

# Endless War Continues as Senate Kills Effort to Repeal 2001 Authorization

"No one with an ounce of intellectual honesty believes these authorizations allow current wars we fight in seven countries," Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) said.

By [Andrea Germanos](#)

Global Research, September 14, 2017

[Common Dreams](#) 13 September 2017

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Law and Justice](#), [US NATO War](#)  
[Agenda](#)

*The U.S. Senate on Wednesday killed an [effort](#) by Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.) to sunset the war authorizations that have been used for 16 years to justify ongoing military actions in regions around the globe.*

Despite the failure, Win Without War director Stephen Miles [argues](#) that the

vote "shows that momentum is building to cancel the president's blank check for endless war," adding that "it's clear that our representatives in Congress are beginning to recognize that after nearly two decades, the conflicts we are currently fighting have a tenuous connection to the laws that are used to authorize them."

"If Congress can't even be bothered to vote on whether we should be in war, then we have no business sending young men and women to die fighting in it," Miles concluded.

In essence, as observers noted, the chamber gave the OK to continuing "endless war":

US Senate [#AUMF](#) vote now being counted. US Senators just voted for endless war. <https://t.co/QomVVKilfF> [pic.twitter.com/ncCsCwE5P1](https://t.co/ncCsCwE5P1)

— Julian Assange ? (@JulianAssange) [September 13, 2017](#)

More endless war. <https://t.co/jCDA1zQ5EY>

— CODEPINK (@codepink) [September 13, 2017](#)

Sen. Paul's attempt was an amendment to the 2018 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) that would have repealed the 2001 and 2002 Authorizations for Use of Military Force after six months and allow for Congress debate another potential war authorization.

The procedural [vote](#) was 61-36, with the "yea" votes in support of tabling (rejecting) the

amendment.

Speaking on the Senate floor Tuesday, Paul [said](#),

“I rise today to oppose unauthorized, undeclared, and unconstitutional war. What we have today is basically unlimited war—war anywhere, anytime, any place on the globe.”

“No one with an ounce of intellectual honesty believes these authorizations allow current wars we fight in seven countries,” he said.

In addition to Mike Lee (R-Utah) and [Tim Kaine \(D-Va.\)](#), Paul’s effort had the backing of Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.), who [tweeted](#) that

“Congress owes our troops and their families a full debate to authorize the sue of military force before we send them into harm’s way.”

Rep. Barbara Lee, (D-Calif.)—the sole member of Congress to vote against the AUMF passed in the wake of the Sept. 11 attack—saw [her similar effort](#) to repeal the 2001 AUMF [killed](#) by House Speaker Paul Ryan (R-Wis.) earlier this summer, and [called](#) the vote a must-follow issue.

“Every member of Congress, regardless of party, has a constitutional obligation to debate and vote on war,” she [tweeted](#).

With the vote to table Paul’s amendment,

“Congress once again chose political convenience over our duty to the American people and service members,” she said in a press statement.

“While this outcome is disappointing,” she added, “we must and will keep fighting to get this blank check for war off the books. The Constitution—and the American people—deserve no less.”

To bring the AUMF to an end, “the public has got to speak out, organize, and mobilize,” Lee told MSNBC Wednesday.

*This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 3.0 License*

*Featured image is from Dandelion Salad/flickr/cc.*

The original source of this article is [Common Dreams](#)  
Copyright © [Andrea Germanos](#), [Common Dreams](#), 2017

---

**[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)**

**[Become a Member of Global Research](#)**

**Disclaimer:** The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://www.globalresearch.ca) contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: [publications@globalresearch.ca](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)