We affirm Resolved: On balance the current authorization for use of military force gives too much power to the President.

Chemerinsky of Duke explains that executive power allows the President to act without expressed constitutional or statutory authority as long as the prerogatives of another branch are not violated.

Thus a policy that grants the President power that violates another branch’s legal power is too much power.

Prefer this interpretation because the process is more Important

Professor Gerald Gaus of Cambridge University explains that the fairness of the decision-making process matters more than the quality of the outcomes it produces, because there is no shared standard for assessing the quality of the outcomes as disagreements about what is objectively good will always persist.

**Our Sole Contention is an Executive Overstep**

The authorization for use of military force, or AUMF fundamentally allows the President to override congressional powers in two ways.

**First** is Continual Conflict

The Library of Congress contextualizes

Before the AUMF the President must comply with the War Powers Resolution anytime military force was used which is significant because it can trigger a 60 day time limit on the use of U.S. forces.

Unfortunately, Nahvi ’17 explains

The 2001 AUMF does not have a sunset clause, meaning that it has no expiration date. For 16 years, the executive branch has continued to use this bill as the basis for military actions around the world. Without repeal, there is no end in sight.

However a sunset clause like the one in the War Powers resolution is key as

Goldsmith ’15 corroborates,

A sunset clause pressures the President on a regular basis to explain the nature of the conflict and the reasons why and how it must continue, and it pressures Congress to exercise its constitutional and democratic responsibilities to deliberate about and vote on the issue..

Without the sunset clause, not only is congress’ constitutional check violated, but

Is also critical for avoid negative continual occupation which saves lives.

Robert Pape of the University of Chicago finds that more than 95 percent of all suicide attacks are in response to foreign occupation.

**Second** is a War against new actors

Cornell Law Institute explains

Article I, Section 8, Clause 11 of the U.S. Constitution grants Congress the power to declare war while The President, meanwhile, derives the power to direct the military after a Congressional declaration of war.

However, Gude ’14 writes

The Obama administration claims that 2001 AUMF in response to 9/11 provide the necessary congressional authorization for its military campaign against ISIS.

Brown ’14 highlights the problem, explaining

The rise of the Islamic State in Iraq and Greater Syria is providing a new issue, however, one that the AUMF doesn’t cover. Due to a split between ISIS and Al Qaeda, there’s no reading of the AUMF that grants legal justification for the White House to target the group.

Keating ’14 furthers, writing

The problem we’re facing now is that a resolution meant to target a specific group of terrorists was transformed into something else entirely due to a lack of geographical constraints.

Essential the President is now able to justify military force against new actors without the approval of congress infringing upon Congress’ constitutional authority

Somin ‘16 concludes

Enforcing the constitutional requirement of congressional authorization is not just a legal necessity. It helps protect us against initiating dubious conflicts at the behest of a single man, and increases the likelihood of success in those wars we do choose to fight.

For example, Najjar 2017 of Al Jazeera writes The US began supporting the Saudi-led coalition against the Houthi rebels in Yemen when Barack Obama cited the Authorization for Use of Military Force. Since taking office, President Donald Trump has done the same to justify U.S. involvement.

Unfortunately Fang 2017 of The Intercept finds the conflict in Yemen has caused 10,000 civilian deaths and has spiraled in recent months into one of the worst humanitarian crises of the century.

However, if it had gone through Congress, aiding military bombing would never have been authorized.

Hellman 2017 writes that the House of Representatives overwhelmingly passed a resolution explicitly stating that U.S. military assistance to Saudi Arabia in its war in Yemen is not authorized.

Vote to preserve the foundation of US democracy and affirm