

¹⁰⁷ *Id.*

¹⁰⁸ *Id.*

¹⁰⁹ Legis. Doc. 25 (Me. 2015).

¹¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹¹ *Id.*

¹¹² *Id.*

passed.

North Dakota drone law enacted on April 15, 2015, has garnered much media attention.¹¹³ Section 5 of North Dakota law HB 1238 states, a “law enforcement agency may not authorize the use of, including granting a permit to use, an unmanned aerial vehicle armed with lethal weapons.”¹¹⁴ However, although this law specifically prohibits lethal weapons, there is no limit on non-lethal weapons, which include, tasers, rubber bullets, bean, bags, and tear gas.¹¹⁵ Originally, the objective of introducing UAV legislation in North Dakota was to require police to obtain a warrant before investigating with the use of a drone. It was also supposed to prohibit the weaponization of drones.¹¹⁶ However, after intense lobbying from law enforcement groups, legislation was passed with a loophole that allowed the installation of non-lethal weapons on drones.¹¹⁷ The law specifically states that a law enforcement agency cannot use a UAV armed with lethal weapons, but makes no mention of non-lethal weapons.¹¹⁸

North Dakota representative Rick Becker, sponsor of the original bill, vows to try to reverse this portion of the law when the House reconvenes in two years.¹¹⁹ In order to pass the section of the bill that requires police to acquire a search warrant when using a drone, Becker was forced to make concessions on the issue of weaponizing drones.¹²⁰

This North Dakota law is in direct opposition to the American Civil Liberties Union, which has expressed its view that UAVs should not be equipped with lethal or non-lethal

¹¹³ H.R. 1328, 64th Leg. (N.D. 2015).

¹¹⁴ *Id.*

¹¹⁵ Laura Wagner, *North Dakota Legalizes Armed Police Drones*, NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO (Aug. 27, 2015), <http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2015/08/27/435301160/north-dakota-legalizes-armed-police-drones>.

¹¹⁶ *Id.*

¹¹⁷ *Id.*

¹¹⁸ *Id.*

¹¹⁹ *Id.*

¹²⁰ *Id.*

weapons.¹²¹ Tasers, for example, deliver a 50,000-volt shock, and are designed to override the subject's central nervous system.¹²² Amnesty International reported that since 2001 there have been 670 deaths from tasers.¹²³ In 2015, police tasers had killed at least 39 people in the U.S. by August. "Rubber bullets, beanbags and tear gas canisters have also caused extensive injuries and even death."¹²⁴

Part V: International Humanitarian Law Compared to the Reasonableness Standard of Domestic Policing

At the core of international humanitarian law (IHL) are four fundamental principles: humanity, distinction, necessity, and proportionality.¹²⁵ Humanity is the understanding that people have the capability to show compassion and respect to all people, even their enemies.¹²⁶ Distinction means that parties to an armed conflict should only target militarized areas and avoid heavily populated civilian areas.¹²⁷ Necessity is the third element and while international law recognizes that destruction and casualties are a byproduct of war, it also understands that opposing parties do not have free range to do whatever they want. Necessity means that a party's objective cannot be achieved by any other means.¹²⁸ The final principle examines proportionality. "IHL proportionality is rooted in humanitarianism. An attack is proportionate

¹²¹ *Domestic Drones*, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, <https://www.aclu.org/issues/privacy-technology/surveillance-technologies/domestic-drones>

¹²² Michelle E. McStravick, *The Shocking Truth: Law Enforcement's Use and Abuse of Tasers and the Need for Reform*, 56 VILL. L. REV. 363, 372 (2011).

¹²³ Karen Kucher, *Tasers Give Cops an Option to Gun, but Risks Exists*, SAN DIEGO UNION TRIBUNE (Jan. 2, 2016), <http://www.sandiegouniontribune.com/news/2016/jan/02/tasers-offer-cops-option-to-guns-but-come-with/>

¹²⁴ *Supra* note 125.

¹²⁵ David Akerson, *Applying Jus In Bello Proportionality to Drone Warfare*, 16 OR. REV. INT'L. L. 173 (2014).

¹²⁶ IHL Resource Center, *Basic Principles of IHL* (Oct. 30, 2013), <https://www.diakonia.se/en/ihl/the-law/international-humanitarian-law-1/introduction-to-ihl/principles-of-international-law/>.

¹²⁷ Rule of Law in Armed Conflicts Project, *International Humanitarian Law*, GENEVA ACADEMY OF INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW AND HUMAN RIGHTS, http://www.geneva-academy.ch/RULAC/international_humanitarian_law.php.

¹²⁸ *Supra* note 135.

when the expected civilian harm is not excessive in relation to the expected value of the attack.”¹²⁹

The advantages to using drones in a military setting are very clear. First, military drones decrease casualties.¹³⁰ When attacking an opposing military target, soldiers can sit far away in a control room without having to risk their lives on the battlefield.¹³¹ Second, drones cost less money to operate, can fly for longer periods of time, and do not have the limitations that restrict humans.¹³² UAVs “are cheaper to make and carry an array of sensors and cameras that can watch both day and night. Without a pilot, drones can fly at altitudes up to 33,000 feet without needing pressurization and temperature control.”¹³³ Furthermore, unlike a pilot, drones do not get drowsy or drained.¹³⁴ Pilots in the air cannot simply switch operators midflight, while drone operators can continuously rotate in a control room. Some drones can be kept in the air for over 40 hours of flight.¹³⁵ Lastly, drones “greatly reduc[e] the time between the identification of a potential target that could be a great distance away and the deployment of deadly force against that target.”¹³⁶

Although there are many advantages to using drones in a war setting, there is a distinct drawback in using an armed drone in armed conflict. Detaching an individual from the battle creates a conflict with the first principle of IHL, humanity. “There is, symbolically, an

¹²⁹ Hitomi Takemura, *Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: Humanization from International Humanitarian Law*, 32 WIS. INT’L L.J. 521 (Fall 2014).

¹³⁰ Chris Cole, Mary Dobbins, & Amy Hailwood, *Convenient Killing: Armed Drones and the ‘PlayStation’ Mentality* (September 2010), <http://static1.squarespace.com/static/54c00acde4b022a64cd0266b/t/5584a5d0e4b040d94305c96e/1434756560707/drones-conv-killing.pdf>.

¹³¹ *Id.*

¹³² *Id.*

¹³³ *Id.*

¹³⁴ *Id.*

¹³⁵ *Id.*

¹³⁶ Special Rapporteur, *Promotion and Protection of Human Rights: Human Rights Questions, Including Alternative Approaches for Improving the Effective Enjoyment of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*, U.N. Doc. 68/382, ¶18, U.N. GAOR, 68th Sess. (Sep. 13, 2013) (by Christof Heyns).

extraordinarily dehumanizing aspect to drone warfare in that it deprives, its targets, from ever even being able to engage in a humanitarian gesture that would manifest their good will and constitute as moral agents of war.”¹³⁷

Although drones have only been used in armed conflicts abroad, there have been discussions about using lethally armed drones strikes on American soil to stop domestic terrorists. Discussions on this controversial topic arose after President Barak Obama ordered the targeted drone killing of al-Alwaki, the al-Qaeda leader and American citizen. It was ultimately ruled that the killing was constitutional, but it also queried whether a targeted killing of an American citizen could be undertaken on American soil.¹³⁸ The Authorization for the Use of Military Force (AUMF), coupled with the laws of armed conflict, creates a sufficient basis for United States military to use an armed drone to target American citizen terrorists on American soil.¹³⁹ There are certain precautions and threshold requirement that the U.S military must meet before they follow through with a targeted killing. “First, the U.S. government has determined after a thorough and careful review, that the individual poses an imminent threat of violent attack against the United States; second, capture is not feasible; and third the operation would be conducted in a manner consistent with applicable law of war principles.”¹⁴⁰

Although it has been established that the United States military can use armed drones against American citizens that are terrorists, the question arises as to whether armed drones can be used on American citizens who are not terrorists, but who are criminals that commit heinous acts. The Posse Comitatus Act “was enacted after the Civil War to keep local civilian law

¹³⁷ Frederic Megret, *The Legal and Ethical Limits of Technological Warfare: The Humanitarian Problem with Drones*, 2013 UTAH L. REV. 1283 (2013).

¹³⁸ Marshall Thompson, *The Legality of Armed Drone Strikes against U.S. Citizens within the United States*, 2013 B.Y.U.L. REV. 153 (2013).

¹³⁹ *Id.*

¹⁴⁰ *Id.* at 170.

enforcement from using military personnel and equipment. It stands for the principle that the military should never be used to enforce civil laws in the United States.”¹⁴¹ This would presumably prevent the local law enforcement from using armed drones on their own because drones first started as military equipment. However, 10 U.S.C. §372, titled the Use of Military Equipment and Facilities, states, “The Secretary of Defense may, in accordance with other applicable law, make available any equipment (including associated supplies or spare parts), base facility, or research facility of the Department of Defense to any Federal, State, or local civilian law enforcement official for law enforcement purposes.”¹⁴² This act would allow for military equipment, such as drones, to be utilized by law enforcement officials for policing purposes.¹⁴³

Part VI: Analysis

The core humanitarian principles, specifically proportionality, used in international law can be compared to the use of force and reasonableness requirements found in the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution, and the holding of *Graham v. Connor*. While the proportionality principle looks at civilian harm compared to the expected value of the attack, the Fourth Amendment’s balancing test requires evaluating the individual’s interest in comparison to the government’s stake.¹⁴⁴ When conducting a Fourth Amendment analysis of excessive force it is necessary to look at “(1) the severity of the crime at issue, (2) whether the suspect poses an immediate threat to the safety of the officers or others; and (3) whether he is actively resisting arrest or attempting to evade arrest by flight.”¹⁴⁵ Put simply, did the officer take reasonable action? While armed drones have become an increasing presence in war, international law

¹⁴¹ *Id.* at 167.

¹⁴² 10 U.S.C. §372 (2015).

¹⁴³ Eric Brumfield, *Armed Drones for Law Enforcement: Why it Might be Time to Re-Examine the Current Use of Force Standard*, 46 MCGEORGE L. REV. 543, 550 (2014).

¹⁴⁴ *Graham v. Connor*, 490 U.S. 386 (1989).

¹⁴⁵ Michelle E. McStravick, *The Shocking Truth: Law Enforcement’s Use and Abuse of Tasers and the Need for Reform*, 56 VILL. L. REV. 363, 372 (2011).

scholars have debated whether the existence of armed drones has had a positive or negative impact on war.¹⁴⁶ These findings can be used to help decipher whether deploying armed drones by law enforcement officials in the United States will escalate or diminish the problem of police brutality in America. Based on all the information set forth above, allowing local police departments to deploy non-lethally armed drones on American soil would only escalate tensions between the American people and law enforcement, and should be completely banned.

Deploying armed drones by law enforcement officials in the United States could bring many of the same benefits drones have provided in a war setting, most importantly protection of police officers. Cases of police brutality have been springing up across the country, and while some police officers abuse their power and are too quick to shoot, many cases involve police officers that are generally fearful for their lives and believe they are in a life-threatening situation.¹⁴⁷ At Washington State University Spokane, officers are participating in a study with a state of the art stimulator known as the Violence Confrontation Lab.¹⁴⁸ One reporter from the media outlet Today “observed on monitors as one officer walked through a realistic scenario, during which a simulated suspect fired on him and the officer returned fire. Within 1.1 seconds, the suspect fired twice and the officer fired four times.”¹⁴⁹ The reporter was then able to test the simulator himself. In his simulation a suspect appeared and pulled out an object the reporter believed to be a gun and started firing.¹⁵⁰ The object was not a gun, however, but simply a beer

¹⁴⁶ David Akerson, *Applying Jus In Bello Proportionality to Drone Warfare*, 16 OR. REV. INT’L. L. 173 (2014) *contra* Doyle McManus, *The Drone Warfare Drawbacks* (July 5, 2014), <http://www.latimes.com/opinion/op-ed/la-oe-mcmanus-column-drones-20140706-column.html>.

¹⁴⁷ *Supra* note 1.

¹⁴⁸ Jeff Rossen & Josh Davis, *To Shoot or Not to Shoot? Researches Test How Police React to Danger*, TODAY (Feb. 24, 2015) <http://www.today.com/news/shoot-or-not-shoot-researchers-test-how-police-react-danger-t4961>; Linda Byron, *WSU Lab Studies the Science Behind Police Shootings*, NBC KING 5 (Apr. 23, 2015), <http://www.king5.com/story/news/2015/04/23/wsuv-violence-confrontation-lab-police/26271391/>.

¹⁴⁹ Jeff Rossen & Josh Davis, *To Shoot or Not to Shoot? Researches Test How Police React to Danger*, TODAY (Feb. 24, 2015) <http://www.today.com/news/shoot-or-not-shoot-researchers-test-how-police-react-danger-t4961>.

¹⁵⁰ *Id.*

bottle.¹⁵¹ It can be very difficult for officers to determine whether objects are guns or something else, but if a suspect does pull out a gun, the police officer could be dead before they have time to decide.

The appeal of non-lethally armed drones is that they can limit police officer's exposure to these life-threatening situations while also deescalating the situation with a non-deadly alternative. While this is definitely an attractive alternate, it also raises some important questions: would a decrease in a threatening situation give police officers more reaction time causing them to be less likely to shoot? Or would the distance between a police officer and a possible suspect make them more likely to shoot from a drone that possesses a non-lethal weapon?

The latter question has been addressed at the international level and has been dubbed the "PlayStation mentality/phenomenon."¹⁵² The PlayStation theory states that "it is less likely that a person controlling a remote drone will hesitate to use lethal force because physical distance can break the psychological barrier that inhibits one person from killing another human being. Armed drones can diminish the deterrent effects of war by rendering death akin to virtual reality."¹⁵³ Regarding law enforcement use of drones, although police are not using lethal force, the PlayStation theory can still apply. In fact, it may even apply more aptly because of the lack of lethal force. If police officers think that they can only temporarily harm a suspect, it may give them greater incentive to shoot a taser or use a beanbag cannon to apprehend a suspect.

¹⁵¹ *Id.*

¹⁵² Hitomi Takemura, *Unmanned Aerial Vehicles: Humanization from International Humanitarian Law*, 32 *WIS. INT'L L.J.* 521 (Fall 2014).

¹⁵³ *Id.*

“[D]isconnecting a person from armed conflict, ‘especially via distance, makes killing easier and [makes] abuses and atrocities more likely’ to occur.”¹⁵⁴

Although weaponized drones, lethal or non-lethal, should not be used by law enforcement personnel in America that does not mean that drones should be banned completely. Drones that can be used for surveillance purposes should be embraced with proper regulation.¹⁵⁵ In fact, one of the reasons drones were first introduced in America was for the specific purpose of surveillance. In 2004, the US Customs and Border Protection (CBP) had its first test flight of an unmanned drone, and in October 2005, the CBP used a drone to fly along the US-Mexican border.¹⁵⁶ Currently drones along the US borders are being used for three purposes: patrolling the borders, investigating crimes, and disaster response.¹⁵⁷ American states without drone laws should follow the direction of states such as Utah, Virginia, Nevada, Maine, Florida, and Oregon that have passed laws allowing drones to be used, pursuant to a warrant, when obtaining information about ongoing criminal investigations or in dire circumstances such as locating a missing person.¹⁵⁸ Drones have the potential to aid law enforcement without the need for weapons or violence. In fact, North Dakota was the first state to use a drone in a lawful arrest.¹⁵⁹ Rodney Brossart was arrested after six cows wandered onto his farm and he refused to return them. Police were called to the scene and after a 16-hour armed standoff police used a predator drone on loan from the Department of Homeland Security’s Customs and Border Patrol to help

¹⁵⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵⁵ *Domestic Drones*, AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION, <https://www.aclu.org/issues/privacy-technology/surveillance-technologies/domestic-drones>.

¹⁵⁶ Arthur Holland Michel, *Customs and Border Protection Drones*, CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE DRONE AT BARD COLLEGE (Jan. 7, 2015), <http://dronecenter.bard.edu/customs-and-border-protection-drones/>.

¹⁵⁷ *Id.*

¹⁵⁸ *Supra* note 86.

¹⁵⁹ Jason Keobler, *North Dakota Man Sentenced to Jail in Controversial Drone-Arrest Case*, US NEWS (Jan. 15, 2014) available at <http://www.usnews.com/news/articles/2014/01/15/north-dakota-man-sentenced-to-jail-in-controversial-drone-arrest-case>.

the situation.¹⁶⁰ “The drone was able to locate Brossart and his three armed sons on the property and let police know it was safe to make an arrest.”¹⁶¹ Drones, when used in a surveillance capacity, are very beneficial for law enforcement, but using non-lethally weaponized drones is too unpredictable, and could escalate the tensions between police and citizens even further.

Part VII: Conclusion

Law HB 1238, allowing non-lethal drone use by law enforcement in North Dakota, is still so new that there has been little time for people to truly gain a grasp on the issue. However, the law does set precedent for future states to follow, and South Carolina and Tennessee have already contemplated the subject by placing the issue on the table for their legislature to debate. Deploying armed drones across the United States has many appealing features including the protection and safety of police officers, but it also has many drawbacks. Drones eliminate human interaction between police officers and the public they are tasked with protecting. By examining the use of UAVs internationally, it can be determined that introducing non-lethally armed drones in America is a terrible idea. The “PlayStation mentality” provides a menacing picture of what could happen if armed drones are introduced into the police force, and with a country already overflowing with allegations of police brutality, armed drones will be another distraction. If law enforcement is going to continue using drones, they should be doing so in a surveillance capacity. Whether drone laws continue to embrace North Dakota’s position or regress from the stance is a question that can only be answered with time. Whatever one’s opinions on the subject however, drones are here to stay. President Barak Obama said it best, “I think creating a legal structure, processes, with oversight checks on how we use unmanned

¹⁶⁰ *Id.*

¹⁶¹ *Id.*

weapons is going to be a challenge for me and for my successors for some time to come.”¹⁶²

¹⁶² Mark Bowden, *How the Predator Drone Changed the Character of War*, SMITHSONIAN MAGAZINE (November 2013), available at <http://www.smithsonianmag.com/history/how-the-predator-drone-changed-the-character-of-war-3794671/?no-ist=&page=2>.