

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 aid to the rural population.

ENGLISH (PRECIS & COMPOSITION)

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?

Comprehension 2021

Question No.1

The doctrine of power set by neo-imperial America has significant implications on international relations. The US prioritizes its own security interests and national interests above all else, denying space to counselling and undermining international cooperation and diplomacy. Hence, this approach exacerbates global tensions and conflicts.

Question No.2

The concept of 'moral equivalence' is that all nations and actors have equal moral standing and should be held to the same standards. This concept is crucial in understanding

the dynamics of war and power. The US claims moral superiority while engaging in destructive wars, demonstrating the hypocrisy and emphasizing the need for equal moral standing among nations. Thus, war inherently involves a violation of moral principles and has no moral justification, also explaining double standards of US ^{that} undermines global trust and perpetuates cycles of violence.

ans is too long

Question No.3

The occupation and tutelage of hyperpower lead to ongoing conflict, instability, and human sufferings. The hyperpower's primary concern is to maintain its own dominance and control, rather than ensuring the well-

being and self-determination of the occupied countries. Ultimately it fails to bring peace and security to occupied nations

Question No.4

The transatlantic divide between Europe and the US on the concept of war is significant. Europe emphasizes diplomacy and multilateralism, while the US prioritizes unilateralism power and military might. In conclusion, this divergence creates tension and conflict, highlighting the need for a more cooperative approach.

Question No.5

Tony Blair's advice to offer 'wise counsel' to the US was overlooked, showcasing the

: 2/5

dangers of unchecked power. The US pursued its own course of action without heeding advice from other nations, stressing the need for multilateral engagement and diplomacy. Therefore, this perspective perpetuates a cycle of dominance and undermines the value of international cooperation and collaboration.

satisfactory

sentence structure and basic grammar is ok
9/20