

1 June 2017

Mr. David Vitter

Louisiana State Senator

U.S. Senate

Capitol Hill

Washington D.C., 20510

Dear Senator Vitter,

I am contacting you to address the issues that arise within national security policies. Lately, I have been hearing a myriad of controversy pertaining to the legality of President Obama's administration's actions when dispatching the alleged threat, Anwar al-Awlaki. Therefore, specifically, I wish to talk about the security policies related to unmanned drones. I would also like to discuss some things that should be changed or added to make the current security policies on drone warfare more efficient.

I feel you should support Obama's current policy on drones. Al-Awlaki was a U.S. citizen when he was targeted. If not legal, Obama's Administration were justified. Al-Awlaki was disloyal to the U.S.. The trouble was that he was only loyal to his own terrorist group, which is why his citizenship was never revoked. The C.I.A. has hard evidence that this man was planning on an attack on our U.S. soldiers that were stationed in Afghanistan. He planned to kill them. So the President acted first.

Other people that I conversed with asked if you should draw up a trial on the behalf of al-Awlaki's natural rights, since he was still a U.S. citizen when Obama targeted him. Even if you did succeed in starting a trial to test if what the President's Administration was constitutional, there is still so much evidence arguing the innocence of al-Awlaki. The President acted based on a balance of choices. The many lives of the American soldiers who were threatened by this man weighed more than that of al-Awlaki and his innocent son. It is very difficult to argue that a man was wronged, when the only reason he wasn't convicted of treason was because he was only affiliated with his own handcrafted terrorist group

Drone operations should only be performed when certain that the target is a group of hostile personnel with no immediate possibilities of civilian casualties. For example, when the C.I.A. was searching for Osama Bin Laden, they had inaccurate information on his whereabouts. The C.I.A. bombed where they thought he was, and ended up bombing the wrong place. Then eventually, the Navy went out and used men to eliminate him. When trying to kill one target, it's

unnecessary to use such powerful explosives; it's the equivalent of trying to kill a single roach with a hand grenade.

There also needs to be a greater focus on the rules and procedures related to when drone missions go wrong and innocent are injured and killed. Most of the civilian casualty statements in the national security is unclear, other than a statement saying that innocent wounded during drone missions were to be monetarily compensated.

Sincerely,

[Student]