

# International relations assignment



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Distant “ Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty. ” -John F. Kennedy These words spoken by John F. Kennedy during his inaugural address on January 20, 1961 are the personification of the agenda towards foreign relations for the United States of America and her Western allies.

As champions of peace and servants of liberty, the nations of the ideological West have swiftly rationalized the invigilation of peacekeepers, implementation economic trade sanctions, and forcefully removed government regimes that were deemed violators of human rights, tyrannical, and/or agitators of world peace. Yet, as the world becomes a smaller place due to enhanced communication, lowered trade barriers, and mass media; nation-states tend to plan their actions more tactfully than before in the sass to maintain their global reputations and popular sovereignty.

Distant ‘ s problematic relations internally and externally symbolize the importance of efficient security, popular sovereignty, lattice liberties, and human rights functioning completely to acquire a civilized state. By chronicling statehood decisions of the following nation-states; France, Great Britain, Russia, and China, the purpose of this paper will be to highlight political and social factors associated with the Distant crisis.

Additionally, it is imperative to analyze the governmental frameworks of these countries as the influential basis behind responses that impact surrounding communities and the international relations process. This brings the discussion to the young nation-state, Takes, which after the separation

from a large authoritarian empire, began to showcase the symptoms of an oppressive government. These traits are showcased, firstly, by the single-party government in national elections, which are largely symbolic because no other party is allowed to have candidates.

Much like Takes, North Korea is ruled by a single party and the recent elections in March of this year, North Korean dictator, Kim Jong-UN, won 100% of the votes because he was the only candidate on the ballot. The 13th Supreme People's Assembly is a rubber-stamp legislature that elects 687 delegates from across North Korea to go through the motions of proper election, but it is all merely a show. Every motion, nomination, and inevitably election of individuals are predetermined by the "Upper" house.

Thus, the meeting is merely a gathering of puppets to show to the world that North Korea adheres to democratic processes. All delegates must automatically lift up their registration cards and vote in favor of all motions. Western nations, such as the United States, France, and Great Britain, view these actions as a mockery to democracy and its principles. "I will simply say that is not a model for democracy around the world," U. S. State Department spokeswoman Jean Khaki. Second trait is shown by the public degradation of the other ethnic groups through police raids and mass graves being found. The world shuddered in 1994, when mass graves containing more than 7,000 bodies were discovered in Rwanda from the "ethnic cleansing" of the Tutsis minority by the Hut majority for political power and ethnic oppression. If Takes has a world leader like France as ally, then France would help to equip, arm and, according to many, train the Attestation militia.

The same actions happened in Rwanda during the 1994 genocide and those same military officials that France trained were the driving force of the massacre of the Tutsis and even after officially learning of the genocide, France continued to support the Rwanda government of the Hut majority. Once sanctions were placed on Rwanda and U. N. Peacekeepers arrived, the French volunteers still proved inefficient. Many of the perpetrators of the genocide conveniently fled the country along roads that went through the French-patrolled area, which was supposed to be a humanitarian corridors.

Relations between France and Rwanda are still strained as emotions stirred during the 20th Anniversary of the Rwanda Genocide. Rwanda president, Paul Kagame, on the eve of somber ceremonies to mark the 1994 genocide. France, he said, bore part of the responsibility for the carnage that killed more than 800, 000 people, mostly members of the Tutsis minority. French political leaders responded defensively, canceling plans for the French Justice minister to attend the commemoration and, in most cases, angrily denouncing Mr. Kagame's assertions.

Rubin) The role of Non-government organizations (NGOs) really gave the horror in Rwanda a global platform that triggered reaction from the major players. The presence of NGOs in response to emergency situations is oftentimes vital in the survival of victims facing such conflicts. It is evident that although NGOs have responded in a time of need after various conflicts around the world, there is still a need for earlier response and greater coordination of the voluntary agencies, both horizontally and vertically, in order to be efficient and successful in their efforts.

Not only is there a need to use Nags more efficiently in the early warning stages of such conflicts, but there is also a need in post-conflict situations where MONGO regulation poses an enormous problem in the realm of humanitarian interventions. Nags typically operate unbiased and without national interest leading their objectives, unlike nation-states under the theory of Realism. This leaves Nags free to take care of the greater needs of society just like they did in the Genocide of Rwanda.

The Western powers, such as Great Britain, admit that their actions were too slow ND could have possibly prevented the bloodshed of thousands if they responded faster. An article from a blob site for students to discuss international relations depicts the Rwanda genocide as a failure of the international community due to interconnected and complex factors that led to international inaction, such as a misguided view of African conflicts, the bureaucratic nature of the United Nations and peacekeeping fatigue in general. Great Britain would react to Takes as a human rights issue because their stance in international affairs, they would not be in purport of the government arresting and executing MONGO leaders this would be considered unjust according the British government. Great Britain political system is parliamentary and they would have to follow parliamentary procedure to see if they will engage the government of Takes.

The structure of the nation will never outweigh the immensity in the loss of innocent lives and will always garner attention of the great world powers that believe in liberty and morality. One would think that after an international hiccup such as the Rwanda genocide occurred that if the hypothetical government of Takes were filling mass graves with the bodies of ethnic

<https://assignbuster.com/international-relations-assignment-essay-samples/>

minorities then all of the major world powers would swoop in quickly to help prevent the loss of lives without the bureaucratic nature of the United Nations, but that's incorrect. Let's look at a present day example, Syria.

In the midst of the Arab Spring, the revolutionary movement throughout many Arab countries led by dictatorships, violence broke out in DARPA, Syria, on March 2011, after a group of children and teenagers were arrested for writing political graffiti. Dozens of people were killed when security forces cracked down on roadsters. In April 2011, the Syrian regime sent thousands of troops into DARPA for a wide-scale crackdown and the violence has persisted throughout the country ever since. The death toll now exceeds 100, 000 people with millions of other displaced into neighboring countries.

There are many similarities between the Syrian government and Takes. Both nations have one ruling political party, Syria has the Bath political party and have a disproportionate amount of wealth. Yet, contrastingly, while the hypothetical Takes is killing its ethnic minority group, the overspent of al-Sad massacres his very own people. Back in October 2011, China and Russia vetoed a resolution in the Security Council of the United Nations that would have threatened the Syrian government with targeted sanctions if it continued military actions.

Russian's attempts to thwart the United Nation's sanctions on Syria are reflective of its economic relationship with Syria, as its major weapons supplier and also the prevention of American influence in the area. 7 In the case of Takes, Russia would most likely support the opposition because they also claim they will en he country dependence on the West and they will

challenge the hegemony of US and its allies. Russia would view Takes as a political issue and their role would be to diminish the influence and power of the United States for political control and economic influence.

In terms of the conflict in Syria, China appears to desire to maintain its financial ties with Syria. It was ranked as Syrians third-largest importer in 2010, according to data from the European Commission. <sup>8</sup> As a parallel to the situation in Takes, China's reaction would have an economical interest attached to it. The hypothetical stated that Takes was a poor country that is rich in resources and China, a manufacturing-based economy, would profit greatly from the large supply of raw materials gained in an economic partnership.

This being said, China would react by supporting the government or the opposition depending upon which one China can gain the most from economically. One can see that based on past considerations of the four nation states- France, Great Britain, Russia, and China- there is a possibility for four different responses from the international community in response to an outbreak such as one in Takes. Inferences have been taken from the past actions of the countries from example such as the unopposed election of Kim Jong-un, the Genocide of Rwanda and the Syrian Civil War.

There could be unwavering support of the ruling class for ideological reasons or opposition against the foreign federal body due to human right issues.

There could be negotiations of economic partnerships for natural resources to be acquired by the larger supporting country. Also, responses can garner interest in political gain and influence by stalling the process in international

organizations. As one can see, the moves played by global players in the monumental game of international relations are strategically placed for the advancement of the respective nation-states' ideology, power, and influence.