

Project

Why Stripping the President of His War Powers Might be a Bad Idea?

May 12th, 2021

Table of Contents

Title Page	Page 1
Table of Contents	Page 2
Introduction I - Background of the Bill	Page 3
II - The Cons	Page 4
Conclusion	Page 5
References	Page 7

Why Stripping the President of His War Powers Might be a Bad Idea?

Introduction

The prospect of partisan politics has created numerous challenges for American institutions such as the US. Congress and the US. Senate. Moreover, these two pillars of American democracy have often been at crossroads with the President of the United States of America. Most notably, there have been numerous occasions when lawmakers in the U.S Congress has openly raised their voice against the decades-old authorizations for military force in the Middle East. These initiatives have often been bipartisan in nature and the most recent measure that will aim to restrict the President's power to launch military actions in the Middle East without the approval of the U.S Congress. However, in the wake of escalating tensions between the U.S. and Iran in the region, and the recent U.S airstrikes in Syria, it is imperative to analyze the pros and cons of the potential adoption of this kind of legislation.

Background of the Bill

This bill is specifically aimed at eliminating or repealing the authorizations from 1991 and 2002, which opened the path for a prolonged military conflict in the middle east in the hands of the POTUS. Moreover, there is a general bipartisan feeling among certain lawmakers that this authorization can create a more suitable debate about possible prolonged intervention in the Middle East and the US Army's use in this volatile region. The opinion is that Congress needs to

Running Head: Why Stripping the President of His War Powers Might be a Bad Idea?

get back its constitutional power of declaring war and making decisions regarding military operations.

III - The Pros

By adopting this bill the US Congress will once again have a total responsibility to not only vote to authorize new military action. At the same time, this bill can help congress not just to retrieve its role but to repeal old authorizations that are no longer necessary according to certain lawmakers and some sections of the public opinion.

At the same time, those lawmakers that are in support of this move are strongly aiming to make the U.S Congress a more credible institution. At the same time, the aim is to open a debate when needed about the United States involved in certain conflicts and will seek bipartisan support.

Therefore, it is safe to say that the adoption of this bill may result in an increased democratic capacity in Congress and may provide a more unified approach when it comes to making decisions that require military involvement.

IV - The Cons

Another notable aspect of this bill can be observed through the prism of downplaying the role of the United States president. To better understand, this claim, it is important to elaborate on this issue from a military point of view. First and foremost, the authorization for the president to take military action in the Middle East from 2001, enabled the U.S Armed Forces to conduct numerous swift operations. To be more specific, certain missions require swift and rapid response to increasing the effectiveness and the potential success of the operation. For instance,

Running Head: Why Stripping the President of His War Powers Might be a Bad Idea?

without those powers, the sitting U.S President would have needed to ask permission from Congress in order to seek permission to conduct operations such as the neutralization of well-known terrorists such as Bin Laden and Al Baghdadi.

The second notable aspect is closely related to the fact that certain military operations have to be kept in secret as much as possible. The reasoning is pretty simple, a short or prolonged debate in Congress about authorizing certain armed operations can eliminate the element of surprise.

Moreover, it can directly alert the adversary to take certain steps in order to protect their goals.

Therefore, it is safe to say that from a tactical point of view, the United States Army can lose some of its strategic advantage of the battlefield due to potential exposure of their plans. This can also have a negative long-term effect on the effectiveness of the U.S military and can have a negative effect on the geopolitical interests of the United States.

At the same time, it can also undermine the position of the President of the United States. The reasoning for this claim is quite simple. Without these powers, the White House will slowly but surely become dependent on the U.S Congress for making certain decisions. That can be strongly influenced by partisanship which in turn can cause conflict. The result can be a lack of united policy for solving certain security and military threats that the nation is and may be facing in the future.

Conclusion

On a final note, we can conclude that the prospect of adopting this bill can be quite challenging. Moreover, taking a definite side also represents a complex issue. From one side, it is rightful that the U.S Congress aims to take back some of its duties and responsibilities or powers. From another point of view, the President of the United States needs to make sure the American

Running Head: Why Stripping the President of His War Powers Might be a Bad Idea?

national security is protected. And that sometimes needs certain swift powers to make the right calls at the right time. Therefore, it is no coincidence that many sitting presidents have used these powers. That is why a prolonged debated a more detailed analysis is needed in order to make decisions about supporting or denied this bill in the United States politics.

Running Head: Why Stripping the President of His War Powers Might be a Bad Idea?

VA Office of Transition and Economic Development. VA Transition Assistance Program (TAP). 2019;101.

Lawrence, P. Testimony before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. U.S. Senate, 115th Congress. 2018.

Jordan, K. N., Sterling, J., Pennebaker, J. W., & Boyd, R. L. (2019). Examining long-term trends in politics and culture through language of political leaders and cultural institutions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 116(9), 3476–3481. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1811987116>