

Honor-less heartless decisions of



Humanity's Lose



The tsunami of Dec 26, 04 in Asia that took approximately 200,000 lives couldn't have been prevented because it was a natural disaster caused by Mother Nature. The UN immediately responded as did the U.S. being a member of it for humanitarian aid but, what about the **genocide** in Rwanda of 1991/1994 and the repeat of the same in Darfur of 2003/2007. Both were **genocides** of more than 800,000 lives and with millions displaced from their homeland by the perpetration of ruthless brutal bullies. Both **genocides** were under father and son Bush administrations and for humanitarian reasons neither was willing to get involved yet, were more than willing to declare war on Iraq for non humanitarian reasons especially George W. Bush's psychotic obsession with Sadom Husane and of course to secure the oil fields. Iraq Death Toll Rivals that of Rwanda and Darfur's **genocide** and Cambodian Killing Fields. A new study estimates that 1, 3 million Iraqis have met violent deaths since Bush and Cheney chose to invade, but they weren't interested in fighting the bullies that they were themselves, without oil it wasn't profitable to do so, for intuitive knowledge ref essay's (Oh fuck it's a duck) with its counter-part addendum (Historians vs. George W. Bush). The U.N. including the U.S. made up then justified reasons not to get involved by not acknowledging it as **genocide**. They just simply turned their backs on the inhumane atrocities being perpetrated by ruthless **genocidal** maniacs.

Definition; Genocide is a term defined by Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (CPPCG) as "any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnic, racial or religious group, as such: killing members of the group; causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life, calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; and forcibly transferring children of the group to another group, "It's the UN's responsibility to honorably uphold the integrity of its law".

History: Africa's worst **genocide** in modern times: the conflict had origins in Belgium's colonial rule, which favored the minority Tutsis and fostered differences between the two groups. In 1962, when the country gained independence, Gregoire Kayibanda headed the first recognized Hutu government. Juvenal Habyarimana seized power in a military coup a decade later, following the massacre of thousands of Hutus in neighboring Burundi. For nearly twenty years under Habyarimana, ethnic relations simmered with sporadic outbreaks of violence. In 1993, Habyarimana signed a short-lived power-sharing agreement with the Tutsis, aiming to end the fighting. In April 1994, the plane carrying Habyarimana and the President of Burundi was shot down. The event triggered the notorious **genocide**. Extremist Hutu militia aided by the Rwandan army launched systematic massacres against Tutsis. Despite reports of mass killings, the UN failed to take immediate action to stop the massacres, due to opposition from France and the US. Around 800,000 Tutsis and moderate Hutus were killed within 100 days, and over three million people fled to neighboring countries.

The **genocidal** maniacs who ruled Rwanda chose an opportune moment to launch their "final solution." Powerful individuals in the U.S. government were actively rewriting the rules of international politics. They implemented changes that went beyond merely revising the ground rules for peacekeeping so that the dispatch of United Nations troops to the world's trouble spots would be almost impossible. They knowingly stood by while genocide occurred.

By this inaction, they systematically began to unravel the great achievements of humanitarian law of this century--most of them gained in the period 1945-51 by men and women driven by the visceral shock of Auschwitz and Dresden. The **genocide** in Rwanda--one of the greatest crimes against humanity in the second half of the twentieth century--was an ironically opportune moment for these revisionists to stake their claim.

French soldiers stationed in Rwanda during the **genocide** in 1994 have been accused of "widespread rape" by a Rwandan commission investigating France's role during the conflict.

The commission, which is due to publish its final report in October, will also provide fresh evidence that French soldiers trained the Interahamwe, the extremist Hutu militia responsible for most of the killing, and even provided them with weapons.

Ten years after Rwanda, **genocide** is unfolding again while the world watches and refuses to say its name. The failure of the United States and the international community to act in Rwanda a decade ago cost 800,000 lives. Now, up to 1 million people face a similar fate in Darfur, western Sudan, as a result of an ongoing government campaign to destroy a portion of its population. What is happening in Darfur is **genocide**, and must be called that. The term "**genocide**" not only captures the fundamental characteristics of the Khartoum government's intent and actions, it also invokes clear international obligations.

Ironically, the international community's unwillingness to intervene results--at least in part--from concern that a fragile peace deal between north and south will be jeopardized. Across several administrations, the United States has been involved in promoting peace in Sudan, and the Bush Administration is eager to claim credit for its diplomatic efforts. But as long as the Sudanese government is waging a **genocidal** war in Darfur, the United States cannot pretend that a meaningful peace deal can be achieved. The Administration had hoped that such an agreement would allow it to lift sanctions on Sudan. This, in turn, would permit US oil companies to pursue a share of the country's recently developed oil wealth. Such interests, however, cannot be allowed to compromise a larger moral obligation.

As parties to the **genocide** Convention, all permanent members of the UN Security Council, including the United States and more than 130 countries worldwide, are bound to prevent and punish **genocide**. The convention names **genocide** as a crime in international law, describing it as the commission of acts with "intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group."

The Security Council continues to hesitate on Darfur, largely because of the economic and diplomatic interests of its permanent members, who don't wish to antagonize Khartoum. Whether the UN can be spurred to action will depend largely on the United States, and Washington has an obligation to act. Unless there is an immediate military intervention in Darfur, up to a million or more people could die this year. We should have learned from Rwanda that to stop **genocide**, Washington must first say the word.

WHAT IS GENOCIDE?

*The term "genocide" did not exist before 1944. It is a very specific term, referring to violent crimes committed against groups with the intent to destroy the existence of the group. Human rights, as laid out in the U.S. Bill of Rights or the 1948 United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, concern the rights of individuals. In 1944, a Polish-Jewish lawyer named Raphael Lemkin (1900-1959) sought to describe Nazi policies of systematic murder, including the destruction of the European Jews. He formed the word "**genocide**" by combining **geno-**, from the Greek word for race or tribe, with **-cide**, from the Latin word for killing. In proposing this new term, Lemkin had in mind "a coordinated plan of different actions aiming at the destruction of essential foundations of the life of national groups, with the aim of annihilating the groups themselves." The next year, the International Military Tribunal held at Nuremberg, Germany, charged top Nazis with "crimes against humanity." The word "**genocide**" was included in the indictment, but as a descriptive, not legal, term.*

*On December 9, 1948, in the shadow of the Holocaust and in no small part due to the tireless efforts of Lemkin himself, the United Nations approved the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of **genocide**. This convention establishes "**genocide**" as an international crime, which signatory nations "undertake to prevent and punish."*

*While many cases of group-targeted violence have occurred throughout history and even since the Convention came into effect, the legal and international development of the term is concentrated into two distinct historical periods: the time from the coining of the term until its acceptance as international law (1944-1948) and the time of its activation with the establishment of international criminal tribunals to prosecute the crime of **genocide** (1991-1998). Preventing **genocide**, the other major obligation of the convention, remains a challenge that nations and individuals continue to face. However, Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of **Genocide** (CPPCG) is not a consideration but an obligation to be honored. When compromised, the result is what took place; Powerful individuals in the U.S. government were actively rewriting the rules of international politics. **They implemented changes that went beyond merely revising the ground rules for peacekeeping so that the dispatch of United Nations troops to the world's trouble spots would be almost impossible. They knowingly stood by while genocide occurred, a dishonorable despicable act by the U.S.***

It is increasingly apparent that the United Nations possesses inherent characteristics that make it incapable of effectively mediating complex international disputes. Yet because of its brief period of success, an egregious gap has grown between popular expectations and U.N. abilities. As currently constituted, the United Nations has great difficulty performing many basic functions required of an effective mediator. It does not serve well as an authoritative channel of communication. It has little real political leverage. Its promises and threats lack credibility. And it is incapable of pursuing coherent, flexible, and dynamic negotiations guided by an effective strategy.

Decisions to implement changes that go beyond merely revising all the ground rules to be able to knowingly stand by while genocide occurred, is a abominable disgrace to all of humanity as well as the integrity of the heart and won't be unnoticed, because what goes around will come sooner or later by Gods decision.

© Author,
Don L. Johnson

*While many cases of group-targeted violence have occurred throughout history and even since the Convention came into effect, the legal and international development of the term is concentrated into two distinct historical periods: the time from the coining of the term until its acceptance as international law (1944-1948) and the time of its activation with the establishment of international criminal tribunals to prosecute the crime of **genocide** (1991-1998). Preventing **genocide**, the other major obligation of the convention, remains a challenge that nations and individuals continue to face. However, Article 2 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of **Genocide** (CPPCG) is not a consideration but an obligation to be honored. When compromised, the result is what took place; Powerful individuals in the U.S. government were actively rewriting the rules of international politics. **They implemented changes that went beyond merely revising the ground rules for peacekeeping so that the dispatch of United Nations troops to the world's trouble spots would be almost impossible. They knowingly stood by while genocide occurred, a dishonorable despicable act by the U.S.***

It is increasingly apparent that the United Nations possesses inherent characteristics that make it incapable of effectively mediating complex international disputes. Yet because of its brief period of

success, an egregious gap has grown between popular expectations and U.N. abilities. As currently constituted, the United Nations has great difficulty performing many basic functions required of an effective mediator. It does not serve well as an authoritative channel of communication. It has little real political leverage. Its promises and threats lack credibility. And it is incapable of pursuing coherent, flexible, and dynamic negotiations guided by an effective strategy.

Political blunders of inhumane decisions like changing all the rules of honor to dishonor by knowingly standing by while genocide occurs, is a abominable disgrace to all of humanity and the integrity of the heart. Decisions like that, is a heartless decision that compromises the integrity of the heart to evil practices and won't be unnoticed because what goes around will come sooner or later by Gods decision.

© Author,

Don L. Johnson

#3