

Domande del repository "CEILS_APR"

Totale domande: 60

1 -- 1 (Categoria: 1_ITSKILLS)

Which of the following is not an Internet Browser?

- A (1) Outlook Express ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) Firefox
 - C (-0,33) Google Chrome
-

2 -- 2 (Categoria: 1_ITSKILLS)

What is a PC motherboard?

- A (1) The board on which all the main components are connected ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) The card that manages the video
 - C (-0,33) The main memory card
-

3 -- 3 (Categoria: 1_ITSKILLS)

What is meant by 'Drag and Drop'?

- A (1) A technique to drag files or icons with the mouse ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) A feature of some peripheral PC devices
 - C (-0,33) An advanced feature to recover files deleted by mistake
-

4 -- 4 (Categoria: 1_ITSKILLS)

What is RAM?

- A (1) The memory used by a PC to run programs ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) A part of the CPU (Processor)
 - C (-0,33) The card containing the computer's BIOS
-

5 -- 5 (Categoria: 1_ITSKILLS)

A company's private network is also called:

- A (1) Intranet ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) Extranet
 - C (-0,33) Internet
-

6 -- 6 (Categoria: 1_ITSKILLS)

What hardware is used to convert paper texts and images for use on a PC?

- A (1) A scanner ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) A printer
 - C (-0,33) A plotter
-

7 -- 7 (Categoria: 1_ITSKILLS)

The folders in a computer with a Windows operating system may contain:

- A (1) other folders and files ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) only folders
 - C (-0,33) a maximum of 100 files
-

8 -- 8 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

The *Third Reich*...

- A (1) is the name assumed by the Nazi regime (1933-1945) to emphasize continuity with the past ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) ended in 1919 with the abdication of Kaiser Wilhelm II
 - C (-0,33) is a book written by Hitler while in prison
-

9 -- 9 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

What is meant in Italy by the expression *Mutilated Victory*?

- A (1) After the First World War, it indicated Italy's failure to obtain some territories to which it aspired ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) A temporary victory that would not have led to tangible results
 - C (-0,33) A victory on the war field not yet ratified in the Treaties
-

10 -- 10 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

What consequences did the outbreak of the Russian Revolution have on the ongoing world conflict?

- A (1) Russia emerged from the conflict and decided to sign a separate peace ✓ (Risposta esatta)
 - B (-0,33) No consequence: everything continued as it did before
 - C (-0,33) Russia had to withdraw some contingents from the front, but the war continued
-

11 -- 11 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

What does the expression *New Deal* mean?

- A (1) The economic and social reform plan devised by President Roosevelt in the 1930s to lift the United States from the Great Depression ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) In general, it indicates the economic policy where the construction of “major building works” is particularly important
- C (-0,33) It indicates a circular economy
-

12 -- 12 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

In his major political work *Two treatises on Government*, the theorist of liberalism Locke ...

- A (1) foreshadows a political order based on the protection of natural rights ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) justifies and defends the institution of slavery
- C (-0,33) provides suggestions to rulers on how to hold power
-

13 -- 13 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

In *Ethics*, Spinoza claimed that:

- A (1) God identifies Himself with nature, therefore Spinoza’s system is a complete pantheism ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) God is the supreme monad
- C (-0,33) religion is superior to philosophy
-

14 -- 14 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

“*The Plague*” - in which pestilence is seen as a metaphor for evil - is a novel written by

- A (1) Albert Camus ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) Martin Heidegger
- C (-0,33) Jean-Paul Sartre
-

15 -- 15 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

The theory of the “good savage” - according to which every man is born good and just and, if he becomes unjust, the cause is to be found in the society that corrupts the original state of purity - was put forth by:

- A (1) Rousseau ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) Montesquieu
- C (-0,33) Freud
-

16 -- 16 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

The Marshall Plan...

- A (1)** was a USA political-economic plan for the reconstruction of Europe after World War II ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** set aside aid for Japan, which had been devastated by atomic bombs
- C (-0,33)** was the USA plan designed to reintegrate veterans of the Vietnam War into society
-

17 -- 17 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

How do we define the political behaviour, widespread in the USA between the end of the 1940s and the beginning of the 1950s, which was characterised by a climate of suspicion and persecution of those considered to be subversives?

- A (1)** McCarthyism ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** Liberalism
- C (-0,33)** Protectionism
-

18 -- 18 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

Which of the following statements does NOT concern the *Belle Époque*?

- A (1)** it was the period between the two World Wars ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** amongst the more affluent classes, the custom of taking holidays arose, and therefore hotels were built and thermal spas developed ...
- C (-0,33)** the quality of life improved, due to a range of new discoveries.
-

19 -- 19 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

The European Restoration...

- A (1)** began with the Congress of Vienna ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** began the process of formation of the nation states
- C (-0,33)** refers to the rebuilding of the cities bombarded during the World War II
-

20 -- 20 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

Why can the American Civil War be considered one of the first industrial wars?

- A (1)** Because of the employment of swift means of transport and communication (railways and telegraph) and mass-produced arms ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** Because it pitched the industrialized North against the agriculturally-oriented South
- C (-0,33)** Because the men who were conscripted left their jobs in the factories to women
-

21 -- 21 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

The reclaiming of Agro Pontino (Pontine Marshes) south of Rome, which transformed a marshland into an extensive agricultural plain, was carried out:

- A (1) during the Fascist period ✓ (Risposta esatta)
B (-0,33) in the immediate aftermath of World War II
C (-0,33) in the years of the economic Boom
-

22 -- 22 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

What is meant by the expression "Third Industrial Revolution"?

- A (1) the change in the whole working environment - starting in the 1970s and still in progress - founded on electronics, informatics and telematics ✓ (Risposta esatta)
B (-0,33) the revolution in the means of production generated by the invention of the internal combustion engine
C (-0,33) the revolution in the wake of the post-WWII period allowing the masses to access consumer goods previously reserved for the élite
-

23 -- 23 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

Which event induced the USA to enter into war in 1941?

- A (1) the Japanese attack on the US base of Pearl Harbour in Hawaii ✓ (Risposta esatta)
B (-0,33) the enforcement of the racial laws in Germany and Italy
C (-0,33) the affirmation of the figure of Mao Tse Tung in the People's Republic of China
-

24 -- 24 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

Which of the following claims about the Kyoto protocol (1997) is correct?

- A (1) it is an international agreement, the aim of which is to counteract global warming as embodied in temperature increase ✓ (Risposta esatta)
B (-0,33) it incentivizes the use of fossil fuels
C (-0,33) it still stands as the reference framework for global action aimed at curtailing greenhouse gases
-

25 -- 25 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

What was Apartheid?

- A (1) the regime of racial segregation imposed by the government of White ethnic identity on Black South Africans ✓ (Risposta esatta)
B (-0,33) the struggle carried forth by Gandhi to achieve independence for India
C (-0,33) the group fighting for the rights of Afro-Americans under Malcom X
-

26 -- 26 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

Totalitarianism is the system whereby ...

- A (1)** power is exclusively in the hands of a single party, which tends to dominate the whole of society and to repress every form of dissent; there is a sole ruler supported by a close governing body ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** all issues are dependent on an absolute monarch, considered to be ruling by divine right
- C (-0,33)** a close-knit military group is in power following a successful coup d'état
-

27 -- 27 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

What does the expression Cold War refer to?

- A (1)** The political, ideological, and military counter-positions of the USA and the USSR after the Second World War ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** The intervention in Siberia by the powers of the Triple Entente during the First World War
- C (-0,33)** The Italian campaign in Russia during the Second World War
-

28 -- 28 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

A polysyllogism...

- A (1)** is a syllogism made up by a chain of syllogisms ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** is a particular polysemantic syllogism
- C (-0,33)** denotes cause/effect reasoning of the type $A \rightarrow B$ (A entails B)
-

29 -- 29 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

Which of the following claims made with regard to the term immanence is NOT correct?

- A (1)** it means everything which is about to happen, as if inevitable ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** it is a philosophical concept, the antithesis of transcendence
- C (-0,33)** is characteristic of what exists in the reality perceived by man
-

30 -- 30 (Categoria: 2_GENKNOW)

Which of the following statements regarding the inductive method and deductive method is NOT correct?

- A (1)** They are synonyms ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** Induction is a process which leads from the particular to the universal
- C (-0,33)** In philosophy, a distinction is made between the inductive methods of Bacon and Aristotle
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

“We ... do”. These words...

- A** (-0,33) Promised popular self-government.
- B** (-0,33) Described democracy.
- C** (1) Performed popular self-government. ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

What is the text written by the Founder, according to Amar's opinion?

- A** (-0,33) A masterwork of Western constitutionalism.
- B** (-0,33) A well-conceived description of the fundamental rules of America's government.
- C** (1) A constituting deed. ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

What was the legitimation's source of this act?

- A** (-0,33) The consent of American people who elected the fathers of constitution.
- B** (-0,33) The Declaration of Independence.
- C** (1) The consent of special conventions elected in American states. ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

When did the first idea of a constitution emerge?

- A (1) ln 1787. ✓ (Risposta esatta)
B (-0,33) ln 1774.
C (-0,33) ln 1789.
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

At the time of the first proposal, the project of a constitution found the consent of:

- A (-0,33) A great majority of the representatives of the states.
- B (1) A group of America's most famous men. ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- C (-0,33) The parliaments of the States.
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

The new constitution...

- A (-0,33) Was immediately effective.
- B (1) Was effective after the ratification of nine state conventions. ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- C (-0,33) Was effective after the ratification of a general continental congress.
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

The new constitution would be binding...

- A** (1) For the states that ratified it ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B** (-0,33) For all the American states.
- C** (-0,33) For the Northern American states.
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

Constitution's ratification...

- A (-0,33) Was easy and very fast.
- B (1) Was opposed by organized people in the most influential states. ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- C (-0,33) Was opposed by Southern states.
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

The state of New York ratified the constitution...

- A (-0,33) With the largest majority of votes.
B (1) With 30 votes to 27. ✓ (Risposta esatta)
C (-0,33) In 1791.
-

Carefully read this excerpt and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

2nd. Text (from A.R. Amar, *America's Constitution. A Biography*, New York, Random House Trade Paperbacks, 2006, p. 5-7).

IT STARTED WITH A BANG. Ordinary citizens would govern themselves across a continent and over the centuries, under rules that the populace would ratify and could revise. By uniting previously independent states into a vast and indivisible nation, New World republicans would keep Old World monarchs at a distance and thus make democracy work on a scale never before dreamed possible.

“We ... do”

With simple words placed in the document's most prominent location, the Preamble laid the foundation for all that followed. “We the People of the United States, ... do ordain and establish this Constitution...”

These words did more than promise popular self-governement. They also embodied and enacted it. Like the phrases “I do” in an Exchange of wedding vows and “I accept” in a contract, the Preamble's words actually performed the very thing they described. Thus the Founders' “Constitution” was not merely a text but a deed – a *constituting*. We the People *do* ordain. In the late 1780s, this was the most democratic deed the world had ever seen.

Behind this act of ordainment and establishment stood countless ordinary American voters who gave their consent to the Constitution via specially elected ratifying conventions held in the thirteen states beginning in late 1787. Until these ratifications took place, the Constitution's words were a mere proposal – the text of a contract yet to be accepted, the script of a wedding still to be performed.

The proposal itself had emerged from a special conclave held in Philadelphia during the summer of 1787. Twelve states governments – all except Rhode Island's – had tapped several dozen leading public servants and private citizens to meet in Philadelphia and ponder possible revisions of the Articles of Confederation, the interstate compact that Americans had formed during the Revolutionary War. After deliberating behind closed doors for months, the Philadelphia conferees unveiled their joint proposal in mid-September in a document signed by thirty-nine of the continent's most eminent men, including George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, James Wilson, Roger Sherman, James Madison, Alexander Hamilton, Gouverneur Morris, John Rutledge, and Nathaniel Gorham. When these notables put their names on the page, they put their reputation on the line.

An enormous task of political persuasion lay ahead. Several of the leaders who had come to Philadelphia had quit the conclave in disgust, and others who had stayed to the end had refused to endorse the final script. Such men – John Lansing, Robert Yates, Luther Martin, John Francis Mercer, Edmund Randolph, George Mason, and Elbridge Gerry – could be expected to oppose ratification and to urge their political allies to do the same. No one could be certain how the American people would ultimately respond to the competing appeals. Prior to 1787, only two states, Massachusetts and New Hampshire, had ever brought proposed state constitutions before the people to be voted up or down in some special way. The combined track record from this pair of states was sobering: two successful popular ratifications out of six total attempts.

In the end, the federal Constitution proposed by Washington and company would barely squeak through. By its own terms, the document would go into effect only if ratified by specially elected conventions in at least nine states, and even then only states that said yes would be bound. In late 1787 and early 1788, supporters of the Constitution won relatively easy ratifications in Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia, and Connecticut. Massachusetts joined their ranks in February 1788, saying “we do” only after weeks of debate and by a close vote, 187 to 168. Then came lopsided yes votes in Maryland and South Carolina, bringing the total to eight ratifications, one shy of the mark. Even so, in mid June 1788, a full nine months after the publication of the Philadelphia proposal, the Constitution was still struggling to be born, and its fate remained uncertain. Organized opposition ran strong in all the places that had yet to say yes, which included three of America's largest and most influential states. At last, on June 21, tiny New Hampshire became the decisive ninth state by the margin of 57 to 47. A few days later, before news from the North had arrived, Virginia voted her approval, 89 to 79.

All eyes then turned to New York, where Anti-Federalists initially held a commanding lead inside the convention. Without the acquiescence of this key state, could the new Constitution really work as planned? On the other hand, was New York truly willing to say no and go it alone now that her neighbors had agreed to form a new, more perfect union among themselves? In late July, the state ultimately said yes by a vote of 30 to 27. A switch of only a couple of votes would have reversed the outcome. Meanwhile, the last two states, North Carolina and Rhode Island, refused to ratify in 1788. They would ultimately join the new union in late 1789 and mid-1790, respectively – well after George Washington took office as president of the new (eleven!) United States.

The last states that ratified constitution were:

- A (-0,33) Virginia in 1791 and South Carolina in 1792.
B (1) North Carolina in 1789 and Rhode Island in 1790. ✓ (Risposta esatta)
C (-0,33) Maryland in 1789 and Georgia in 1790.
-

41 -- 41 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

One may be citizen of the United States

- A (1) either by birth in US territory or later after successful application ✓ (Risposta esatta)
B (-0,33) because his/her parents are citizens of the United States
C (-0,33) only if s/he was born in the territory of the United States
-

42 -- 42 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In order to be a citizen of the United States

- A (1) the citizenship of one's parents is not formally taken into account ✓ (Risposta esatta)
B (-0,33) both the parents are required to be US citizens
C (-0,33) at least one parent is required to be US citizen

43 -- 43 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In the United States

- A (1) the privileges and immunities connected with citizenship cannot be erased by the laws of the individual State ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33) only some privileges connected with citizenship may be erased by the laws of the individual State
- C (-0,33) the privileges and immunities connected with citizenship may be erased by the laws of the individual State following a specific procedure

44 -- 44 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In the United States

- A (1) all people born or naturalized in the United States are automatically considered as citizens ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33) citizenship may be limited by law only to people born in the United States
- C (-0,33) some privileges and immunities may be excluded by law for naturalized citizens

45 -- 45 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In the United States, each citizen

- A (1)** is both a citizen of the United States and of the State where he/she lives ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** may choose to be either a citizen of the United States or a citizen of the State where he/she lives
- C (-0,33)** may choose to be a citizen not only of the United States but also of one or more States

46 -- 46 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In the United States, an individual State can

- A (1)** deprive a person of life respecting a due process of law ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** never deprive a person of life
- C (-0,33)** deprive a person of life when formally authorized to do so by the President of the United States

47 -- 47 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In the United States, the limitations by the laws of the individual State

- A (1) of life, liberty and property, may be allowed with the same conditions ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33) of life, are never allowed, while the limitations of liberty and property are allowed if the State follows specific procedures
- C (-0,33) of life and liberty, are never allowed, while the limitations of property are allowed if the State follows specific procedures

48 -- 48 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In the United States, each State

- A (1) must ensure the equal protection of the laws to everyone within its jurisdiction ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33) must ensure the equal protection of the laws to all their citizens, even if they are abroad
- C (-0,33) is allowed to take normative initiatives in order to ensure a minimum level of equal protection of the laws to all the people in the world

49 -- 49 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In the United States

- A (1)** the legislation issued by each State can deprive a person of his/her right to property if the compliance with a due procedure is ensured ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** the individual States cannot deprive a person of his/her right to property
- C (-0,33)** the individual States are allowed to deprive a person of his/her right to property by law and not by other legal acts

50 -- 50 (Categoria: 4_BRA2)

Carefully read this provision and answer the questions below **using only the information provided in the text**:

US Constitution, Amendment XIV

Section 1

All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

[... omissis]

In the United States,

- A (1)** the legislation issued by each State can deprive a citizen of his/her liberty if the compliance with a due procedure is ensured ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33)** the legislation issued by each State can never deprive a citizen of his/her liberty
- C (-0,33)** only non-citizens may be deprived of their liberty by the law of a State with no limits

51 -- 51 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

In this text, abortion is presented as:

- A (1) a profound moral issue on which, in a democracy, it is legitimate to disagree ✓
(Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) a profound moral issue on which the Supreme Court offered a valuable regulatory response
- C (-0,33) a profound moral issue on which it is no longer possible to disagree

52 -- 52 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

On the issue of abortion, the text of the US Constitution

- A (1) is silent and the gap was filled by the Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade* ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) sets out a scheme in which each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently
- C (-0,33) explicitly assigned the power to regulate this profound moral issue to each state, but after 185 years it was amended

53 -- 53 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

In *Roe v. Wade*, the Supreme Court held that the US Constitution

- A (1) confers a broad right to obtain an abortion on the basis of dubious historical and legal arguments ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) confers a broad right to obtain an abortion on the basis of compelling historical and legal arguments
- C (-0,33) does not confer a broad right to obtain abortion because 30 states prohibited it at all stages

54 -- 54 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

The text expresses an assessment of *Roe v Wade* which is

- A (1) fiercely critical of its outcome and arguments ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) favorable to the outcome, but critical of the arguments
- C (-0,33) critical of the outcome, but favorable to the arguments

55 -- 55 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

Under *Roe v. Wade*, the right to obtain an abortion

- A (1) cannot be restricted before "viability" ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) extends in principle until the end of the second semester of pregnancy, but the States can restrict it because they have a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life"
- C (-0,33) cannot be restricted because the Court did not consider the interest in protecting "potential life" legitimate

56 -- 56 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

Criticism against *Roe v Wade*

- A (1) extended even beyond the circle of the opponents of abortion, based on the fact that the Court had usurped the prerogatives of the legislature ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) remained confined to the circle of abortion opponents
- C (-0,33) was shared even by abortion supporters, because that judgment was memorable and brutal

57 -- 57 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

From this excerpt, it is fair to infer that its author

- A (1) agrees with Justice Byron White ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33) would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court drafted if he were "a legislator"
- C (-0,33) favors the prohibition of abortion at all stages

58 -- 58 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

Roe v Wade ended up

- A (1) imposing a highly restrictive regime on States' political prerogatives ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) imposing a highly restrictive regime of women's rights on the entire Nation
- C (-0,33) imposing a highly restrictive regime of abortion on the entire Nation

59 -- 59 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

At the time of *Roe v. Wade*

- A (1) abortion was possible in some form in at least 16 states ✓ (Risposta esatta)
- B (-0,33) abortion was possible in some form in about half of the states
- C (-0,33) there was a clear trend towards the liberalization of abortion

60 -- 60 (Categoria: 5_BRA3)

Carefully read this excerpt from the judgment of the US Supreme Court *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* (2022) and **answer the questions below using only the information provided in the text:**

Abortion presents a profound moral issue on which Americans hold sharply conflicting views. Some believe fervently that a human person comes into being at conception and that abortion ends an innocent life. Others feel just as strongly that any regulation of abortion invades a woman's right to control her own body and prevents women from achieving full equality. Still others in a third group think that abortion should be allowed under some but not all circumstances, and those within this group hold a variety of views about the particular restrictions that should be imposed.

For the first 185 years after the adoption of the Constitution, each State was permitted to address this issue in accordance with the views of its citizens. Then, in 1973, this Court decided *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113. Even though the Constitution makes no mention of abortion, the Court held that it confers a broad right to obtain one. It did not claim that American law or the common law had ever recognized such a right, and its survey of history ranged from the constitutionally irrelevant (e.g., its discussion of abortion in antiquity) to the plainly incorrect (e.g., its assertion that abortion was probably never a crime under the common law). After cataloging a wealth of other information having no bearing on the meaning of the Constitution, the opinion concluded with a numbered set of rules much like those that might be found in a statute enacted by a legislature.

Under this scheme, each trimester of pregnancy was regulated differently, but the most critical line was drawn at roughly the end of the second trimester, which, at the time, corresponded to the point at which a fetus was thought to achieve "viability," i.e., the ability to survive outside the womb. Although the Court acknowledged that States had a legitimate interest in protecting "potential life," it found that this interest could not justify any restriction on pre-viability abortions. The Court did not explain the basis for this line, and even abortion supporters have found it hard to defend *Roe's* reasoning. One prominent constitutional scholar wrote that he "would vote for a statute very much like the one the Court end[ed] up drafting" if he were "a legislator," but his assessment of *Roe* was memorable and brutal: *Roe* was "not constitutional law" at all and gave "almost no sense of an obligation to try to be."

At the time of *Roe*, 30 States still prohibited abortion at all stages. In the years prior to that decision, about a third of the States had liberalized their laws, but *Roe* abruptly ended that political process. It imposed the same highly restrictive regime on the entire Nation, and it effectively struck down the abortion laws of every single State. As Justice Byron White aptly put it in his dissent, the decision represented the "exercise of raw judicial power," 410 U. S., at 222, and it sparked a national controversy that has embittered our political culture for a half century.

Justice Byron White's dissent in *Roe v Wade*

- A (1) viewed that decision as the "exercise of raw judicial power" ✓ **(Risposta esatta)**
- B (-0,33) is regarded by the author of the text as the "exercise of raw judicial power"
- C (-0,33) sparked a national controversy that has embittered American political culture for a half century