

PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION 2010

GENERAL PAPER

8806/2

PAPER 2 ANSWER SCHEME

Duration: 1 hour 30 minutes

Passage 1

1. Give two arguments from paragraph one which support the view that military power might be less relevant in the future? **Use your own words as far as possible.** (2 m)

Lifting	Paraphrased
<p>Ineffectual US Interventions in Kosovo and Bosnia, and the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have been seminal events calling into question common assumptions on the efficacy of what is termed 'hard power'.</p> <p>the 9-11 terrorist attacks</p> <p>It is true that the number of large-scale inter-state wars continues to decline,</p> <p>and</p> <p>fighting is unlikely among developed nations with representative governments.</p>	<p>Inferred :</p> <p>Despite the large scale military action in areas of contention / countries with contentious issues, these have largely been futile in resolving conflict</p> <p>and have had little effect on discouraging/deterring terrorist attacks/attacks on countries' own soils.</p> <p>The number of occurrences/outbreaks of major / sweeping / wide-ranging / global / international / worldwide conflict / combat has decreased significantly</p> <p>and</p> <p>Confrontation / warfare appears less probable / conceivable among rich / affluent democracies.</p> <p>(Any 2 out of 4)</p>

2. "...it is this consideration that leads rational actors to purchase expensive insurance" (line34). Who or what are the 'rational actors' being referred to here and what is the nature of the 'expensive insurance' they buy? (1m)

Lifting	Paraphrased
Inferred	<p>"Rational actors" refer to countries/ governments that logically/sensibly conclude they need military deterrence to adequately defend themselves/ensure their survival (1/2m)</p> <p>"Expensive insurance" refers to costly/extensive investments in weaponry / arms/ armaments / hardware for combat/warfare. (1/2m)</p>

3. Summarise Yarger's reasons for arguing that military power is still of crucial importance in the world today. Use material from paragraphs 2-4 of the passage. Write your summary in no more than 150 words, not counting the opening words which are printed below.

Use your own words as far as possible.

(8 m)

Yarger argues that military power is still of crucial importance in today's world because...

Lifting	Paraphrased
Whether we like it or not .. might remains right .	Military power is still the ultimate / final or decisive factor
Fundamentally, the world has changed very little since Napoleon's time: because our planet is still segmented into sovereign states with hard borders	...as the traditional political system of / the independent / autonomous nations/territories has not altered/ remains ;
And vested interests ,	with their own selfish aims / objectives priorities
...every nation still needs an army not only to secure its welfare but also to ensure its survival .	To ensure its well-being, existence, self protection (any one of the 3 acceptable for 1/2m) , each country still needs a physical defence/ military forces / militia.
In a world with few international laws and	There is a paucity of / are not many global/ world-wide legislation / rules / regulations, directives
even fewer enforceable ones, ...(might remains right.)	and those that do exist are ineffectual / lack clout / cannot be successfully implemented / put in effect
Even on an international level, where order is more tenuous, residual concerns about the coercive use of force , even if a low probability , can have important effects	Even if it is unlikely , armed conflict between states is still considered possible / feared / insecurity/doubt/anxiety still remains
Military force at least helps to provide a minimal degree of order .	The existence of hard power continues to act as a deterrent
the nature of conflict in the 21st century has metamorphosised	Also the type of hostilities / confrontations has radically been transformed / altered OR New kinds of hostilities/ confrontations / antagonists have emerged
Most "wars" today occur within , rather	Nowadays, fighting takes place/ transpire

than between states and	inside / intra countries
... many combatants do not wear uniforms . Here, the distinction between civilian and military disappears altogether	Involving terrorists/ insurgents / radicals who are less easy to identify / not easily recognizable as conventional soldiers / impossible to distinguish from ordinary citizens / the population at large.
... Contemporary military theorists refer to this as “fourth-generation warfare” that has no definable battlefields or fronts .	There is no demarcated / designed war zone / theatre of war / battlefield / arena
Here, the distinction between civilian and military disappears altogether with commercial aircraft being used as weapons of mass destruction and suicide bombers	and they employ methods/tactics that are very different / unconventional
Killing innocent bystanders	to attack non-military targets / innocent citizens.
In the face of an implacable and fanatical adversary , hard power is not just our last but our only resort .	Because this new enemy is extremist / irrational/ uncompromising / obdurate, force is the only option .
As if all this were not enough, technology has added a new foe that only the presence of hard power can deter : the prospect of cyber attacks by which an enemy — state or non-state — can create enormous destruction (or threaten to do so) without the need for an army to physically cross another country’s border.	The latest weapon is using the internet/ computer/ electronic attacks to disrupt a country , which only the prospect of military retaliation can prevent / discourage/ dissuade / daunt .
Military Power is also used to provide protection for and assistance to allies .	Hard Power can be used to safeguard and help a country’s friends
<i>Repeat of point 7:</i> <i>Even if the actual use of force among states has become less probable, its possibility can never be discounted,</i>	Despite the reduced chance / possibility / likelihood of conflict / hostilities can never be ruled out / ignored
and it is this consideration that leads rational actors to purchase expensive insurance	so countries still need to invest in military hardware
This leads to a larger point about the economic role of military power in world politics. Economic security relies upon stable systems and institutions, which in turn rest upon the bedrock of hard power.	Order in financial/fiscal/money / trading markets depends on unwavering/ firm/ robust / sturdy /solid organizations/ establishments / enterprises which are built on the foundation of hard/ military might/strength .

In a well-ordered modern state, the credibility and reliability of this hard power depend on its monopoly on the legitimate use of force , which allows domestic markets to operate. In chaotic conditions, markets crash and economies crumble.	This hard power must be in the hands or control of an officially recognized government to instil confidence / maintain credibility / prevent financial turmoil /disarray/instability / turbulence/ confusion.
--	---

Max 16 out of 20 points for 8m

Suggested Summary

Yarger argues that military power is still important in today's world because...

it is still the decisive factor as the traditional political system of autonomous nations with selfish aims remains. To ensure its well-being, each country still needs military muscle. There is a paucity of global legislation and that which does exist lacks clout. Although unlikely, armed conflict between states is still feared so countries need to invest in military hardware. The existence of armies acts as a deterrent. Radically different types of confrontation have emerged with new kinds of hostilities and antagonists. Fighting now occurs within countries, involving insurgents not recognizable as conventional soldiers. There is no demarcated war zone and unconventional tactics are employed to attack innocent citizens. Force is the only option against such an uncompromising foe. The latest weapon is using electronic attacks to disrupt a country which only the prospect of military retaliation can discourage. Military might can also be used to safeguard or help a country's friends. Order in financial markets depends on robust enterprises built on the foundation of hard power which must be in the control of an officially recognized government to instil confidence and prevent turmoil.

(All 20 points in full – 183 words)

4 “Military strength provides a degree of security that is to political and economic order as oxygen is to breathing: little noticed until it begins to become scarce” (lines 40-41). Explain carefully how this analogy effectively conveys the writer’s argument. **Use your own words as far as possible.** (2m)

Lifting	Paraphrased
Military strength provides a degree of security that is to political and economic order as oxygen is to breathing: little noticed until it begins to become scarce.	<p>Just as oxygen is essential / vital / indispensable / crucial for respiration to ensure individual survival (1/2m) ,</p> <p>so military power is needed for national survival .(1/2m)</p> <p>Like oxygen, the presence of military power as a deterrent is usually taken for granted/is inconspicuous/unobtrusive (1/2m)</p> <p>But, if they were to diminish/disappear, both their absences would immediately and keenly be felt (1/ 2m)</p>

5. “As much as Kim Jong Il may enjoy watching Disney cartoons and eating fast food, Mickey Mouse is not going to persuade him to trade his nuclear weapons for a Happy Meal” (lines 45-47). What point is the writer making here? **Use your own words as far as possible.** (1m)

Lifting	Paraphrased
As much as Kim Jong Il may enjoy watching Disney cartoons and eating fast food, Mickey Mouse is not going to persuade him to trade his nuclear weapons for a Happy Meal.	<p>The writer stresses that the attractions of Western popular culture, hardline/ obdurate / uncompromising/ militaristic despotic leaders/ governments will not change their policies/become more amenable/compliant because they are political realists. (1m)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Despite its attractions, no amount of soft power will persuade such leaders.</p> <p>(1m)</p>

Passage 2

6. What two reservations about the effectiveness of military power does the writer express in the last sentence of paragraph one? **Use your own words as far as possible.** (2m)

Lifting	Paraphrased
While the use of military power may serve to compel temporary submission , it also presents some glaring shortcomings with regard both to its ultimate efficacy and its wielder's legitimacy .	<p>Military Power might be utilized to force / coerce / drive others yield to demands (1/2m) but this is only of a brief/ short term/ short-lived / momentary nature. (1/2m)</p> <p>It also will incite/ elicit questions / concerns (1/2m) about the authority / source of the weight/ mandate / legality /justice/ethics of such use (1/2m) of force to bend others to their will.</p>

7. "If you are able to attract others, you can economise on the sticks and the carrots" (line 19) Explain carefully what Professor Nye means here. (1)

Lifting	Paraphrased
	<p>If a country has / is able to wield its soft power well (1/2m) ,</p> <p>it need not resort to the more usual practice of enticing someone to do our bidding by dangling a reward / incentive / enticements (1/2m) before them and, either alternately</p> <p>OR</p> <p>at the same time, urging them to do so by threatening punishments /disincentives (1/2m)</p> <p>to discourage undesired behaviour. (1/2m)</p>

8) What does the writer believe is America's current weakness where soft power is concerned and what does he believe America needs to do to rectify this problem? **Use your own words as far as possible.** (2m)

Lifting	Paraphrased
In terms of political values, the U.S. indisputably offers desirable democratic role models in terms of its egalitarian systems, ethical values, and efficient institutions. ...its international actions (does not) mirrored its internal ideals,	Instead of capitalizing/leveraging on its attractive political system which emphasizes on equality, transparency and accountability (1/2 m), it does not utilize this same yardstick to measure / control / its actions outside of its domestic domain. (1/2m) OR US foreign policies smack of double standards/hypocrisy. (1m)
Inferred Instead of (behaving like)... an arrogant and aggressive bully, ... it would (then) be regarded with admiration and respect.	America must employ the same standards to herself as she applies to others /internally in its foreign policy (1/2m) and not act like a belligerent tyrant / being intimidating / browbeating others into agreeing with her (or her policies) (1/2m)

9. "Today, even China, that most combative and cranky of nations, has gone soft by marketing Confucius as a cultural icon" (lines 39-40). Why does the author include the word "even" here? **Use your own words as far as possible .** (1m)

Lifting	Paraphrased
Inferred	The author is suggesting surprise / that it is remarkable (1/2m) that a country like China , well known for / having a reputation of being a traditional / uncompromising wielder /user /believer of military power / country which has not been bothered about rapprochement, has jumped onto the bandwagon of soft power/ use of more persuasive tactics (1 /2 m) OR China is a country one would least expect to be willing to bend / be accommodating enough to use "softer"

	tactics. (1m)
--	-----------------------

10. Describe two advantages of soft power compared to hard power suggested in the last sentence of the passage. **Use you own words as far as possible.** (2)

Lifting	Paraphrased
..soft power is a far more nimble, amenable and amiable creature to employ than the blundering, unruly, intimidating beasts of hard power currently straining at their collective leashes, the better.	<p>It is more flexible/versatile as opposed to clumsy (1/2m)</p> <p>compliant/easier to manage /handle /restrain as opposed to unmanageable /uncontrollable/ unrestrainable (1/2m)</p> <p>attractive/endearing/amicable as opposed to terrifying/fearsome (1/2m)</p> <p>and less hostile/belligerent/ferocious. (1/2m)</p>

11. Vocabulary

Give the meaning of the following words as they are used in the passages. Write your answer in one word or a short phrase. (5m)

a. seminal (Passage 1, line2)

1 mark	1/2 m	0 mark
strongly influential (on later developments), shaping, formative		determining, decisive, powerful, significant, important, leading, prominent, momentous, major, noteworthy

b. ignominiously (Passage 2, line 4)

1 mark	1/2 m	0 mark
in a humiliating manner, humiliatingly/abjectly/ shamefully / disgracefully		contemptibly / dishonorably / shabby / sordid / sorry / approbiously /tragically /infamously

c) assets (Passage 2, line 25)

1 mark	1/2 m	0 mark
valuable possessions/ attributes		possessions, resources, property, belongings, worldly goods, advantages, qualities, goodwill

d) leverage (Passage 2, line 32)

1 mark	1/2 m	0 mark
influence/ power exerted to gain influence/ control/ advantage	influence/power	force, pull, stress upon, emphasize upon, tool to achieve certain ends

e) prestige (Passage 2, line 37)

1 mark	1/2 m	0 mark
high reputation/admiration and influence / stature/ high status/ standing/	Status	dignity, glory, pride, respect, international image

Application Question

12. Harry Yarger argues that hard power is far more important than soft power in today's world whilst Shashi Tharoor disagrees.

Which writer's arguments do you find more persuasive and why? To what extent and how effectively does your own country employ both types of power?

Refer to relevant material from both passages as well as your own knowledge and opinions to support your points. (8m)

From passage A : The following are some possible points for and against Harry Yarger's argument.

Harry Yarger argues that...

Points from Passage A	Agree	Disagree
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fundamentally, the world has changed very little since Napoleon's time: our planet is still segmented into sovereign states with hard borders and vested interests; 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concept of sovereign states is still very much relevant today. International conflicts and tensions between countries (Palestine and Israel, Iran/North Korea and the U.S./U.N) are often the result of competing and conflicting interests between sovereign states. Territorial disputes (past and present) also validate Yarger's argument of "hard borders and vested interests." The territorial dispute over Kashmir, (between India, Pakistan and China), is a case in point, as is Pedra Branca. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The idea that the world has changed very little, as in countries being segmented into sovereign states, is an over generalisation. While sovereign states will undoubtedly continue to exist for a long to come, the revolution of the information technology has broken down "hard borders" between countries. This has resulted in the notion of the global village.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ...every nation still needs an army not only to secure its welfare but also to ensure its survival. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Much can be said about seeking alliance with the major super powers, as these countries seek protection from these powers when they have none. This is especially pertinent for Singapore. Even though the government spends quite a considerable sum on defence, the fact of the matter is, Singapore relies heavily on U.S. support and alliance for protection (who has the most advanced military equipment and the biggest defence budget in the world). Singapore knows that adversaries that seek to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Singapore spends a significant proportion of its GDP on building its military forces (\$11.46b), military might has not been used exclusively to ensure its survival. Though Singapore has one of Asia's best-equipped militaries, the large proportion of the defence budget is used for the upkeep of military equipment and the payment of salaries for the conscription-based armed forces. Furthermore, the survival of the nation has instead been dependent on other factors, such as sound economic policies, corrupt-

	threaten Singapore will have to face the hard power of the U.S.	free governance and strong educational and social policies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military force at least helps to provide a minimal degree of order. • In the face of such an implacable and fanatical adversary, hard power is not just our last but our only resort. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The deterrent value with super powers with military forces cannot be denied. There is also the element of the balance of terror. Arguably, the size and might of the U.S. military force acts as a deterrent against rogue nations. Any country that seeks to invade another will always have to factor in retaliation by the U.S. and other allied forces. In this sense then, there is a certain degree of order with the presence of military force. • This is particularly illuminating in the context of Singapore, whose geopolitical climate is complex. Although Singapore is a member of ASEAN, Singapore cannot rely on its neighbours to fight off acts of aggression, given that members of the ASEAN often lack the political and economic will to do so. In addition, the amount of money Singapore spends on its annual budget on defence is indicative of the importance of hard power to ensure protection against potential adversaries. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The causal link between military force and order is highly questionable as real world examples point to the contrary. For example, countries like Monaco, Western Samoa and the Vatican State City do not possess armies and these countries are not in chaos. Conversely, there are countries that possess a sizeable military force and are in a perpetual state of disorder, such as Haiti and Congo. In addition, there is the fact that given how fragile order is in the world today, military force might ironically precipitate an arms race, evident during WW1. • Singapore has also not relied on hard power to deal with "implacable and fanatical" adversaries. While Singapore takes an extremely firm stand towards foreign elements that threaten her survival, the use of hard power has taken a back seat in relation to education.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This leads to a larger point about the economic role of military power in world politics. Economic security relies upon stable systems and institutions, which in turn rest upon the bedrock of hard power. In a well-ordered modern state, the credibility and reliability of this hard power depend 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The U.S. spends in excess of \$800 billion annually on national security (including the cost of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, and the Departments of Homeland Security and Veterans Affairs). But what is the point? Why do Americans spend so much more on its military than does any other country, or any other combination of countries? • One possible argument is that the purpose of American military power is to provide global public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is the need to distinguish between a standing army and civil authorities, which the writer fails to do so. A strong / non-corrupt police force enforcing law and order with an independent judiciary will ensure stability and security of a state; it need not necessarily be the existence of a military army. • In its quest for economic security, Singapore is committed to the maintenance of "an open

<p>on its monopoly on the legitimate use of force, which allows domestic markets to operate. In chaotic conditions, markets crash and economies crumble.</p>	<p>goods, to defend other countries so that they don't have to defend themselves, and to ensure international order for long term economic security.</p>	<p>global and regional trading regime". Unlike traditional notions of national security based on military strength, the security imperative of a vulnerable island-state is dependent upon economic strength rather than military prowess. Singapore's national leaders recognised the fundamental importance of economics in ensuring the viability of a vulnerable small state.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soft power is not only reliant on hard power for its very existence but also totally useless without its protection 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In a sense, soft and hard power are related because they are both aspects of the ability to achieve one's purpose by affecting the behaviour of others. No matter how attractive the style of a country's foreign policies (or cultural power), it cannot be separated from its substance, which is an integral part of hard power. People will only admire your culture if you have the power to 'coerce' them. In other words, the country with soft power needs at least some kind of resources (hard power) to communicate and promote its soft power. • To put it differently, soft power is nothing other than the 'soft' face of hard power. Behind or beneath it is hard power. Soft power is merely a manifestation or presentation of hard power. It is important to distinguish potential and real soft power. A country with rich sources in soft power does not necessarily have the 'power' at its disposal. In other words, the existence of soft power sources provides a deposit but the country needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Soft power can make the use of hard power redundant, because hard power and all that go with it, bribes and threats, can only get a nation so far. In other words, soft power need not be seen as effective only in relation to the strength of hard power. Corporations in the U.S. like Hollywood, Disney, Coca Cola and Nike are some examples of the influence of soft power, while the failures in Afghanistan and Iraq point to the inefficacy of hard power.

	to have the ability, means and other resources, quite often, power, to tap into the deposit and convert this potential power into real power. Without hard power soft power cannot work properly or cannot work at all.	
--	---	--

From Passage B : The following are some possible points for and against Shashi Tharoor's argument.

Shashi Tharoor argues that...

Points from Passage B	Agree	Disagree
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traditionally, power in world politics was seen in terms of military might but even in the past, this was not enough; after all, the United States lost the Vietnam War, and the Soviet Union was ignominiously defeated in Afghanistan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fact that the two superpowers lost these wars points to the inefficacy of hard power. If hard power was the most effective means of asserting power, backed by strong military might (which the U.S. and Russia possessed at that point in time), in theory, these two countries would not have lost the wars. Thus, while in theory, hard power would have guaranteed victory to the superpowers that possessed hard power, in reality, the opposite held true. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While valid in principle, the extent of this assertion is questionable. "Traditionally", military might has defined those in power and those without power but the two examples cited do not validate completely the assertion that "this was not enough." Perhaps the defeats in the Vietnam War and Afghanistan were not so much a question about the inefficacy of military power but rather tactical errors in the deployment of military power and the loss of political will (with waning public support for Vietnam).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The attractiveness of these assets, and of the American lifestyle they epitomise, permits the United States to maximise its ability to attract and persuade others not only to adopt its values but also to support its policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It can be argued that the U.S. should enhance the co-optive power of its culture and the attraction of its lifestyle in order to become preponderant not only in hard power, but also in soft power. This will establish its ideological domination throughout the entire world. Soft power plays a strong reactive role in international politics. Its positive impact can help make a country make feasible national strategy, guide national enthusiasm, shape united will and strong cultural power. Thereby it can 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are limits to what soft power could achieve. In a context dominated by hard power considerations, soft power is meaningless; big soft power does not bend hearts; it twists minds in resentment and rage. Hence, the argument of soft power that rests on affection, attraction and desire is too simplistic and unrealistic. People may like some aspects of American values but hate others, evidenced by the mixed perception of the U.S. in China: people generally admire American technological superiority and super brands

	<p>promote the development of comprehensive national power, improve the country's international status, and increase its international contribution and influence.</p>	<p>but detests its policies on Taiwan.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of political values, the U.S. indisputably offers desirable democratic role models in terms of its egalitarian systems, ethical values, and efficient institutions. 	<p>Any country, in drawing up its national strategy, must pay attention to creating better surroundings; to making its development model, values, lifestyle and corresponding systems attractive, appealing and inspiring; and to incorporating both tangible and intangible power in order to assure the achievement of national interests. Therefore, soft power is always the first option or tool for countries to deal with various affairs in contemporary international relations.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The socio-political reality of the situation in U.S. paints a different picture. The racial riot in Los Angeles, the Columbine High and Virginia Tech massacres, and the notoriously bureaucratic institutions with overlapping roles and responsibilities (eg, FEMA's poor response to Hurricane Katrina) debunk the writer's point of contention. Ironically as well, for the land of the free, the rate of incarceration is alarmingly high. In addition, the writer's argument is largely ethnocentric and possibly condescending as it is based on false assumptions that American culture is superior and that western values and culture will continue to define the world. Western core values of democracy, liberty and consumerism, no matter how attractive or even admirable at first sight, may not necessarily be suitable or achievable in other countries.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The sooner politicians realise that soft power is a far more nimble, amenable and amiable creature to employ than the blundering, unruly, intimidating beast of hard power currently straining at their collective leashes, the better. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to the increasing influence of soft power in international relations, major powers in the world stress the enhancement of their soft powers. As early as the 1980s, former Japanese PM Nakasone proposed a strategic plan to "create a culturally developed country." French President Chirac suggested making a cultural Europe and establishing a European cultural community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Here, the writer cleverly appeals to emotion rather than reason by alluding to hard power as an "unruly, intimidating beast" and soft power as a "nimble, amenable and amiable creature." The dichotomy is arguably a false one as both forms of power are needed to "legitimate" a country's political status. Both hard and soft power possess limitations, and history

	<p>Russian President Putin began to carry out his “cultural expansion” strategy as acting President. In September 1992, former U.S. President Bush highlighted in his Agenda for American Revival, “our political and economic connections are supplemented by the attractiveness of American culture in the world.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the face of aggressive cultural expansion of U.S.-led Western countries, developing countries feel challenged. President Jiang Zemin pointed out recently that “it is vital for most developing countries to maintain and upgrade the excellent traditions of their national cultures, carry forward their national ethics, absorb the good cultural achievements of others, and keep cultural development abreast of the times.” 	<p>has proven that the exclusive employment of one or the other yields limited results. Singapore recognises this and has gone on the offensive in developing and employing both forms of power. The government spends a significant sum of the budget on military expenditure while it has also spends a considerable amount of resources developing its soft power.</p>
--	---	---

To what extent and how effectively does your own country employ both types of power?

Hard Power	Soft Power
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Singapore has astutely recognised the need to use both forms of power. This is why it has invested heavily in building up its military force. Singapore’s economic importance and military capability rank it among Southeast Asia’s middle powers despite its small size and population. Unique among the ASEAN states, Singapore has ignored the economic crisis affecting the region since 1997, and has continued its military build-up, a relentless process that began in 1965 following Singapore’s independence. Singapore fears sudden political developments in the region that might require its armed forces to be used either as a deterrent, or as a means of national defence. This indicates that Singapore’s leadership perceives that under certain circumstance, conflict could in fact 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In many ways, while Singapore attempts to employ soft power via attracting foreign talents, its policies are arguably discriminatory and self-serving. This difference in the treatment between white and blue collar immigrants is telling. Professionals from the I.T., medical and sporting fields are often offered and granted permanent residency while those from the construction industry face basic problems of inadequate housing and exploitation. Hence, there is a certain degree of hypocrisy in the use of soft power. • In addition, what has Singapore achieved with the use of soft power? While the impact of hard power is normally direct and immediate, straight and visible, the effect of soft power is indirect and takes much longer to appear; it may take years to produce the

<p>occur, and military defence capabilities must be credible at all times. The fact that it takes a very long time to build up a military capability, especially if that military capability has to be relative to potential adversaries as well as unforeseen enemies, has meant that Singapore's military development has been continuous and sustained. This also reflects Singapore's basic insecurity as a city-state in a volatile region. Hence, it recognizes that ultimately, the only form of deterrence is via hard power.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To invoke Lord Palmerston regarding his British foreign policy: "Nations have no permanent friends or allies, they only have permanent interests". Singapore has taken this cue seriously given the volatile economic and geopolitical setting she finds herself in. As a result, defence interactions between Singapore and the US are extensive and expanding. Singapore has been a strong supporter of the US military presence in the Asia-Pacific region. When the US withdrew from Clark and Subic, Singapore was the first to offer facilities. In 1990 Singapore and the US signed an MOU to allow the US navy and airforce access to Singapore's military facilities. Also, COMLOG WESTPAC, a US logistics coordinating unit which serves US forces deployed in the Asia-Pacific, was relocated to Singapore in July 1992. The Singapore-US MOU, now into its eighth year, has served both countries well. More than a hundred ships from the US Navy call at Singapore each year and US fighter aircraft regularly deploy to Singapore. • Access to Singapore's facilities has enabled the US military to deal quickly with contingency situations in the Persian Gulf, Indian Ocean, Korean Peninsula, and Somalia. For instance, during the Gulf War, the US Armed Forces used Singapore as a transit point for US ships, troops and aircraft on their way to the Gulf. The use of Paya Lebar Air Base helped the US to support its airlift operations to Somalia. Over the years, the SAF has bought many types of military equipment from the US, e.g., F-16s, Chinook helicopters and KC-135 aircraft. • In recent years, Singapore has drawn upon the U.S. experience in the first Gulf War, and has noted the RMA debate in the United 	<p>desired outcome. Do initiatives like "Uniquely Singapore" and the SIWW actually work in augmenting Singapore's regional and international clout?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inefficacy of soft power is all the more evident given the nebulous understanding and definition of soft power. Soft power, by definition and implementation, is intangible and uncontrollable. The relevance of effectiveness of soft power depends on the perception of the target country audience on the host country; ultimately, they are the deciders of what is attractive to them and what is not. Additionally, soft power is still power and it can still make enemies. The instrumental nature of soft power can lead to feelings of manipulation, and no country likes to be manipulated, be it real or perceived. • The Mas Selamat affair is a case in point. Despite being members of ASEAN, which aims to promote bilateral relations within the South East Asia region, Singapore did not have enough clout for Mas Selamat to be extradited from Malaysia to Singapore for trial. This serves to highlight the inefficacy of soft power that is achieved via alliance with other countries, such as the ASEAN. • While there is an inherent need to spend on military defence, Singapore arguably spends far too much money in this area. One suspects that the money could be better used on education or health or even transportation. What is the point of possessing one of the most (or even the most) impressive military forces in South East Asia if citizens in Singapore find the costs of health care, education and transportation increasingly less affordable? • The ongoing development of the Singapore military force is also questionable. A cursory comparison amongst the ASEAN states, notably Singapore, will indicate an increase in all categories, such as military personnel, tanks, armoured personnel carriers (APCs), medium-range howitzers, missile-armed naval vessels, combat helicopters and combat aircraft. This phenomenon, namely, the concerted regional arms build-up, has caused some to express concerns about the prospects of an arms race in the region. For instance, the initial acquisition of F-16
---	--

<p>States, which has touted the new information, sensing, precision attack, stealth and aerial warfare technologies employed in the Gulf as being the precursor of a fundamental change in the way wars will be fought. Singapore has taken note of these developments, and is paying special attention to enhancing its command, control, communication and intelligence systems in order to fully exploit the modern weapons systems that it possesses or will soon acquire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of soft power is also concomitant in the social pervasiveness of the Singapore Armed Forces (SAF), reinforced by glitzy television and print commercials for careers in the SAF that are managed by leading advertising firms. The SAF also has its own radio station, Power 98, which, in between playing song requests, provides snippets of information on the SAF's training and operations. The SAF therefore is, <i>ceteris paribus</i>, extremely well represented in everyday life. • There also exist very telling political indicators of the military's pre-eminence in Singapore, the most obvious being the defence budget. Singapore's high and sustained defence spending over the years illustrates the Ministry of Defence's (MINDEF) importance in the minds of policymakers. In 1998, MINDEF was allocated a total of SGD\$6.1 billion, making the island's defence spending per capita the highest in the Asia-Pacific. In 1999, this was increased to SGD\$7.3 billion, making up 25% of the overall budget. Of even greater significance is the 2004 budget speech, where Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong announced a permanent 2% cut in budget allocations in FY2004 for all ministries except MINDEF. That the country's defence spending is generally not reduced in bad times or good is a clear indication of Singapore's commitment to the uninterrupted growth of its Armed Forces. • More visible to the man on the street are the continual reminders during official speeches of the need to keep the SAF strong and credible. The most notable of these in recent times was President S.R. Nathan's address at the Istana on 12 Jan 2005, where he 	<p>combat aircraft by Singapore, then Indonesia and Thailand, as well as Malaysia's subsequent interest in acquiring an advanced strike fighter, point to the need to counter or at least not be left behind by one's neighbours.</p>
--	---

<p>proclaimed that: "..... a strong SAF remains a priority. The SAF provides us with a credible deterrence and effective defence. The SAF is effective, because of our collective determination to fight to protect ourselves, our families and our homes when we are endangered. The dedication and sacrifices of generations of national servicemen demonstrate that despite many years of peace, this resolve remains unshaken. The SAF will maintain a high level of operational readiness as it modernises and transforms into the 3rd Generation SAF."</p>	
--	--