

**Q. 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 aid to the rural population.

Page 1 of 2

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

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

Ans The doctrine of power set by neo-imperial America denies the space to counselling as it considers counselling a threat to national security of America. The idea of counselling contradicts with ideals of hyperpowers projected by United States of America. Hence, it is rejected by hyperpowers America.

2- What is essence of moral equivalence, whereas war has no moral justification.

Though the war has no moral justification yet the need of security and survival provides the essence of moral equivalence among the states.

incorrect start

incorrect format never answer in a single sentence

3- Why do countries occupied and under the tutelage of hyperpower have peace.

Countries occupied and under the tutelage of hyperpowers have no peace because indiscriminate killings

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

of non-combatants and innocent  
locals for fulfilling the security  
needs of hyperpowers. The countries  
witness a deteriorated law and  
order situation due to ~~war~~  
~~and~~ Hence, peace becomes a mere  
dream.

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

Yes, according to the passage, the  
Europe and hyperpowers US are at  
cross purpose over the concept of  
war. This is evident from Tony Blair's  
idea of wise counsel and its  
rejection by hyperpowers America. Likewise,  
the splitting of United Nation over  
US war against Iraq and mass  
protests in Europe against war also  
support the conflicting opinion of  
America and Europe over concept of  
war. Lastly, the remarks by O'Reilly  
that "there is no moral equivalence  
between America and ~~Bolgium~~" supports  
the idea that US and Europe are  
not at the same page on concept  
of war. The strong public opinion  
manifested through wide protests in  
Europe is the reason that Europe

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

no more agrees with America's  
concept of war

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

According to Tony Blair, wise  
counsel is the only approach a  
superpower should adopt to deal  
with its ~~✓~~ security issues. It is a  
pacific mean to resolve the security  
issue. The idea of 'wise counsel'  
was rejected by many countries  
across the globe including hyperpower  
America, hence it did not prevail.

2nd last answers it too lengthy  
be precis and to the point  
need improvement  
10/20