

TEACHING

CBASE-Social-Studies

CBASE Social Studies Certification Exam

- **Up to Date products, reliable and verified.**
- **Questions and Answers in PDF Format.**

Full Version Features:

- **90 Days Free Updates**
- **30 Days Money Back Guarantee**
- **Instant Download Once Purchased**
- **24 Hours Live Chat Support**

For More Information:

<https://www.testsexpert.com/>

- **Product Version**

Latest Version: 6.0

Question: 1

During the early days of the American government, which was true?

- A. Party politics were prevalent from the beginning of the government.
- B. Parties evolved around candidates.
- C. Candidates formed parties specifically to run for President.
- D. Members of Congress were all members of one of two parties.

Answer: B

Explanation:

To address the question regarding the early days of the American government, it's important to understand the context and the development of political parties. Here's an expanded explanation of the true aspects of the early political environment in the United States:

****Party Politics Were Prevalent From the Beginning:**** Although the U.S. Constitution does not mandate a two-party system, the foundations of party politics in America were laid down almost immediately after the government's formation. Figures like Alexander Hamilton and Thomas Jefferson became the nuclei around which the first political parties coalesced. Hamilton's Federalist Party advocated for a strong central government, while Jefferson's Democratic-Republican Party pushed for more power to be held by states.

****Parties Evolved Around Candidates:**** Initially, political factions or parties in the U.S. formed mainly around key personalities and their differing visions for the country. For instance, the Federalists gathered around the financial policies of Alexander Hamilton, while the Democratic-Republicans supported Thomas Jefferson's agrarian and decentralized government ideals. This personalization of parties meant that the political stance was heavily influenced by the philosophies and the charisma of their leaders.

****George Washington and the Electoral College:**** George Washington was indeed elected by the Electoral College in 1789, which was established by the U.S. Constitution. The members of this Electoral College were selected either by popular vote in some states or by state legislatures in others. Washington's election was unique as he was a universally admired figure and was elected unanimously without the overt influence of party politics. His presidency, however, saw the rise of these factions.

****The Constitution and Party System:**** It's critical to note that the U.S. Constitution does not create or endorse a two-party system. The emergence of the party system was an organic process driven by differing ideologies and practical political considerations of the time. The framers of the Constitution were, in fact, generally opposed to the rigid party divisions that they feared might lead to a fractious divide.

****Thomas Jefferson's Views on Parties:**** Thomas Jefferson himself was ambivalent about the role of political parties. His quote, "If I could not go to heaven but with a [political] party, I would not go at all," reflects his personal conflict about the divisive nature of party politics, despite being a leader within the Democratic-Republican Party. Jefferson's perspective underscores the complex view of party politics among the founding fathers — they recognized the inevitability of factions but cautioned against their potential to lead to partisanship that could override the common good.

****Congress and Party Membership:**** While it is not strictly accurate that all members of Congress belonged to one of two parties, the early Congresses quickly saw members aligning into Federalist and Democratic-Republican camps. These alignments were more fluid in the early years but solidified as the party system became more entrenched. Understanding these nuances provides a clearer picture of the early political landscape of the United States, illustrating how foundational figures and issues shaped the emergence of the party system that plays a critical role in American politics today.

Question: 2

The Church of England has a troubled history. How did it begin?

- A. Martin Luther nailed his theses to the Wittenberg Door.
- B. Jakob Ammon withdrew from the existing church and started his own group.
- C. Henry VIII disagreed with the Pope over his marriage.
- D. Mary and Elizabeth both sought the throne.

Answer: C

Explanation:

The Church of England, also known as the Anglican Church, was founded in a complex historical context marked by religious and political upheaval. The origin of this church can be traced back to the actions of King Henry VIII in the 16th century.

Henry VIII, initially a devout Catholic and even titled "Defender of the Faith" by the Pope, faced a personal and political dilemma when his marriage to Catherine of Aragon failed to produce a male heir. Catherine, a Spanish princess, was the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, and their marriage was initially arranged to strengthen alliances between England and Spain. Over time, Henry's desperation for a male successor to secure the Tudor dynasty led him to seek an annulment of his marriage to Catherine.

The pivotal conflict arose when Pope Clement VII refused to annul the marriage. The Pope's refusal was heavily influenced by the political pressure from Catherine's nephew, Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor, who had significant control over the Pope following the Sack of Rome in 1527. Frustrated by the Pope's refusal and desperate to secure a male heir, Henry VIII took drastic measures.

In 1534, Henry enacted the Act of Supremacy, which declared him the Supreme Head of the Church of England, effectively severing ties with the Roman Catholic Church. This act marked the formal beginning of the Church of England. It was a revolutionary move that allowed Henry to annul his marriage to Catherine on his own authority and subsequently marry Anne Boleyn, who he hoped would bear him a son. Anne Boleyn gave birth to Elizabeth, who would later become one of England's most famous monarchs, although not the male heir Henry had hoped for.

The creation of the Church of England was not just about Henry's need for a divorce; it was also a power struggle between the monarchy and the Catholic Church. By establishing a church under his control, Henry could not only decide his marital issues but also redirect the wealth and lands associated with the church in Rome to his own coffers, significantly increasing the power and wealth of the English crown. This move had lasting religious and political implications, leading to the Reformation in England, a period of religious conflict and transformation. The Church of England retained many aspects of Catholic worship but introduced doctrinal reforms influenced by Protestant ideas, which were spreading across Europe following Martin Luther's initiatives.

The history of the Church of England is deeply intertwined with the Tudor dynasty's political machinations and the broader European Protestant Reformation. It stands as a significant development in English history, affecting religious, social, and political life in the realms under English influence.

Question: 3

What defines the official language of a nation?

- A. the language spoken by most people
- B. the language which originated in a country
- C. the family a language belongs to
- D. the language designated by law

Answer: D

Explanation:

What defines the official language of a nation? This question can be approached by considering various factors such as the predominant language spoken by the population, the historical origins of the language, the language family it belongs to, and the legal status of the language. However, the defining characteristic of an official language is its legal designation by the governing bodies of a nation.

An official language is typically designated through legislation or governmental decree. This means that the language has been formally given a special status in the public and legal administration of the country. This designation can influence various aspects of national life including government proceedings, judicial matters, public education, and official documentation. It is important to note that the official language may not necessarily be the most widely spoken language within the country. For example, as noted in the example of Namibia, English is designated as the official language despite only a small percentage of the population speaking it as their first language. This can often be the case in countries where colonial history or political considerations play a role in choosing an official language. The choice of official language is often a reflection of historical, political, and social negotiations and may serve purposes such as promoting national unity or aligning with international norms.

Additionally, some countries may have more than one official language. This occurs in multilingual nations where the government recognizes several languages as having equal legal status in order to accommodate diverse linguistic communities. In contrast, some countries like the United States do not have an official language at the national level, although certain states have designated official languages.

In summary, while a variety of factors can influence which languages are spoken and valued in a nation, the official language is defined by its legal designation. This legal status sets the official language apart from other languages spoken within the country and underscores its role in the official and administrative life of the nation.

Question: 4

The British ruled the Asian sub-continent from 1858 to 1947. After independence, they partitioned the sub-continent into two nations. What are they?



- A. India and Afghanistan
- B. India and Pakistan
- C. India and Kashmir
- D. India and Nepal

Answer: B

Explanation:

The correct answer to the question regarding the partition of the Asian sub-continent after the end of British rule in 1947 is India and Pakistan. This partition was a significant and complex event in the history of the region, driven by various socio-political factors.

The British controlled the Indian subcontinent as part of their empire, starting formally in 1858 when the rule was transferred from the East India Company to the British Crown, following the Indian Rebellion of 1857. The control lasted until 1947, during which the region was governed under what was known as British India.

As the movement for independence gained momentum, led by figures such as Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru, communal tensions between different religious groups, primarily Hindus and Muslims, also intensified. These tensions were exacerbated by political strategies and decisions during the colonial period. The Muslim League, under the leadership of Muhammad Ali Jinnah, began to demand a separate nation for Muslims, fearing domination by the Hindu majority in an independent India.

The decision to partition British India into two separate states, India and Pakistan, was made as it became increasingly clear that a united India post-independence was unfeasible due to intense religious and cultural divisions. The partition plan, known as the Mountbatten Plan after the last Viceroy of India, Lord Louis Mountbatten, was announced on June 3, 1947. It came into effect on August 14-15, 1947, leading to the creation of the Dominion of Pakistan (which initially included both West Pakistan and East Pakistan, now Bangladesh) and the Union of India.

The process of partition, however, was rushed and marred by lack of proper planning and foresight regarding the implications for the millions of people who would be affected. The division was based on district-wise Hindu or Muslim majorities, which led to the mass migration of populations across the new borders, accompanied by horrific violence and loss of life. The hastily drawn borders, especially in key

regions like Punjab and Bengal, ignored complex demographic realities and historical community ties, leading to long-lasting conflicts and disputes, the most notable being the ongoing conflict over the Kashmir region.

The partition of India and Pakistan in 1947 remains one of the most defining and traumatic events in the history of the subcontinent, with repercussions that are still felt in the political, social, and cultural fabric of the region today. The division did not take into account the myriad local identities, tribal loyalties, and historical connections, laying the groundwork for several conflicts that persist.

Question: 5

The prosperity of the Roaring 20's was abruptly ended by which of the following events?

- A. Women's suffrage.
- B. Art deco.
- C. The Wall Street Crash of 1929.
- D. The Great Depression.

Answer: C

Explanation:

The correct answer to the question, "The prosperity of the Roaring 20's was abruptly ended by which of the following events?" is "The Wall Street Crash of 1929."

The Roaring 20s, often referred to as the Jazz Age, was a period characterized by major economic growth, cultural flourishing in the United States, particularly in cities like New York and Chicago. This era saw a booming stock market, technological advancements, and significant changes in lifestyle and culture. However, this period of economic prosperity and cultural dynamism came to an abrupt end with the Wall Street Crash of 1929.

The Wall Street Crash of 1929, which began in late October of that year, also known as Black Tuesday, marked the beginning of the Great Depression. This was the most severe stock market crash in the history of the United States, both in terms of full extent and the duration of its impact. The crash signaled the beginning of a 10-year Great Depression that affected all Western industrialized countries and had devastating effects on the global economy.

The crash was preceded by an economic bubble during the 1920s when the financial sector was characterized by speculative trading and an overestimation of asset values. This period witnessed an expansive use of credit, and an overconfidence in the permanence of economic growth, which ultimately led to overleveraged investments. When the bubble burst, it led to a massive sell-off in the stock market, which did not only wipe out millions of investors but also had a cascading effect on the economy.

Following the crash, the United States saw a dramatic decline in consumer spending and a steep fall in production. Banks failed in large numbers as panicked savers withdrew their deposits. Unemployment rates soared, leading to widespread poverty and a significant decrease in the standard of living. The prosperity of the Roaring Twenties was replaced by widespread economic hardship.

Thus, while the Great Depression, which followed the crash, was a more prolonged period of economic turmoil, it was the Wall Street Crash of 1929 that served as the immediate catalyst that ended the economic boom of the 1920s and led to a decade of economic difficulties. Hence, the Wall Street Crash of 1929 is the correct answer to what abruptly ended the prosperity of the Roaring 20's.

Question: 6

You are a candidate for U.S. President! You state in a public debate that the current government of the U.S. is a "socialist" government which needs to be overthrown for a more republican government. Are you guilty of treason and why?

- A. Yes, you criticized a sitting president.
- B. No, you are not planning a military coup. Your right to criticize the government is protected.
- C. No. You only criticized the executive and legislative branches. You did not criticize the judicial branch.
- D. Yes. Your speech is treasonous because you criticized the government.

Answer: B

Explanation:

The question at hand is whether a U.S. presidential candidate who publicly calls the current U.S. government "socialist" and asserts that it should be overthrown for a more republican form of government is committing treason. The answer is "No, you are not planning a military coup. Your right to criticize the government is protected."

To understand why this is not treason, we must turn to the U.S. Constitution. Section 3 of Article III defines treason against the United States as either "levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort." Clearly, the act of criticizing the government, even if harshly or in terms of needing an 'overthrow', does not meet this definition unless it involves actual acts of war or concrete aid to enemies of the state.

Furthermore, the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution protects the freedom of speech. This amendment ensures that individuals have the right to express their opinions, even if those opinions are critical of the government. This is a foundational element of democratic societies, which rely on open debate and discussion to function effectively.

In the scenario described, the candidate's statement does not suggest any form of violence or unlawful action. The use of the word "overthrow" could hypothetically imply a forceful removal of government, but in a political context, it more commonly refers to defeating the current government through electoral means, such as voting, rather than through violence. Thus, without evidence of an intention to use or advocate for violence, the candidate's speech is protected.

It's also noteworthy that political hyperbole is common in the discourse surrounding elections and governance. Politicians and candidates often use dramatic language to emphasize their points and galvanize support. The legal system typically views such language as part of the normal ebb and flow of political speech unless it directly incites imminent lawless action as per established legal standards (like those set forth in *Brandenburg v. Ohio*, 1969).

In conclusion, criticizing the government, even in strong terms, does not constitute treason under U.S. law, provided there is no incitement to violence or actual violent actions undertaken. The right to express such criticisms is a protected and vital aspect of the freedom of speech, ensuring healthy discourse and the potential for governmental change through peaceful, democratic processes rather than through unlawful means.

Question: 7

Although Kings and certain nobility were very powerful in Medieval Europe, they were less powerful than which of the following groups?

- A. Elected parliaments.
- B. High church officials.
- C. The growing middle class.
- D. The revolutionary serfs.

Answer: B

Explanation:

In Medieval Europe, although kings and nobility held significant power, they were arguably less powerful than high church officials. This assertion stems from the unique and influential role that the Church, particularly its higher echelons, played during this period.

The medieval Church wielded immense power not only in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters but also in political and worldly affairs. High church officials, such as bishops and archbishops, often acted as advisors to the monarchy and held considerable sway over the governance of the realm. Their influence extended beyond mere counsel to monarchs; they possessed the authority to excommunicate rulers and place entire regions under interdicts (prohibitions on the performance of religious rites), which could destabilize a ruler's reign.

Furthermore, the Church controlled vast tracts of land and wealth, which it accumulated through donations, tithes, and other means. This economic power further enhanced its influence over the nobility and monarchs, as many relied on the Church's financial support or feared the economic repercussions of falling out of favor with the Church.

In addition, the Church played a central role in education and literacy, operating schools and maintaining the only well-educated workforce in Europe through its clergy. This monopoly over knowledge further empowered the Church to influence societal norms and policies.

While there were other groups in Medieval Europe, such as elected parliaments, the growing middle class, and even revolutionary serfs, none had as consistently pervasive or powerful an influence as the high church officials. Parliaments were still developing as influential bodies, the middle class was only beginning to emerge and gain economic power later in the medieval period, and the serfs, despite occasional revolts, remained largely under the control of their feudal lords.

Thus, when considering the complex hierarchical structure of Medieval Europe, high church officials indeed stood out as uniquely powerful, often surpassing kings and nobility in their ability to shape the political landscape of their time.

Question: 8

Following WWI, the U.S. pursued an isolationist policy wanting to stay out of world affairs. What did they "ignore" during the years following the war?

- I) Japan invaded China.
- II) Hitler invaded Austria and Czechoslovakia..
- III) Mussolini invaded Ethiopia.
- IV) China invaded Japan

A. I, II and III only

- B. II and III only
- C. II, III and IV only
- D. I only

Answer: C

Explanation:

Following World War I, the United States adopted an isolationist stance, largely influenced by a desire to avoid further entanglements in international conflicts that had led to massive casualties and economic turmoil during the war. This isolationism manifested in various ways, including legislative actions such as the Neutrality Acts of the 1930s which aimed to prevent the U.S. from becoming involved in foreign wars. However, this policy led to the U.S. overlooking several critical aggressive actions by other nations during the interwar period. *I* One significant event that the U.S. chose to overlook was Japan's invasion of China in 1937, which marked the beginning of the Second Sino-Japanese War. Japan's military aggression included the infamous Nanking Massacre, where hundreds of thousands of civilians were killed. Despite these atrocities, the U.S., adhering to its isolationist policies, initially chose not to intervene or take strong actions against Japan. *II* In Europe, Adolf Hitler's aggressive expansionism also went largely unchecked by the U.S. In 1938, Hitler annexed Austria in the Anschluss and later that year, the Munich Agreement permitted Nazi Germany's annexation of the Sudetenland in Czechoslovakia. These actions were clear violations of the Treaty of Versailles, which had ended World War I and were aimed at limiting Germany's military capabilities and territorial ambitions. Despite these aggressive moves, the U.S. maintained its stance of non-involvement, influenced by the prevailing isolationist sentiment among the American public and its policymakers. *III* Similarly, the U.S. ignored Italian dictator Benito Mussolini's invasion of Ethiopia in 1935. This invasion was condemned by the League of Nations, yet the response from the United States was minimal in terms of concrete action. The U.S. did not participate in sanctions or military interventions aimed at deterring Italian aggression, consistent with its policy of keeping clear of European colonial affairs and conflicts. *IV* The statement that "China invaded Japan" is incorrect and does not align with historical events. It was Japan that invaded China, which has been accounted for in point I. Therefore, statement IV is not applicable to the discussion of what the U.S. ignored during its interwar isolationist period. In conclusion, during the years following World War I, the U.S. ignored several significant acts of aggression by Japan, Germany, and Italy. This was largely due to its isolationist policies, which were aimed at avoiding involvement in external conflicts. The events the U.S. overlooked had profound implications, contributing to the escalation towards World War II.

Question: 9

In the summer of 2008, military forces from which two former Soviet republics clashed in South Ossetia?

- A. Armenia and Azerbaijan.
- B. Byelorussia and Lithuania.
- C. Estonia and Latvia.
- D. Georgia and Russia.

Answer: D

Explanation:

In the summer of 2008, the military forces that clashed in South Ossetia were from Georgia and Russia. This conflict, often referred to as the Russo-Georgian War, was primarily centered around the disputed territories of South Ossetia and Abkhazia. These regions have been a source of tension between Russia and Georgia since the dissolution of the Soviet Union, with both areas having significant populations that seek either independence or closer ties with Russia.

The immediate cause of the conflict can be traced back to escalating tensions and a series of violent incidents in South Ossetia. In early August 2008, after a period of increasing skirmishes and artillery exchanges, Georgian forces launched a large-scale military operation into South Ossetia. The stated aim of this operation was to restore constitutional order in the region and to protect the local population from ongoing separatist violence.

In response to the Georgian offensive, Russia intervened militarily, deploying a large number of troops into South Ossetia and launching airstrikes against Georgian military targets. Russia justified its intervention by claiming it was protecting its citizens and peacekeepers who were in South Ossetia. The Russian military quickly overwhelmed Georgian forces and pushed deeper into Georgian territory, including the city of Gori and parts of the region around Abkhazia.

The conflict drew international attention and concern, leading to several attempts at mediation. By late August 2008, a ceasefire agreement was brokered primarily through the efforts of the French presidency of the European Union, which was active at that time. Under the terms of the ceasefire, both Russian and Georgian forces agreed to pull back. Russia, however, established permanent military bases in South Ossetia and Abkhazia and recognized both regions as independent states, a move condemned by Georgia and much of the international community.

As of today, the status of South Ossetia remains highly contentious. Only a few countries recognize it as independent, the most notable being Russia and Nicaragua, as mentioned in the original text. The region is still considered by Georgia and most of the world to be part of Georgian territory under Russian occupation. The 2008 war has had lasting effects on Georgia-Russia relations and has influenced geopolitical dynamics in the wider Caucasus region.

Question: 10

Great civilizations were destroyed by others seeking treasure. Which culture was obliterated by Francisco Pizarro in Peru?

- A. The Mayans
- B. The Aztecs
- C. The Taino
- D. The Incas

Answer: D

Explanation:

The correct answer to the question of which culture was obliterated by Francisco Pizarro in Peru is the Incas. The Incas were a formidable civilization known for their advanced social structure, impressive architectural achievements such as Machu Picchu, and their vast empire which stretched across western South America.

Francisco Pizarro, a Spanish conquistador, led a small force into the heart of the Inca Empire. In 1532, with just 180 men and three big guns, Pizarro executed a daring conquest of Peru. He capitalized on

internal conflicts within the Inca Empire, which had been weakened by a recent civil war between two competing heirs to the throne, Atahualpa and Huáscar.

Pizarro's most notorious act was the capture of the Inca Emperor, Atahualpa, during his stay in the town of Cajamarca. Under the guise of establishing peaceful relations, Pizarro invited Atahualpa to a meeting. Once the Inca emperor arrived with his retinue, the Spaniards, well-armed and prepared for battle, ambushed and seized Atahualpa. Pizarro then demanded an enormous ransom for the emperor's release, specifying a room filled with gold. Despite the Incas fulfilling this ransom, Pizarro deceitfully executed Atahualpa anyway, marking a pivotal moment in the downfall of the Inca Empire.

Following the capture of Cajamarca and the execution of the emperor, Pizarro continued his campaign across the Inca territory, encountering little organized resistance. The combination of advanced European military technology, strategic alliances with local tribes, and diseases such as smallpox, which the Incas had no immunity against, facilitated the Spanish conquest. The fall of the Incas marked a significant episode in the colonial history of the Americas, leading to the establishment of Spanish rule over the vast and rich territories formerly under Inca control.

Ultimately, Pizarro's quest for wealth and power led to internal conflicts among the Spanish themselves. Pizarro was assassinated by the son of a rival conquistador in 1541, a stark testament to the turbulent and often violent nature of the conquest era. The legacy of the conquest, however, left a profound impact on the cultural and social landscape of South America, echoes of which are observable to this day.

For More Information – Visit link below:
<https://www.testsexpert.com/>

16\$ Discount Coupon: **9M2GK4NW**

Features:

■ Money Back Guarantee.....



■ 100% Course Coverage.....



■ 90 Days Free Updates.....



■ Instant Email Delivery after Order.....

