

In its response to 9/11, America has shown itself to be not only a hyperpower but increasingly assertive and ready to use its dominance as a hyperpower. After declaring a War on Terrorism, America has led two conventional wars, in Afghanistan and Iraq, demonstrating its overwhelmingly awesome military might. But these campaigns reveal something more: America's willingness to have recourse to arms as appropriate and legitimate means to secure its interests and bolster its security. It has set forth a new doctrine: the right of pre-emptive strike when it considers its security, and therefore its national interests, to be at risk. The essence of this doctrine is the real meaning of hyperpower. Prime Minister Tony Blair has consistently argued that the only option in the face of hyperpower is to offer wise counsel. But increasingly this is a course that governments and people across the world have refused. The mobilisation for war against Iraq split the United Nations and provoked the largest anti-war demonstrations the world has ever seen. And through it all, America maintained its determination to wage war alone if necessary and not to be counselled by the concerns of supposedly allied governments when they faithfully represented the wishes of their electorates. Rather than engaging in debate, the American government expressed its exasperation. The influential new breed of neoconservative radio and television hosts went much further. They acted as ringmasters for outpourings of public scorn that saw French fries renamed 'freedom fries' and moves to boycott French and German produce across America. If one sound-bite can capture a mood, then perhaps it would be Fox News' Bill O'Reilly. At the height of the tension over a second Security Council resolution to legitimate war in Iraq, Mr O'Reilly told his viewers that the bottom line was security, the security of his family, and in that matter 'There's no moral equivalence between the US and Belgium'. It is, in effect, the ethos of hyperpower articulated and made manifest in the public domain of 24-hour talk. And America's willingness to prosecute war has raised innumerable questions about how it engages with other countries. Afghanistan has seen the removal of the Pathan. But there are no official statistics on the number of innocent civilians dead and injured to achieve that security objective. The people of Afghanistan have witnessed a descent into the chaos that preceded the arrival of the Pathan, a country administered not by a new era of democracy under the tutelage of the hyperpower, but merely by the return of the warlords. Beyond Kabul, much of the country remains too insecure for any meaningful efforts at reconstruction and there is enormous difficulty in bringing relief aid to the rural population.

Questions: (4 marks each)

1. Why does the doctrine of power set by neo-imperial America deny space to counselling?

The doctrine of power is set by neo-imperial America to safeguard its interest. ~~Besides~~, the US ~~denied~~ counselling for maintaining its might over others. Thus, it can be said with full confidence that the US, in order to ensure its vested interests, sets the doctrine of power and denies counselling.

2. What is the essence of 'moral equivalence' whereas War has no moral justification?

The essence of 'moral equivalence' is that all must remain in peace. However, to exert force means to deprive people of peaceful life. That is why, to wage war against anyone is unjustified.

3. Why do countries occupy and under the tutelage of hyperpower have no peace?

## Return of warlords

Powerful countries occupy other states. They show that their purpose is to bring peace there. However, instead of making these nations peaceful, they bring more chaos and lawlessness. In short, there is no peace under the tutelage of hyperpower

4. Arguably Europe and hyperpower US are at cross purposes over the concept of war. Are they? Why?

**They are at cross purposes**

It is assumed that the US and Europe are at cross purposes over the concept of war. However, fact lies elsewhere. Throughout the history, they both support each other in their wars. Though a few segments in Europe did not want the US to use its might, but it does not mean the whole Europe was outrightly against the misadventures of Washington.

5. What Tony Blair's meant by 'wise counsel', and did it prevail?

**means resolving**

According to Tony Blair, wise counsel is to resolve conflicts through dialogue. The reason is that aggression always leads to anarchy. However, despite his suggestions, the US pursued its policy of using force. As a result, unarmed and innocent people of Afghanistan have endured countless hardships.

**It was a difficult passage. Answers need to be direct.**

6/20