

## PASSAGE 1

The assertion that states have a right to take, military action to enforce western codes of human rights on other countries has been made possible by the absence of serious military threats to the west . Before the collapse of the Soviet Union the initiation of war was best left outlawed due the risk of escalation into nuclear holocaust. After the disintegration of USSR, however, the balance of power so overwhelmingly favors western states that they can safely claim a right of intervention in the full knowledge that this right will not be used against them. Thus the incentive to keep war outlawed has diminished, while the incentive to legitimize war has increased.

Gradually the western world is re-legitimizing war. Officially western States no longer wage war, because they do not actually declare war on their appointments. Instead multitude of new types of military campaign are appearing in doctrine: humanitarian interventions, peace enforcement, and other actions defined as "operations other than war". They maintain that there is a difference between intervention and war, because interventions are "police actions". A police action means that there is a specified crime; the police go in to stop it using no more force than needed. The problem, however, is that it is extremely hard to keep the use of force within certain limits; and when the Second party resists " arrest" and fires back at the intervener, as it is likely to do because it will almost certainly feel that the " police " have no jurisdiction over it , the " police action" turns into a full-scale war. As a Great military theorist Kar Von Clausewitz wrote. "War is an act of violence to compel our opponent to fulfill our will." So long as there is an opponent, therefore, every military intervention can be considered as war.

1.What does the passage mainly discuss?

A) the rulings of the international court of law

**B) use of military action by western states**

C) use of military action by the Soviet Union

D) history of the United Nations

2. Western states feel they can safely claim a right to intervene in other countries after the disintegration of the Soviet Union because :

A) there is no longer a risk of escalation into nuclear holocaust.

**B) the balance of power forces the USSR**

C) they know this right will be used against them

D) there is no longer a risk of disintegration for the Western States.

3. Which of the following is an instance of “operations other than war”?

**A) collapse of the Soviet Union**

B) declaring war on opponents

C) nuclear holocaust

D) humanitarian interventions

4. “Police action” could potentially turn into a full-scale war when:

A) the “police” try to stop conflict using no more force than needed.

B) the “police” have full jurisdiction over the country under intervention.

**C) the second party resists arrest and fires back.**

D) there is a specified crime.

5. Based on Karl Von Clausewitz’s definition every military intervention can be

interpreted as an act of war because:

A) it is fulfilling

B) he was a great military theorist

**C) it includes an opponent**

D) it includes a will

6. The word “diminished” in paragraph 1 is closest in meaning to:

A) vanished B) reduced

C) risen D) distorted

7. The word “multitude” in paragraph 2 is closest in meaning to:

A) variety B) crowd

C) complex D) aspect

8. The word “maintain” in paragraph 2 is closest in meaning to:

A) boast B) deny

C) argue D) retain

9. The word “it” in paragraph 2 is closest in refers to:

A) force B) police

C) intervener D) party

10. The word “compel” in paragraph 2 is closest in meaning to:

A) tempt B) empower

C) force D) prevent