

3. Read the following passage carefully and answer the questions given at the end.

(20)

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 Taliban. 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 Taliban, 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 to the rural population.

Questions:

(4 marks each)

1. Why does the doctrine of power set by neo-imperial America deny space to counselling?
2. What is the essence of 'moral equivalence' whereas War has no moral justification?
3. Why do countries occupied and under the tutelage of hyperpower have no peace?
4. Arguably Europe and hyperpower US are at cross purposes over the concept of war. Are they? Why?
5. What Tony Blair's meant by 'wise counsel', and did it prevail?

ANS: 1

Sehes noon

After 9/11 America has increased its influence as a hyperpower. It denies for the Council, in order to keep itself dominant as a powerful country. America's war on terrorism is also demonstrate its very power seeking nature.

ANS: 2

When it comes to the survival and security of the people there would be no moral equivalence. Although war is not justifiable but for the sake of America's ~~and~~ security and the people, ~~retaliation~~ they have to ~~take~~ take security measures. Moral equivalence is often neglect while high tensions among the countries.

ANS: 3

Countries are occupied because of instability. The unfavourable security conditions in the country threats peace not only in that country but also in the world. This security threat lead to war and destroy peace. The powerful nation in order to

maintain its influence as dominant in the region or for securing its territory from the security threats occupied the countries.

ANS 4:

Europe wants peaceful settlements between the countries. Europe urge for the counselling and avoid destruction. Europe take this war initiative not to encourage able. However, US ~~do not~~ wants to let down his position over its dominancy.

ANS 5: By "wise counsel" Tony Blair means the mutual consensus. The consensus among the countries at the platform of Security Council. As America did not put ear to anyone, so that was the way suggested by the Tony Blair. However, that consensus did not prevail.