Dear Senator,

The events of September 30th , 2011 caused the end of two lives in Yemen and the beginning of political controversy in the United States. Neither of these consequences have been beneficial for the two countries affected. However, I feel that in the over time, it will be advantageous for you to support the president's national security policy.

Awlaki ordered many attacks against the United States armed forces. Critics claimed that President Obama acted as judge, jury, and executioner in this case because he ordered the death of a U.S. citizen; others argue that Awlaki had done the same on a much larger scale. This man decided the fate of many U.S. soldiers by making himself judge, jury, and executioner of hundreds of men and women. The families of our troops had to hear the heartbreaking news of their loved one's deaths. Do these families and other United States citizens deserve to know that the man responsible has paid the ultimate price for his actions?

This instance of the killing of Awlaki and his son brings up an often avoided topic: security versus liberty or safety versus freedom. Freedom is our nation's common ideology, and it is what unites us as a nation. However, if people have to die at the cost of someone else's freedom, then how can that be justified? Our constitution promises us liberty and life, but what if it is to ensure the lives of citizens. Should one's liberty be taken?

Yes, technically Awlaki was a U.S. citizen, but he forfeited his citizenship rights when he decided to commit treason, or the betrayal of his country. Article III, Section 3 states that Congress has the power to declare the punishment for this federal crime. The minute he ordered the attacks on U.S. troops, he not only gave up his right to liberty, but made the government consider forfeiting the liberty of the citizens that conform to the countries laws to add more security and safety for the civilians.

Though I do not think his son deserved to die due to his father's actions, there are other people who do not deserve this fatal end, but must suffer the consequences intended for others in order for more lives to be saved. What is one innocent life's death compared to the thousands of civilians that are in danger of termination if Awlaki lived? . The men and women who served to protect innocent citizens did not deserve to die, but because of Awlaki they did.

I am aware of the controversy this topic can bring to the table, but there is no other option that keeps U.S. civilians safe from outside threats. We must weigh our cost/ benefit analysis. Two lives were lost, but this potentially saved the lives of thousands of people who could have died because of Awlaki. We have to decide if it would have been worth it to save the life of one innocent man and one guilty man, thus allowing the threat to potentially harm more soldiers and civilians; or let both of the men die in order to save thousands of potential victims.

Sincerely,

Cyber Discovery