

THE CONSTITUTION PROJECT



Safeguarding Liberty, Justice & the Rule of Law

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Armando Gomez – Chair
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher
& Flom LLP

David Beier
Bay City Capital LLC

Mariano-Florentino Cuéllar
Stanford Law School

Mickey Edwards – Emeritus
The Aspen Institute

Phoebe Haddon – Emeritus
University of Maryland,
School of Law

Morton H. Halperin – Emeritus
Open Society Foundations

Stephen F. Hanlon – Emeritus
Georgetown Law

Kristine Huskey
Georgetown Law

Asa Hutchinson
Asa Hutchinson Law Group PLC

David Irvine
David R. Irvine, P.C.

David Keene
The American Conservative Union

Timothy K. Lewis
Schnader Harrison Segal
& Lewis LLP

Lawrence Rosenberg
Jones Day

Paul C. Saunders – Emeritus
Cravath, Swaine & Moore LLP

William S. Sessions
Holland & Knight LLP

Bradley D. Simon
Simon & Partners LLP

Virginia E. Sloan
The Constitution Project President

*Affiliations listed for
identification purposes only*

July 22, 2013

Dear Member of Congress:

As the conflict in Syria deepens and calls for greater U.S. involvement grow, the constitutional process for using force abroad requires congressional focus and respect. The President cannot conduct offensive military action without prior congressional approval.

We write as members of the War Powers Committee of The Constitution Project, which addressed the vexing issue of how the United States should exercise its constitutional authority under Article I, Section 8, to make decisions about the use of force abroad. Our 2005 report, [*Deciding to Use Force Abroad: War Powers in a System of Checks and Balances*](#), recommended improvements needed to restore the proper roles of all three branches. The Report recalls that the Framers of the Constitution imposed deliberate requirements to guard against a single individual, the President, taking the nation into war. They gave the representatives of the people in Congress the power to declare or authorize war and gave the President, after obtaining that express legislative decision, the power as Commander in Chief to direct our armed forces.

We recognize that the Constitution contemplates a limited range of defensive conditions when the President may act on his own. None of these narrow exceptions applies to the conflict in Syria. Some actions urged by Members of Congress – such as targeting Syrian airfields, runways, and aircraft on the ground – would be unlawful absent advance congressional approval.

We understand the administration's view that the Syrian government crossed the President's "red line" by using chemical weapons against rebel forces. If that or later developments constitute cause for U.S. military action, the President must come to Congress to seek authorization. Without it, any such use of force in Syria would be unlawful, contrary to the Constitution, and against the Framers' commitment to self-government. Unilateral presidential wars violate both the rule of law and democratic values.

Sincerely,

Mickey Edwards (co-chair), Vice President, Aspen Institute; former member of Congress (R-OK) and chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee

David Skaggs (co-chair), Adjunct Professor of Law, University of Colorado Law School; former Member of Congress (D-CO); Member of the Appropriations Committee and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence

Louis Fisher, Specialist in Constitutional Law, Law Library of Congress (ret.); Scholar in Residence, The Constitution Project

Michael J. Glennon, Professor of International Law, Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy, Tufts University; author of Constitutional Diplomacy and co-author of Foreign Relations and National Security Law; former Legal Counsel, U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations

Don Wallace, Jr., Professor, Georgetown University Law Center; Chairman, International Law Institute