

Example of creative writing on thought paper; the concept of sovereignty is highl...

[Sociology](#), [Racism](#)



The concept of sovereignty is one in which nations around the world hold dear to the advancement of their international policy. The principles of sovereignty dictate that a country holds unlimited power over the ability to govern itself without outside interference. The advancement of these principles gives the rest of the world powers a peripheral role in determining the destiny of separate nations. While this concept is important in ensuring that countries do not overstep their authority and harm the interests of other nations for the advancement of their own, the applicability of the sovereignty of a nation is a concept that needs more study and be expounded upon in order to determine who really should be sovereign and who should not. For the sovereignty of a nation to be recognized, the leadership of that nation must have a free reign over the running of their affairs. In most democratic models, sovereignty works since the leadership in truly representative governments advance the wishes of their constituents. Being the people's representatives, the people are in control of power and therefore in international perspective, are sovereign in the running of their affairs. The concept of sovereignty is complicated and much less straightforward, when it comes to nations led by monarchies and authoritarian regimes; the power exercised by these regimes, while being over the people, does not derive expressly from the people.

When it comes to humanitarian responses and emergencies, the sovereignty principle fails miserably. The United Nations Security Council is the one body created to go around the obstacle of sovereignty in cases of emergency operations or in instances, which necessitated humanitarian efforts. Case that have arisen in the recent past have brought to fore the various factors

that come into play in situations where people die as a result of war or by cases of genocide as in the case of Rwanda 1994. Rwanda 1994 is an example where a mix of factors saw total failure of reaction to the plight of the Tutsi community who were facing near extermination by the Hutu controlled government and military. The Rwandan genocide erupted as following the death of the president, Juvénal Habyarimana in a plane crash. The accounts of the genocide by the various people involved, point to a systematic failure of cultures and principles rather than the lack of adequate information or even capacity to quell what would have been an otherwise mild revolt. The UN commander posted to the UNAMIR mission to Rwanda offers an insight into a scenario where among other factors, sovereignty of the Rwandan people was used as an excuse to let the genocide proceed undeterred until it was a little too late. When the United Nations fails, the fate of a country that does invoke major interest in the imagination of the big powers of the world like Rwanda is doomed. The failure of the United Nations is explicit and undeniable in its approach to the Rwandan genocide in relation to its mandate. By avoiding upsetting its main financiers including the United States, the United Nations failed to execute a function in its mandate, over ride the sovereignty of a nation in the interest of protecting its citizens from unnecessary butchering in ethnic cleansing. The United Nations charter needs an amendment further delineate it from the major world powers sponsoring it. The obligations towards the united nations should not measure up to the amount of influence a nation has in the UN, rather, the United Nations should be allowed to operate and make decisions without influence. The influence of the United States on the on the United

Nations is a major factor that the genocide proceeded to the levels it did. President Bill Clinton made a call to the United Nations to desist from, or 'say no to chancy or costly missions'. To the United States, the preservation of world peace scaled up against a financial scale rather than a humanitarian one. The interests of the United States in Rwanda were minimal, and as such did not see the need to invest heavily in the peacekeeping initiative there, even through the United Nations of which it had major influences on. Congress owed half a billion dollars in UN dues and peacekeeping costs and its reluctance to furnish those funds meant that UNAMIR mission was run on a shoestring budget. The amendment of the UN charter, to grant it exclusive rights in calling for action in places where there are mass killings, is an essential step towards avoiding a replica of the Rwandan genocide for instance. There should be the formation of a dedicated armed wing funded by predetermined contributions by all member states. The United Nations should be the world government.

The argument on reducing the emphasis laid on state sovereignty in case of crisis is supported by the idea that countries that have to be allowed sovereignty have to show some amount of responsibility towards their citizens and towards the international community. While the Hutu government was a legal government, it did not act with the responsibility required of it towards assuring the protection of the Tutsi people and should not be allowed a free reign under the guises of technicality of, what can be defined as genocide and what cannot. The criticism to the right of intervention became increasingly popular in the 1990s was because of poor implementation where countries intervened in conflicts and took a partisan

role while propagating their interests instead of quelling the intended violence. A revision of the policy guiding the right to intervention would have been the appropriate measure taken rather than a complete avoidance of intervention. The world has seen times where the abstract concepts of nationhood and sovereignty precede the nonnegotiable rights to life of the citizens of these countries.

While intervention poses the threat of helping rebels overthrow governments, where there are all indications that large-scale killing is bound to occur; military action is a viable option as an anticipatory measure. The case of Rwanda where large batches of arms were being imported with the full knowledge of the international community and the UN without any substantial measure taken. The confiscation of such arms either by the UN forces or by the help of other major world powers would have been the most prudent thing to do. The genocide that followed was unprecedented while the risks of taking action at this stage increased significantly.

Dallaire, a frustrated UNAMIR general, who went on to develop post-traumatic stress following his mission in Rwanda summed up the feeling of frustration he felt on ground with a chocked UN combat unit and a world unwilling/restrained from responding. This nation, without any hesitation nor doubt, is capable and even expected by the less fortunate of this globe to lead the developed countries beyond self-interest, strategic advantages, and isolationism, and raise their sights to the realm of the pre-eminence of humanism and freedom. the excerpt obtained from a letter he sent to Canadian broadcasting company, Dallaire is expressly calling upon Canada to take responsibility, devoid of self interest but in genuine urge to help,

using its forces to bring order to the under privileged. In times of difficulty such as the Rwanda genocide, Dallaire feels that it is the responsibility of the world's big powers such as Canada to step in and end the violence with disregard for illusionary 'sovereignty' of the threatened people. The sovereignty of human life takes emphasis over the sovereignty of a nation; a person becomes a human being first before they are citizens of political demarcations. The life of the individuals making up a nation takes precedence over sovereignty of their leaders to oppress/ incite them to killing each other. The sovereignty of a nation ties with its ability of remaining a nation.