

# 13sp2 rebuttal argument

Linguistics, English



## ENG 122-751 of Assignment Editorial Rebuttal: To Kill an American

Introduction A New York Times editorial d February 5, tackled about the moral, legal, and administrative issues confronting the newly exposed white paper which serves as a legal basis for killing alleged Al Qaeda operational leaders or its allies. The editorial writer/s stood up for their beliefs that the paper is a clear manifestation of inconsistency entitling any American citizen to a due process and fair trial. In addition, their beliefs are also firmed in saying that there should be a civilian judge or a separate special court that will take charge of sensitive issues like those involving terrorist group in order to follow fair rules. I firmly believe that the U. S. government, on issues that involve the safety, welfare, and national security of its citizens, is entitled to impose the most effective means of waging war on terror especially that from the very beginning, the state enemy has clearly not followed any fair rules of engagement.

## Points/Arguments

NY Times editor/s agreed to a statement released by the American Civil Liberties arguing that every American citizen has their “ constitutional rights” that the judiciary “ must respect” (“ To Kill” par. 6). That stance must be agreeable to any American citizen who commits a crime. However, history has taught us that even President Lincoln needed not issue an executive order announcing he allowed thousands of Confederates to be killed simply because there were sufficient evidence to support that they were threats to the growth and progress of the New World. There are a lot of differences between an American transgressor who commits a crime of theft and robbery compared to any Al Qaeda member who brutally killed thousands of

people all over the world, or helped suicide bombing and hijacking to be possible. If there are sufficient evidence pointing out that that person is an authentic Al Qaeda operative, it gives the federal authority the discretion to exert whatever means it sees fit for the situation.

Furthermore, the Constitution entitles the authority to declare war or allowed an act of violence against a defined enemy, and for no other reasons, the CIA and other related agencies know exactly who the enemies are. However, that principle alone does not also entitled the executive or the authority to make fast decisions in killing an alleged terrorist member or ally. There must also be consensus and coordination between the executive and the legislative branch, the latter being responsible for the Constitution. Lastly, fair rules of engagement in waging war against terrorists, citizens or noncitizens are already outdated in this age because terrorists themselves do not define whether they live as civilians or the enemies of the government. As a result, it is impossible to know what kind of laws apply to these people in question (" To Kill" par. 11).

#### Conclusion

There were already sufficient evidence to prove that some U. S. citizens are active Al Qaeda members; therefore, there is no need to issue a memorandum to the public announcing the authority's basis for killing those people in question. Second, the Constitution itself entitles the state to use acts of violence to a defined enemy, especially which they are threats to the national security. Lastly, there are no fair rules of engagement nowadays because terrorist themselves do not clearly define whether they function as enemies or civilians, and therefore, laws applied to them are vague.

Work Cited

“ To Kill an American.” Editorial. New York Times. New York Times, 5

February 2013. Web. 11

February 2013.