Teacher Answer Key

Case Study

1. The Constitution gives Congress the war power precisely so force requires ongoing democratic consent, but the AUMF's sixty words — no countries, no time limit — transferred open-ended discretion to the president. The debate surfaces whether a single 2001 vote can constitutionally carry decades of new conflicts.
2. Because the civic skill is not holding an opinion but tracing accountability: who authorized force, who exercises it, what oversight exists, and what repeal would require. Students who can locate the power can evaluate any future use of it — which is the durable purpose of studying the War on Terror.

Multiple Choice

1. A
2. B
3. C

Matching

1-D, 2-C, 3-E, 4-B, 5-A

Fill-in-the-Blank

1) 1, 2) trillion, 3) 2011

Short Answer (Sample Responses)

Q1: Its operative phrases — 'all necessary and appropriate force,' those who 'planned, authorized, committed, or aided' — name no enemy state, region, or end date. That open text let successive presidents apply a 2001 vote to later groups and countries, making the authorization's breadth the legal foundation of a two-decade war.

Q2: Bulk phone-record collection began under a secret reading of Section 215; Snowden's 2013 disclosures exposed it; public backlash and litigation followed; a federal appeals court found the program exceeded the statute; and the USA Freedom Act of 2015 ended bulk collection while keeping targeted tools — reform real, but achieved only after forced sunlight.

Q3: Answers will vary. Strong responses give both cases their best evidence: no second 9/11-scale attack, disrupted plots, and broken information silos support effectiveness; the unmeasurability of prevention, red-team failures, civil liberties costs, and eight trillion borrowed dollars support the skeptics — and honest answers concede the counterfactual cannot be settled.