**We affirm.**

**We observe that the president’s military power is defined in Article II of the Constitution.**

­­­Former Secretary of State, William Rogers, writes that Article II, which designates the president as “Commander-in-Chief,” is the basis for all executive military authority. However, Jane Chong of Yale finds that the broad wording of Article II means it can be easily misused. Unfortunately, the Authorization for Use of Military Force, or AUMF, enables such abuse. Louis Fisher of the Journal of National Security Law and Policy writes that the president’s constitutional authority consists solely of defensive actions to repel attacks with only Congress possessing the power to shift the United States into a “state of war.” However, Ellen Gorsevski of Bowling Green University explains that the AUMF puts the United States in a perpetual “state of war” against terrorism, permanently allowing the president to overextend his normally restricted authority. Mark Lander of the New York Times contextualizes that President Obama, the first president to have the current AUMF during his full tenure, is the only president to serve two terms entirely under constant warfare.

**With that, our only contention is abusing authority.**

The AUMF pushes the president to misuse his power in two ways.

**First is through skewing international policy.**

Targeted killings are specific strikes meant to eliminate the leaders of terrorist organizations. Lindsey Kowka of the University of Pennsylvania finds that these strikes are illegal under normal circumstances. However, Heather Hurlburt of the Democracy Journal explains that the AUMF’s constant “state of war” allows the president to use targeted killings anytime anywhere. Gregory McNeal of Pepperdine University confirms that the AUMF allows the president to conduct covert killings without any oversight or input from Congress. Unfortunately, America’s targeting killing policy is riddled with holes that harm the innocent more than the terrorists. Specifically, Jo Becker of the New York Times reports that American counterterrorism policy counts all military-age males in a strike zone as combatants, permitting shocking civilian deaths. Indeed, Jeff Bachman of American University quantifies that, on average, American strikes kill twenty-eight other people before their desired target. However, not only do targeted killings harm the innocent, they also worsen terrorism. Tom Pizinsky of the University of Colorado explains that trying to destroy terrorist groups fuels conflict because it bolsters recruitment. For example, Ben Rawlence of New African Magazine reports that a majority of combatants joined East Africa’s biggest terror group, al-Shabaab, after experiencing American brutality.

**Second is through skewing domestic policy.**

Anne Conway of the University of Florida explains that due process is “one of the most basic rights preserved by the Constitution” and is “an important safeguard to prevent…oppressive incarceration prior to trial.” Glenn Greenwald of Salon Magazine explains that presidents use the AUMF as the justification to indefinitely detain terror suspects and deny them constitutional rights. For example, David Cole of Georgetown University reports that, in the wake of the nine eleven attacks, thousands of Arab foreign nationals “who posed no demonstrable threat” were unjustly detained without trial. In fact, Michael Kelly of Business Insider confirms that provisions passed under the Obama administration stretch the AUMF to indefinitely detain suspected US citizens without access to lawyers, or fair trial. Unfortunately, the problem will only get worse in the future. Maureen Duffy of the University of Calgary reports that Trump is planning to expand the use of detention for terror suspects. Worse still, Elizabeth Goitein of Fortune Magazine concludes that the precedent set by the AUMF would not only allow the president to imprison foreign suspects without trial, but also American citizens who are arbitrarily deemed by the president to “support” international terrorist groups. Because the AUMF allows the president to completely bypass the Constitution, Cole concludes that “the power to hold a human being indefinitely is [simply] too grave to [give] to [the] executive.”

**Thus, we affirm.**