In *Sanchez-Espinoza v. Reagan* in 1983, 12 Members of the House of Representatives, 12 Nicaraguan citizens, and two United States citizens sued for damages, injunctive relief, and a declaration that President Reagan and other executive officials violated various federal statutes, including a law known as the War Powers Resolution that requires the President to inform Congress when troops are deployed into hostile territory so that Congress can decide whether or not to continue funding of such military operations. The litigants claimed this law was violated by supporting paramilitary operations designed to overthrow the government of Nicaragua. A federal district court dismissed the litigation as raising… political questions [the court won’t hear based on precedent], and the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia again affirmed.

The district court stated… [that the Constitution] affords the judiciary [has] a very limited role in matters related to foreign policy and national security, stating that such matters are largely, if not exclusively, entrusted to the political branches…


**After reading the scenario, respond to (a), (b), and (c) below:**

(a) Referencing the scenario, describe the constitutional principle reflected in the district court’s statement and explain how the Court’s decision in *Sanchez-Espinoza* affects Congress’s formal powers exercised in the War Powers Resolution.

(b) Referencing the scenario, explain how the Supreme Court’s decision in *Marbury v Madison* differs from the court’s decision in *Sanchez-Espinoza v. Reagan*.

(c) Describe the formal power of the President affected by the War Powers Resolution. Explain how the President can affect Congress’s decision to fund military operations.