

## **National Admissions Test for Law (LNAT)**

### **Mock Paper 1**

The test has 2 separate sections, A and B.

#### Section A: Multiple Choice

This section is divided into 12 sub sections; each sub section has between 3 and 4 questions.

You should answer all 42 multiple choice questions in Section A, selecting **one** of the possible answers listed for each question.

**Time allowed: 95 minutes**

#### Section B: Essay

This section has 5 essay questions.

You should select and answer **one** question in Section B.

**Time allowed: 40 minutes**

## 1. The Origins of War

Like most historians, many students of international politics have been sceptical about the possibility of creating a theory that might help one to understand and explain the international events that interest us. Thus Morgenthau, foremost among traditional realists, was fond of repeating Blaise Pascal's remark that "the history of the world would have been different had Cleopatra's nose been a bit shorter" and then asking "How do you systemize that?" His appreciation of the role of the accidental and the occurrence of the unexpected in politics dampened his theoretical ambition.

The response of neorealists is that, although difficulties abound, some of the obstacles that seem most daunting lie in misapprehensions about theory. Theory obviously cannot explain the accidental or account for unexpected events; it deals in regularities and repetitions and is possible only if these can be identified. A further difficulty is found in the failure of realists to conceive of international politics as a distinct domain about which theories can be fashioned. Morgenthau, for example, insisted on "the autonomy of politics," but he failed to apply the concept to international politics. A theory is a depiction of the organization of a domain and of the connections among its parts. A theory indicates that some factors are more important than others and specifies relations among them. In reality, everything is related to everything else, and one domain cannot be separated from others.

But theory isolates one realm from all others in order to deal with it intellectually. By defining the structure of international political systems, neorealism establishes the autonomy of international politics and thus makes a theory about it possible. In developing a theory of international politics, neorealism retains the main tenets of realpolitik, but means and ends are viewed differently, as are causes and effects. Morgenthau, for example, thought of the "rational" statesman as ever striving to accumulate more and more power. He viewed power as an end in itself. Although he acknowledged that nations at times act out of considerations other than power, Morgenthau insisted that, when they do so, their actions are not "of a political nature." In contrast, neorealism sees power as a possibly useful means, with states running risks if they have either too little or too much of it. Excessive weakness may invite an attack that greater strength would have dissuaded an adversary from launching. Excessive strength may prompt other states to increase their arms and pool their efforts against the dominant state. Because power is a possibly useful means, sensible statesmen try to have an appropriate amount of it. In crucial situations, however, the ultimate concern of states is not for power but for security. This revision is an important one. An even more important revision is found in a shift of causal relations. The infinite materials of any realm can be organized in endlessly different ways. Realism thinks of causes as moving in only one direction, from the interactions of individuals and states to the outcomes that their acts and interactions produce. Morgenthau recognized that, when there is competition for scarce goods and no one to serve as arbiter, a struggle for power will ensue among the competitors and that consequently the struggle for power can be explained without reference to the evil born in men. The struggle for power arises simply because men want things, not because of the evil in their desires. He labelled man's desire for scarce goods as one of the two roots of conflict, but, even while discussing it, he seemed to pull toward the "other root of conflict and concomitant evil" -- "the *animus dominandi*, the desire for power." He often considered that man's drive for power is more basic than the chance conditions under which struggles for power occur. This attitude is seen in his statement that "in a world where power counts, no nation pursuing a rational policy has a choice between renouncing and wanting power; and, if it could, the lust for power for the individual's sake would still confront us with its less spectacular yet no less pressing moral defects."

*Excerpt from 'The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory' by Kenneth Waltz*

1. Which of the following is used to further the writer's **argument**, in the second paragraph?
  - a) 'isolates'
  - b) 'in contrast'
  - c) 'recognise'
  - d) 'important'
  - e) 'insist'
  
2. What does the author **say** about evil?
  - a) That it is the root of conflict
  - b) That it explains the struggle for power
  - c) That it only explains part of the struggle for power
  - d) That it is inherent to human nature
  - e) That it explains competition
  
3. What do **neorealists** think is the ultimate concern of states?
  - a) Power
  - b) Strength
  - c) Winning competitions
  - d) Security
  - e) Autonomy
  
4. What is **traditional realism's** response to attempts to make theories of war?
  - a) It does not account for the unexpected and the accidental
  - b) That war is easy to account for: it is merely the manifestation of human nature
  - c) That such theories can only deal with the regularities and the repetitions
  - d) That wars come of States fighting for power, and there is no need for complex theories to account for this
  - e) That autonomy must be accommodated within any theoretical framework