Answer Key: Bill of Rights

1. **RI.2**

PART A: Which statement identifies the central idea of the text?

* 1. **The Supreme Court interprets the Bill of Rights to protect and limit personal rights in a way that makes sense in modern day.**
	2. When the Bill of Rights was first established, the rights protected for civilians were too far-reaching and required the Supreme Court to eventually limit them.
	3. The Bill of Rights has historical value, but it is too outdated for Supreme Court justices to refer directly to it in cases.
	4. The Supreme Court is responsible for altering the Bill of Rights in a way that doesn’t diminish the document but also makes it relevant today.
1. **RI.1**

PART B: Which detail from the text best supports the answer to Part A?

* 1. “...a group known as the Anti-Federalists refused to sign onto the Constitution without assurances protecting their ‘natural rights,’ rights that they asserted were given to them by God, and which could not be violated by any government.” (Paragraph 7)
	2. “The Third Amendment is less relevant to our modern lives. It says that the government cannot force you to house soldiers unless Congress passes a law in a time of war.” (Paragraph 11)
	3. “At the time of its writing, the Bill of Rights was only intended to protect land-owning white males, but it nevertheless represented the broadest protections for citizens by any established Western government.” (Paragraph 14)
	4. **“Can students say anything at school? Once again, the Supreme Court would have to step in to interpret the words of the First Amendment and clarify.” (Paragraph 21)**
1. **RI.3**

Which of the following describes how the author develops his analysis of the Bill of Rights?

* 1. The author compares the original claims of the Bill of Rights with how we interpret the document today.
	2. **The author explores different court cases in which the Bill of Rights needed to be reinterpreted to address modern day conflicts.**
	3. The author emphasizes how outdated many of the amendments in the Constitution are and how the Supreme Court is attempting to modernize them.
	4. The author provides examples of how the Bill of Rights has protected citizens from having their rights violated by the government.
1. **RI.5**

How does the author’s discussion of Bethel School District v. Fraser contribute to the development of ideas in the text (Paragraphs 22-23)?

* 1. It suggests that the results of the Tinker case didn’t actually ensure the protection of students’ free speech in school.
	2. **It emphasizes the idea that the Supreme Court not only interprets the Bill of Rights to protect natural rights, but also to determine the extent of them.**
	3. It shows how the Supreme Court’s reinterpretations of the Bill of Rights primarily limit rights, rather than protect them.
	4. It highlights how confusing the Bill of Rights is, and how the Supreme Court is the only group of people qualified to interpret it.
1. **RI.3**

What connection does the author draw between changes in our society and the need for the Supreme Court to reinterpret the Bill of Rights?

* 1. **Answers will vary; students should discuss how the author emphasizes how much our society has changed since the initial establishment of the Bill or Rights. In order for the document to be relevant in our changing society, it requires justices to look at it in new ways. For instance, when the author discusses the Bill of Rights, he states, “At the time of its writing, the Bill of Rights was only intended to protect land-owning white males, but it nevertheless represented the broadest protections for citizens by any established Western government.” (Paragraph 14). Even just considering all American citizens as protected under the Constitution requires reinterpretation of the original document. Additionally, students should discuss how our standards as a society have changed over time. This can be seen most drastically in the author’s discussion of the juvenile justice system. For instance, students should discuss the Supreme Court’s reinterpretation of the Eighth Amendment, resulting in the ruling that it was, “…‘cruel and unusual’ to execute teenagers convicted of crimes” (Paragraph 25). In all, the constant evolution of our society requires the Supreme Court to consider how to apply the Bill of Rights to best reflect our current values as a nation.**