

Name: _____

_____/ 5 pts

Corrected by: _____

Period: _____

AP World History

9.8 Practice MCQs (APW)

“In theory, all of the peoples of the world, though different in their degree of civilization and enlightenment are created equal and are brothers before God. As universal love advances, the theory goes, and as the regulations of international law are put into place, the entire world will soon be at peace. This theory is currently espoused mainly by Western Christian ministers or by persons who are enamored of that religion. However, when we leave this fiction and look at the facts regarding international relations today, we find them shockingly different. Do nations honor treaties? We find not the slightest evidence that they do. When countries break treaties, there are no courts to judge them. Therefore, whether a treaty is honored or not depends entirely on the financial and military powers of the countries involved. Money and soldiers are not for the protection of existing principles; they are the instruments for the creation of principles where none exist.

There are those moralists who would sit and wait for the day when all wars would end. Yet in my opinion the Western nations are growing ever stronger in the skills of war. In recent years, these countries devise strange new weapons and day by day increase their standing armies. One can argue that that is truly useless, truly stupid. Yet if others are working on being stupid, then I must respond in kind. If others are violent, then I too must become violent. International politics is the way of force rather than the way of virtue—and we should accept that.”

Yukichi Fukuzawa, Japanese intellectual, *Commentary on the Current Problems*, 1881

1. Which of the following international organizations were founded upon principles that were in direct opposition to the approach to international politics advocated in the second paragraph?

- (A) Regional trade agreements such as ASEAN and Mercosur
- (B) International economic institutions promoting free trade, such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank
- (C) Cold War military alliances such as NATO and the Warsaw Pact
- (D) Collective security and cooperation organizations, such as the League of Nations and the United Nations

Source 1:

“At the end of the First World War, the League of Nations had been designed to implement the principle of ‘collective security.’ This was the principle that, wherever an act of ‘aggression’ occurred, the whole international community would combine to defend the victim of that aggression. In so doing, the League would defend not only the particular country concerned, but peace itself. . . .

In theory this system should have been foolproof. If the principle had been fully implemented, no nation would have ever taken action to breach the peace because doing so would have united against it the combined forces of the rest of the world. Japan would not have invaded Manchuria. Italy would not have invaded Ethiopia. Nazi Germany would not have invaded Czechoslovakia or Poland. The fact that these things did nonetheless happen suggests that there was something wrong with the theory. What this was was clear: while nations would readily accept the abstract theory of ‘collective security,’ they were not usually willing, in concrete situations, to undergo the strenuous sacrifices involved in going to war to fulfill it.”

Evan Luard, historian, “The Lessons of the League,” introduction to a history of the United Nations, published 1982

Source 2:

“The founders of the UN created a system which theoretically prohibited states from using force unilaterally other than in self-defense. Instead, the system aimed to centralize the use of force under the control of the UN’s Security Council. Under the UN Charter, the Security Council was to act in cases of breaches of peace and acts of aggression. It could take measures such as political and economic sanctions or measures involving the use of force. The Security Council was to have its own standing army and a Military Staff Committee. . . . However, the Charter’s collective security scheme did not operate as planned. Not surprising, the prohibition on the use of force did not stop states from using force—there have been over 100 major conflicts since 1945. Especially during the Cold War, the veto (or the threat of veto) by the five Permanent Members—the USA, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, France, and China—obstructed the Council’s ability to act. A standing UN army that could maintain or restore international peace was never established.

Nevertheless, the UN system proved sufficiently flexible to allow the Security Council to take action in ways not expressly provided for in the Charter. The UN created the institution of peacekeeping, even though there was no express basis for it in the Charter. UN peacekeeping operations were to be conducted with the consent of the host state, to be impartial in nature, and were not to involve the use of force by the peacekeepers, except in self-defense. Despite these limitations and the ongoing problem of securing adequate resources, peacekeeping has been a relatively effective way of containing some international conflicts.”

Christine Gray, international relations expert, “The Charter Limitations on the Use of Force: Theory and Practice,” scholarly article, 2008

2. Which of the following is a similarity between the two historical interpretations above?
- (A) Both interpretations are written from an overtly nationalist perspective that questions the very idea of international cooperation to resolve conflicts.
 - (B) Both interpretations offer critical evaluations of the effectiveness of international organizations relative to their respective missions.
 - (C) Both interpretations use newly discovered evidence to re-evaluate commonly held views about the primary purpose of international organizations.
 - (D) Both interpretations focus on foundational principles such as collective security but neglect to provide historical details on how international organizations sought to implement these principles.
3. Based on the two passages, the authors would most likely have agreed that
- (A) international organizations dedicated to maintaining world peace need to have effective enforcement mechanisms
 - (B) both the League of Nations and the United Nations were completely ineffective
 - (C) giving UN Security Council veto power to communist countries such as the Soviet Union and China was a mistake
 - (D) the shortage of funding from member states was the main reason for the organizational challenges experienced by both the League and the UN
4. Based on the passages, which of the following best explains why Luard’s assessment of the League of Nations in Source 1 differs from Gray’s assessment of the United Nations in Source 2 ?
- (A) Source 1 adopts a realist rather than an idealist perspective, making it more objective than Source 2.
 - (B) Source 1 explicitly sets out to examine the League of Nations as a failed precursor of the United Nations, making it more biased than Source 2 from the start.
 - (C) Source 2 considers both intended and unintended effects, making it more nuanced than Source 1.
 - (D) Source 2 is closer in time to its subject, making it likelier that it made use of more interviews and eyewitness accounts than Source 1 did.

NUMBER OF NUCLEAR BOMBS OR WARHEADS BY NATION, 1945 TO 2000

Year	United States	Russia or Soviet Union	Other Nations	Total
1945	2			2
1950	299	5		304
1955	2,422	200	10	2,632
1960	18,638	1,627	105	20,370
1965	31,139	6,144	308	37,591
1970	26,008	11,736	486	38,230
1975	27,519	19,235	888	47,642
1980	24,104	30,665	986	55,755
1985	23,368	38,582	974	62,924
1990	21,392	32,980	1,404	55,776
1995	10,904	18,179	1,031	30,114
2000	10,577	12,188	1,081	23,846

Data adapted from <https://ourworldindata.org/nuclear-weapons>.

5. Changes in the overall number of nuclear weapons shown in the table contributed most directly to which of the following international developments?

- (A) Revolutionary movements in colonized African countries
- (B) Mass violence caused by ethnic or ideological conflicts
- (C) Institutions investing in economic development in newly independent nations
- (D) International efforts to promote peace and security