

The Sovereignty and Goodness of God Questions and Answers. The Question and Answer section for The Sovereignty and Goodness of God is a great resource to ask questions, find answers, and discuss the novel.

Sign up to receive special offers and promotions from Llewellyn. Click for more information about New Worlds or to receive issues via mail. While we think of her today as a queen of battle, she is more accurately the "Great Queen" and a goddess of sovereignty. Celtic mythology is filled with powerful, enigmatic queens, both mortal and divine. Some, like Maeve and Rhiannon, began as goddesses but were eventually demoted to mortal queens within their myths. Regardless, the roles of these queens remained constant. They personify power, authority, and strength. They were goddesses of the land, and only through a union with them could kings win the right to rule. To modern seekers they offer the gift of empowerment and self-knowledge. They challenge us to reclaim sovereignty over our lives, and lead us towards wholeness. But before we can examine what role the goddess of sovereignty can play in our lives today, it is important to understand who she was to those who worshiped her in the past, the Pagans. To the Celts sovereignty was not simply the right to rule over a clan or country; sovereignty was a divine power that was granted by the goddess of the land. The goddess and the land were one and the same, and thus sovereignty took on the guise of a mystical or divine woman. It was only through a union—either a marriage or sexual encounter—with her that the king could rule. By joining with the goddess of the land, he in turn became connected to the land and its people. It was believed that a blemish to a king would manifest in the land; if a king was disfigured in anyway, he could no longer remain king, lest he risk transferring his disfigurement to the land. Thus when the king of the Irish Gods, Nuada, lost his hand in battle he was forced to abdicate the throne. Because kings had to enter into a symbolic marriage with the goddess of the land, there are many references to goddesses of sovereignty also being queens. The Morrigan is no exception; her name means "Great Queen," inferring a connection to sovereignty, and as Macha one of the three goddesses who form the Morrigan she appeared as a mortal queen who goes to battle to retain the right to rule. When her father died and his allotted time came to rule she demanded to take his place. The other kings refused, not wishing to rule alongside a woman. Macha swiftly went to war against them and won her crown on the battlefield. It is important to notes the other kings could not rule without her. When they reject her, they reject the power of sovereignty she holds. Like other goddesses of sovereignty, the Morrigan has a strong connection to the land. While we think of her today as a goddess of battle, her name appears in connection to numerous earth works and features of the land, making her origins most likely that of an earth goddess. The places she makes her home also point toward her connection to the land and sovereignty. The Cave of Cruachan, also said to be her home, stood not far away from Cruachan, the royal seat of power for the kings and queens of Connacht. The gift of sovereignty was not shared; instead, it was conveyed from the goddess to the king, who acted as her representative. This relationship was not always permanent; if the king became too old to rule or was unjust the goddess could leave the union and replace him with a younger, more fitting ruler. We can find this theme in the stories of Maeve, Rhiannon, and Guinevere. She takes many consorts, replacing them when she sees fit. Despite this Maeve always retains Queenship over Connacht, while the men in her life can only become kings through a union with her. Like other kings, it is not until Dagda engaged in a sexual union or marriage with the goddess of the land that he and the other Irish gods could truly rule Ireland. As a mortal woman she is reduced to a lustful, cheating wife, but when we return her to her original form, seeing her instead as the goddess of sovereignty, she is maintaining her right to choose her lovers and confer sovereignty to a younger, worthier mate. She acts in the best interest of the land, giving the power to rule to someone she feels is better suited to its prosperity and protection. This same theme is mirrored in the interactions between Morgan Le Fay and her sometimes-lover brother, when she attempts to have her young lover Accolon replace Arthur as king. It is debatable if Morgan Le Fay and the Morrigan are the same, but they share many traits. Certainly they share similar roles as sovereignty figures within Celtic lore. The goddess of sovereignty, like the Morrigan, was somewhat of a shape-shifter ; she could take the form of a young beautiful woman or a monstrous hag. When she appears as the hag it is usually to test the king or to

remove him from his position, while as the maiden she grants him her loving support and gifts. At times the two themes are combined and the king must face the hag in order for her to transform into the lovely maiden. The sovereign-hag usually appears in a story when the king has broken his vows to the goddess in some way. Usually this is after he has violated a taboo, or geis. Kings and heroes often had several geis placed upon them by a goddess or Otherworldly female. When the king broke one of his geis, the sovereign-hag would appear, tempting him to break his remaining taboos. This functioned as a sort of divine checks and balances system. If he broke his taboo, he was unworthy and the goddess relinquished the power of sovereignty, which he had abused. We often find the Morrigan filling the role of the sovereign-hag who brings unworthy kings low. Disguised as a hideous hag she tricked him into breaking his final geis, to never admit a single female into his house after dark, and by the morning Conaire was dead. The Morrigan, charmed by his prowess in battle, appears to him as a beautiful maiden. She offers him her love, but he rudely turns down her offer. When she offers to aid him in battle instead, he again insults her. Fueled by his ego he believes he does not need her aid to win his battles. Like other kings who the sovereign goddess tests and find unworthy, the Morrigan takes actions against him. She attacks him in the form of a heifer, an eel, and a wolf, hindering him in battle. Like her interaction with Conaire, she attempts to make the hero break his geis. She offers him some of the meat, which puts him in a precarious situation. No matter what he does, refuse the food or eat it, he will break a geis. He eats the food, and like Conaire, dies shortly after. In mythology the goddess of sovereignty is a mighty queen; she dispenses justice and aids the worthy, all in service to the land and its people. As the goddess of sovereignty, the Morrigan challenges us to champion ourselves, to claim the sovereignty of self. Too often in life we forget to recognize our own power, our right to steer the directions of our lives. Sometimes we hand our power over to others; perhaps we have been learned to rely on other people and not ourselves, or we are afraid to take control of our lives, or maybe we have handed our power over to another out of love. Perhaps we feel too shy to speak our true feelings, or feel like the course of our lives is out of our control. Whether we have relinquished our personal power within a relationship, in our careers, or just in life in general, the Great Queen calls to us to reclaim our sovereignty. Beverly Moon and Elisabeth Benard relate the word "sovereign" to the Sanskrit *sva-raj*, which means "self-rule" or "self-ruler. When we self-rule our lives we do not leave our fates up to others. Empowered by this aspect of the goddess we can bravely reshape ourselves and our lives into what we desire. As the sovereign-hag she appears to us when we need to break down the barriers that hold us back in life. She tests our strength, and teaches us to rely on the power within. As the queen she teaches us the necessity of action. If we wish to bring change into our lives, then at times, like Macha, we must go to battle and stand up for what we believe in. When we have learned to call upon our inner strength, she appears as the beautiful maiden, offering us the wealth of the land and the fruits of our hard earned labors. While the great queens of mythology are often cast as villains, they teach us a vital truth. When we embrace the mysteries of the sovereign queen we embrace our own inner power, letting it shine radiantly into all aspects of our lives. The ancient queens of myth and legend took power into their own hands, and fought fiercely to maintain it. No matter the situations they remained resolutely true to themselves. Through self-rule they shaped the course of their stories, just as we can re-shape our own. Her lifelong love of Irish mythology led to a close study of Celtic Witchcraft. A natural clairvoyant and empath, she has worked as a

Chapter 2 : Sovereignty - Kingdom of Wales

A Chinese general stated that the placing of weapons on the artificial islands is a "symbol of sovereignty." They are entitled to do whatever they want on the islands, because they own them.

Investigations of the state more and more frequently critically analyze the foundational status of sovereignty. Such analyses require more than just making the claim that sovereignty is a variable concept. They entail shifting through the various ways in which this seemingly foundational concept has been reconfigured in diplomatic practice. To do this effectively, the concept of sovereignty ought not to be examined in isolation either from history or from related theoretical terms. Additionally, attention must be directed to the ways in which various meanings of sovereignty, as they shift and are reformed, have been configured. I present a number of theoretical arguments to support this assertion. Then I turn to historical analyses of intervention practices by the Concert of Europe, the Wilson administration, and the Reagan-Bush administrations in which I trace the constitution and interpretation of community standards for legitimate intervention practices and their corresponding effects upon collective understandings of state sovereignty. I weave critical international relations theory informed by the works of Michel Foucault and Jean Baudrillard into foreign policy discourses of intervention to accomplish two theoretical tasks. First, rather than redefining state sovereignty, this analysis "un"-defines and therefore radically deconstructs state sovereignty by questioning the historical foundations of sovereign authority. Secondly, this analysis provides a critique of representation generally and of the representation of the sovereign state in particular. I suggest that the meanings of sovereignty no longer abide by what I term a logic of representation in which referents [signifieds] and indicators [signifiers] are clearly demarcated but instead abide by a logic of simulation in which there are no ultimate foundations but XI PREFACE instead a chain of interchangeable signifiers. Theorizing the relationship between state sovereignty and intervention in a logic of simulation and in a system of symbolic exchange requires that we cease to assume representational relationships and pose representation as a question. Instead of asking "what is represented?" I begin this project here by examining how sovereignty might be simulated in contemporary diplomatic practice and how simulation transforms international relations theories of state sovereignty and intervention. Along the way, innumerable people have taught me and encouraged me. I owe them my greatest intellectual debts. I was fortunate to spend a year at the Center for International Studies at the University of Southern California working on the early research and writing of this book. Over the years, Roxanne Doty, Marianne Marchand, and Eric Selbin have engaged me in lively debates about sovereignty and poststructuralism. Surely, they have saved me from many a misstep. Students, staff, and faculty at Purdue University provided me with encouragement and support, particularly Diane Rubenstein who read almost as many drafts of the emerging text as did I. Like Diane, Michael Weinstein kept me theoretically honest. Also, Carol Pech provided editorial and research assistance, as did Francois Debrix. I thank them all. Finally, without the support of my friends in West Virginia, I may have done something "pragmatic" like get a law degree. I thank them for tolerating my impracticalities and for helping me to place my academic endeavors in perspective. This book is dedicated to my grandmother Hilda Lilyan Fyfe, who offered me similar combinations of unconditional personal support and cheerful intellectual disinterest. Parts of this work have appeared elsewhere. Parts of chapters 1 and 5 appeared in *Alternatives Summer* under the title "Writing Sovereign Identities: Wilson Administration Intervention in the Mexican Revolution. When this question is considered in light of most of the literature in international relations, the answer appears to be probably not. Few scholars would admit this answer, yet when one considers how international relations theorists give accounts of history, concepts, and issues in their discipline, they seemingly are presented with a choice between two opposed options. They may provide explanations from within the tradition of realism which takes individual sovereign states as its point of departure. Alternatively, they may give their accounts from within the tradition of idealism which takes a community of sovereign states as its point of departure. Sovereignty describes states either individually or in a community. Thus sovereignty serves as a fundamental point of reference in international relations, a ground or essential modifier for the state. Even though the concept of

sovereignty performs as a referent for statehood, debates in the international relations literature suggest that the meaning of sovereignty is not clearly defined Biersteker et al. Generally, sovereignty is taken to mean the absolute authority a state holds over a territory and people as well as independence internationally and recognition by other sovereign states as a sovereign state. However, when confronted by questions about the specific meaning of sovereignty, international relations theorists readily admit that precisely what sovereignty means remains rather fuzzy. In response to this problem of meaning, theorists may follow Ernst Haas who once wrote, "I do not use the concept at all and see no need to" Recently, however, a more common response by theorists has been to make sovereignty the focus of their work, examining more how the concept functions in international relations than precisely what sovereignty means. In effect, then, theorists "solve" however temporarily the problem of state sovereignty by proceeding as if the meaning of sovereignty were stable because a solution to this problem seems to be a prerequisite for getting on with the business of international relations theory. With this in mind, R. Walker noted that far from its largely accepted status as an "essentially contested" concept,³ state sovereignty is instead an essentially wwcontested concept. Walker writes of sovereign statehood: Its meaning might be marginally contestable by constitutional lawyers and other connoisseurs of fine lines, but for the most part state sovereignty expresses a commanding silence. At least some problems of political life, it seems to suggest, are simple and settled, fit for legalists and footnotes, but not of pressing concern to those interested in the cut and thrust of everyday political struggle. The first is a blindness to the historicity of sovereignty. Not one but countless forms of state sovereignty co-exist in modern global political life. Not only do various forms of sovereign statehood co-exist in distinct locales in modern global politics, but added to this spatial dimension of sovereignty ⁵ is a temporal variation as well. The legitimate privileges and competencies of states are markedly different in the eighteenth, nineteenth, and twentieth centuries. Taking these observations about sovereignty seriously, some scholars suggest that while the word sovereignty denotes a state of being an ontological status - sovereignty in fact expresses a characteristic way in which being or sovereign statehood may be inferred from doing or practice. It is not possible to talk about the state as an ontological being - as a political identity - without engaging in the political practice of constituting the state. Thought of in this way, sovereignty marks not the location of the foundational entity of international relations theory but a site of political struggle. This struggle is the struggle to fix the meaning of sovereignty in such a way as to constitute a particular state - to write the state - with particular boundaries, competencies and legitimacies available to it. This is not a one-time occurrence which fixes the meaning of sovereignty and statehood for all time in all places; rather, this struggle is repeated in various forms at numerous spatial and temporal locales. The second embarrassment for international relations theorists who presume settlement of the question of sovereignty, then, is that they cannot begin to investigate how the meaning of sovereignty is stabilized. They must close their eyes to what is without a doubt the most fundamental of political questions - how is the meaning of state sovereignty fixed in theory and practice? It is just this question that is the focus of this study. What is not attempted here is to trace historically how sovereignty has been defined by theorists or legal scholars to provide a genealogy of sovereignty and then to choose which definition is best or most useful. Nor does this study attempt to refine vague definitions of sovereignty and offer my own more precise, exact understanding of the concept so a better understanding of statehood can be achieved. Instead, this study investigates another question: How is the meaning of sovereignty fixed or stabilized historically via practices of international relations theorists and practices of political intervention? In other words, how do practices of theorists and diplomats stabilize the meaning of sovereignty and, by default, write the state? These introductory remarks have suggested that practices by international relations theorists participate in the stabilization of the meaning of state sovereignty. How intervention practices fit into this analysis has yet to be elaborated. Rather, intervention practices are examined because they raise the very question of sovereignty. Intervention practices participate in stabilizing the meaning of sovereignty. This is so because discussions of intervention invariably imply questions of sovereignty. In modern global political discourse, intervention generally infers a violation of state sovereignty Vincent, ; Little, ; Bull, Thus, intervention discourse begins by positing a sovereign state with boundaries that might be violated and then regards transgressions of these boundaries as a problem. Furthermore, intervention

practices take analysis immediately to the question of when, from a reputedly global perspective, sovereignty is or is not invested in a particular locality, leadership, or set of practices. When state practices do not fit intersubjective understandings of what a sovereign state must be, then interference by a sovereign state into the affairs of an "aberrant" state is legitimate. Moreover, such practices rarely are referred to as interventions. On the other hand, when state practices do accord with intersubjective understandings of being or statehood, intervention is prohibited and, when carried out, condemned by the supposed community of sovereign states. By analyzing interventions which occurred at different historical periods, it is possible to get indications of how intervention justifications, sovereignty and statehood have changed. Both have to do with the constitution of communities - communities of sovereign states, on the one hand, and communities as the foundations for sovereign states, on the other. To begin with how the constitution of communities of sovereign states is raised by intervention practices, it would be beneficial to illustrate this point with reference to a popular theme in international relations research in the s and s - norms. In a situation of structural anarchy, neorealist theorists ask, how can norms be explained? Prevailing wisdom holds that norms are the result of interest coordination and often are expressed as regimes - informal institutions around which interests converge Krasner, For the concept of norms to be meaningful in global political life, there must exist an interpretive community to evaluate state practices in the light of prevailing norms. That is, according to this logic, state practices encounter interpretive standards that are always already in place before practices occur, and these standards emanate from an already existing interpretive community. Interpretive communities appear to exist prior to state practices because in giving an explanation for the existence of norms, neorealist theorists must assume both sovereign states and interpretive communities a priori. Very few theorists question this logic, much less turn it around by asking how interpretive communities can be said to exist before interests converge. When intervention practices occur, they are accompanied by justifications on the part of an intervening state to a supposed international community of sovereign states. In offering justifications for their intervention practices, diplomats of intervening states simultaneously assume the existence of norms regulating state practices and an interpretive community that will judge intervention practices in accordance with these norms. But just as in the case of international regimes, it is international practice that constitutes the boundaries and capacities of both sovereign states and international interpretive communities. I do not mean to suggest that when undertaking an act of intervention and offering an apology for this act, spokespersons for a sovereign state consciously configure their audience into a community of similarly disposed sovereign states. The question of community constitution also arises with reference to the constitution of the sovereign voice of a state. Implicit in the notion that diplomats offer justifications to interpretive communities¹¹ is the assumption that the state for whom the diplomat speaks is also already fully constituted as a sovereign identity. That is, the state has the capacity to speak on behalf of its domestic constituency on matters of global politics and deserves to be heard. But how can this community be said to exist, and how can the state be said to speak on its behalf? It seems that a number of things are required. Primarily, a domestic community must be differentiated from both the realm of global politics and from other domestic communities. This is no easy matter considering that the boundaries marking off a domestic community are not naturally given, uncontested, and fixed. Boundaries are transgressed by both domestic groups excluded by the state the disenfranchised, be they minorities, homeless or criminals, for example as well as external groups such as refugees and illegal aliens. If one includes in the notion of boundaries not just physical phenomena like peoples and geography but also less tangible phenomena like authority, it becomes quite difficult to locate anything resembling a stable boundary. One need only think of the permeability of state authority in economics expressed in terms like "interdependence" Keohane and Nye, and "sovereignty at bay" Vernon, and - security - aired in debates about "the demise of the territorial state" due to the existence of nuclear weapons Herz, 13 - or ecology - highlighted by noting that such things as acid rain, pollution, and the disposal of nuclear waste defy territorial boundaries Walker, Yet even if theorists assume the existence of a domestic community, they still confront another question: This is very much tied to the notion of the way in which practice or "doing" implies ontology or "being."

Chapter 3 : Sovereignty - Wikipedia

This book is a critical inquiry into sovereignty and argues that the meaning and functions performed by this concept have changed significantly during the past decades, with profound implications for the ontological status of the state and the modus operandi of the international system as a whole.

The central tenet is that legitimacy of rule or of law is based on the consent of the governed. Popular sovereignty is thus a basic tenet of most Republics , and in some monarchies. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau were the most influential thinkers of this school, all postulating that individuals choose to enter into a social contract with one another, thus voluntarily giving up some of their natural freedom in return for protection from dangers derived from the freedom of others. Whether men were seen as naturally more prone to violence and rapine Hobbes or cooperation and kindness Rousseau , the idea that a legitimate social order emerges only when the liberties and duties are equal among citizens binds the social contract thinkers to the concept of popular sovereignty. A parallel development of a theory of popular sovereignty can be found among the School of Salamanca see e. Francisco de Vitoria “ or Francisco Suarez “ , who like the theorists of the divine right of kings and Locke saw sovereignty as emanating originally from God , but unlike divine right theorists and in agreement with Locke passing from God to all people equally, not only to monarchs. Republics and popular monarchies is theoretically based on popular sovereignty. However, a legalistic notion of popular sovereignty does not necessarily imply an effective, functioning democracy: Popular sovereignty in the United States of America[edit] Main article: Popular sovereignty in the United States The application of the doctrine of popular sovereignty receives particular emphasis in American history, notes historian Christian G. Lutz noted the variety of American applications: To speak of popular sovereignty is to place ultimate authority in the people. There are a variety of ways in which sovereignty may be expressed. It may be immediate in the sense that the people make the law themselves, or mediated through representatives who are subject to election and recall; it may be ultimate in the sense that the people have a negative or veto over legislation, or it may be something much less dramatic. In short, popular sovereignty covers a multitude of institutional possibilities. In each case, however, popular sovereignty assumes the existence of some form of popular consent, and it is for this reason that every definition of republican government implies a theory of consent. Lutz [3] [b] The American Revolution marked a departure in the concept of popular sovereignty as it had been discussed and employed in the European historical context. With their Revolution, Americans substituted the sovereignty in the person of King George III , with a collective sovereign “composed of the people. Thenceforth, American revolutionaries generally agreed and were committed to the principle that governments were legitimate only if they rested on popular sovereignty “ that is, the sovereignty of the people. Rather, the consent of the governed and the idea of the people as a sovereign had clear 17th and 18th century intellectual roots in English history. Douglas of Illinois promoted popular sovereignty as a middle position on the slavery issue. It said that actual residents of territories should be able to decide by voting whether or not slavery would be allowed in the territory. The federal government did not have to make the decision, and by appealing to democracy Cass and Douglas hoped they could finesse the question of support for or opposition to slavery. Douglas applied popular sovereignty to Kansas in the Kansas Nebraska Act which passed Congress in The Act had two unexpected results. By dropping the Missouri Compromise of which said slavery would never be allowed in Kansas , it was a major boost for the expansion of slavery. Overnight outrage united anti-slavery forces across the North into an "anti-Nebraska" movement that soon was institutionalized as the Republican Party , with its firm commitment to stop the expansion of slavery. Second, pro- and anti-slavery elements moved into Kansas with the intention of voting slavery up or down, leading to a raging civil war, known as " Bleeding Kansas. The Southern Democrats broke off and ran their own candidate against Lincoln and Douglas in

Chapter 4 : Symbols of Sovereignty - The National Flag - The Flag Institute

A summary of Themes in Mary Rowlandson's The Sovereignty and Goodness of God. Learn exactly what happened in this chapter, scene, or section of The Sovereignty and Goodness of God and what it means.

Reformation[edit] Sovereignty reemerged as a concept in the late 16th century, a time when civil wars had created a craving for stronger central authority, when monarchs had begun to gather power onto their own hands at the expense of the nobility, and the modern nation state was emerging. Jean Bodin , partly in reaction to the chaos of the French wars of religion , presented theories of sovereignty calling for strong central authority in the form of absolute monarchy. Not temporarily delegated as to a strong leader in an emergency or to a state employee such as a magistrate. He held that sovereignty must be perpetual because anyone with the power to enforce a time limit on the governing power must be above the governing power, which would be impossible if the governing power is absolute. Bodin rejected the notion of transference of sovereignty from people to the ruler also known as the sovereign ; natural law and divine law confer upon the sovereign the right to rule. And the sovereign is not above divine law or natural law. He is above ie. He emphasized that a sovereign is bound to observe certain basic rules derived from the divine law, the law of nature or reason, and the law that is common to all nations jus gentium , as well as the fundamental laws of the state that determine who is the sovereign, who succeeds to sovereignty, and what limits the sovereign power. Bodin also held that the lois royales, the fundamental laws of the French monarchy which regulated matters such as succession, are natural laws and are binding on the French sovereign. Despite his commitment to absolutism, Bodin held some moderate opinions on how government should in practice be carried out. He held that although the sovereign is not obliged to, it is advisable for him, as a practical expedient, to convene a senate from whom he can obtain advice, to delegate some power to magistrates for the practical administration of the law, and to use the Estates as a means of communicating with the people. In particular, the " Social contract " as a mechanism for establishing sovereignty was suggested and, by , widely accepted, especially in the new United States and France , though also in Great Britain to a lesser extent. He created the first modern version of the social contract or contractarian theory, arguing that to overcome the "nasty, brutish and short" quality of life without the cooperation of other human beings, people must join in a "commonwealth" and submit to a "Sovereigne [sic] Power" that is able to compel them to act in the common good. This expediency argument attracted many of the early proponents of sovereignty. The sovereign is the only final authority in his territory; he does not share final authority with any other entity. Hobbes held this to be true because otherwise there would be no way of resolving a disagreement between the multiple authorities. Rousseau considered sovereignty to be inalienable; he condemned the distinction between the origin and the exercise of sovereignty, a distinction upon which constitutional monarchy or representative democracy is founded. John Locke , and Montesquieu are also key figures in the unfolding of the concept of sovereignty; their views differ with Rousseau and with Hobbes on this issue of alienability. Sovereignty, or the general will, is inalienable, for the will cannot be transmitted; it is indivisible, since it is essentially general; it is infallible and always right, determined and limited in its power by the common interest; it acts through laws. Law is the decision of the general will in regard to some object of common interest, but though the general will is always right and desires only good, its judgment is not always enlightened, and consequently does not always see wherein the common good lies; hence the necessity of the legislator. But the legislator has, of himself, no authority; he is only a guide who drafts and proposes laws, but the people alone that is, the sovereign or general will has authority to make and impose them. Thus the legal maxim, "there is no law without a sovereign. It is an indisputable fact that this conception, from the moment when it was introduced into political science until the present day, has never had a meaning which was universally agreed upon. Lassa Oppenheim â€” , an authority on international law [14]

Absoluteness[edit] An important factor of sovereignty is its degree of absoluteness. International law ; policies and actions of neighboring states; cooperation and respect of the populace; means of enforcement; and resources to enact policy are factors that might limit sovereignty. For example, parents are not guaranteed the right to decide some matters in the upbringing of their children independent of societal regulation, and

municipalities do not have unlimited jurisdiction in local matters, thus neither parents nor municipalities have absolute sovereignty. Theorists have diverged over the desirability of increased absoluteness. Exclusivity[edit] A key element of sovereignty in a legalistic sense is that of exclusivity of jurisdiction. Specifically, the degree to which decisions made by a sovereign entity might be contradicted by another authority. Social institutions such as religious bodies, corporations, and competing political parties might represent de facto infringements on exclusivity. De jure and de facto[edit] De jure , or legal, sovereignty concerns the expressed and institutionally recognised right to exercise control over a territory. De facto , or actual, sovereignty is concerned with whether control in fact exists. Cooperation and respect of the populace; control of resources in, or moved into, an area; means of enforcement and security; and ability to carry out various functions of state all represent measures of de facto sovereignty. When control is practiced predominantly by military or police force it is considered coercive sovereignty. Sovereignty and independence[edit] This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. July Learn how and when to remove this template message State sovereignty is sometimes viewed synonymously with independence , however, sovereignty can be transferred as a legal right whereas independence cannot. Alternatively, independence can be lost completely when sovereignty itself becomes the subject of dispute. The pre-World War II administrations of Latvia , Lithuania and Estonia maintained an exile existence and considerable international recognition whilst their territories were annexed by the Soviet Union and governed locally by their pro-Soviet functionaries. When in Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia re-enacted independence, it was done so on the basis of continuity directly from the pre-Soviet republics. The post Polish state claims direct continuity from the Second Polish Republic which ended in For other reasons however, Poland maintains its communist-era outline as opposed to its pre-World War II shape which included areas now in Belarus , Czech Republic , Lithuania , Slovakia and Ukraine but did not include some of its western regions that were then in Germany. At the opposite end of the scale, there is no dispute regarding the self-governance of certain self-proclaimed states such as Republic of Abkhazia , Republic of South Ossetia or the Republic of Kosovo see List of states with limited recognition since their governments neither answer to a bigger state, nor is their governance subjected to supervision. Internal[edit] Internal sovereignty is the relationship between a sovereign power and the political community. A central concern is legitimacy: Claims of legitimacy might refer to the divine right of kings or to a social contract i. Internal sovereignty examines the internal affairs of a state and how it operates. It is important to have strong internal sovereignty in relation to keeping order and peace. When you have weak internal sovereignty, organisations such as rebel groups will undermine the authority and disrupt the peace. The presence of a strong authority allows you to keep agreement and enforce sanctions for the violation of laws. The ability for leadership to prevent these violations is a key variable in determining internal sovereignty. The presence of strong internal sovereignty allows a state to deter opposition groups in exchange for bargaining. It has been said that a more decentralized authority would be more efficient in keeping peace because the deal must please not only the leadership but also the opposition group. While the operations and affairs within a state are relative to the level of sovereignty within that state, there is still an argument between who should hold the authority in a sovereign state. This argument between who should hold the authority within a sovereign state is called the traditional doctrine of public sovereignty. This discussion is between an internal sovereign or an authority of public sovereignty. An internal sovereign is a political body that possesses ultimate, final and independent authority; one whose decisions are binding upon all citizens, groups and institutions in society. Early thinkers believe sovereignty should be vested in the hands of a single person, a monarch. They believed the overriding merit of vesting sovereignty in a single individual was that sovereignty would therefore be indivisible; it would be expressed in a single voice that could claim final authority. Jean-Jacques Rousseau rejected monarchical rule in favor of the other type of authority within a sovereign state, public sovereignty. Public Sovereignty is the belief that ultimate authority is vested in the people themselves, expressed in the idea of the general will. This means that the power is elected and supported by its members, the authority has a central goal of the good of the people in mind. The idea of public sovereignty has often been the basis for modern democratic theory. A form of government that is a little different from both is the UK parliament

system. From to it was argued that sovereignty in the UK was vested neither in the Crown nor in the people but in the "Monarch in Parliament". This is the origin of the doctrine of parliamentary sovereignty and is usually seen as the fundamental principle of the British constitution. With these principles of parliamentary sovereignty majority control can gain access to unlimited constitutional authority, creating what has been called "elective dictatorship" or "modern autocracy". Public sovereignty in modern governments is a lot more common with examples like the USA, Canada, Australia and India where government is divided into different levels. For example, the United Kingdom uses the following criterion when deciding under what conditions other states recognise a political entity as having sovereignty over some territory; "Sovereignty. The Arantzazu Mendi, [] A. This resulted as a natural extension of the older principle of cuius regio, eius religio Whose realm, his religion , leaving the Roman Catholic Church with little ability to interfere with the internal affairs of many European states. It is a myth, however, that the Treaties of Westphalia created a new European order of equal sovereign states. Determining whether a specific entity is sovereign is not an exact science, but often a matter of diplomatic dispute. There is usually an expectation that both de jure and de facto sovereignty rest in the same organisation at the place and time of concern. Foreign governments use varied criteria and political considerations when deciding whether or not to recognise the sovereignty of a state over a territory. The Holy See was in this position between the annexation in of the Papal States by Italy and the signing of the Lateran Treaties in , a year period during which it was recognised as sovereign by many mostly Roman Catholic states despite possessing no territory " a situation resolved when the Lateran Treaties granted the Holy See sovereignty over the Vatican City. Another case, sui generis , though often contested,[citation needed] is the Sovereign Military Order of Malta , the third sovereign entity inside Italian territory after San Marino and the Vatican City State and the second inside the Italian capital since in the Palazzo di Malta and the Villa Malta receive extraterritorial rights, in this way becoming the only "sovereign" territorial possessions of the modern Order , which is the last existing heir to one of several once militarily significant, crusader states of sovereign military orders. These sovereign rights were never deposed, only the territories were lost. The International Committee of the Red Cross is commonly mistaken to be sovereign. It has been granted various degrees of special privileges and legal immunities in many countries,[which? In the case of the European Union members states this is called "pooled sovereignty". Nation-states[edit] A community of people who claim the right of self-determination based on a common ethnicity, history and culture might seek to establish sovereignty over a region, thus creating a nation-state. Such nations are sometimes recognised as autonomous areas rather than as fully sovereign, independent states. Federations[edit] In a federal system of government , sovereignty also refers to powers which a constituent state or republic possesses independently of the national government. In a confederation constituent entities retain the right to withdraw from the national body, but in a federation[citation needed] member states or republics do not hold that right. Depending on the particular issue, sometimes both northern and southern states justified their political positions by appealing to state sovereignty. Fearing that slavery would be threatened by results of the presidential election , eleven slave states declared their independence from the federal Union and formed a new confederation. Acquisition of sovereignty A number of modes of acquisition of sovereignty are presently or have historically been recognised by international law as lawful methods by which a state may acquire sovereignty over territory. The classification of these modes originally derived from Roman property law and from the 15th and 16th century with the development of international law.

Chapter 5 : Symbol of sovereignty - Crossword Clue Answers

Introduction. 1. Like every other nation, the United Kingdom has a range of national symbols signifying sovereignty on land, at sea and in the air.

Firearms in private hands function to protect the balance of power between the people and their government. Our Founding Fathers could not envision the extent to which science could take us, but their principles hold firm through the centuries. The simple firearm remains the symbol of individual sovereignty and liberty. Today we see that the reaction of the media, our government and many of our citizens to yet another mass murder, with a firearm, indicates that they have no understanding of what freedom means or why freedom is not always convenient. We must acknowledge that its time for us all to return to the basics. Several decades ago, it was common for gun writers and gun owners to discuss the politics of the Second Amendment, and other Amendments. But that discussion was side tracked when it became obvious that we were in a public relations war with enemies who wished to disarm Americans. Their simple tactic was to frighten the public and their representative law makers. Their goal is to keep the ignorant public concerned about gun-owner existence. The Second Amendment was under fire. The Constitution was in danger. So we stopped discussing the fundamental precepts upon which our country was founded and began addressing their specific attacks. Discussion of principles gave way to refutation of lies. The problem for us, is that Kellermann outright lied. He played with the statistics. Four were shot by police acting in the line of duty. The rest were killed by another member of the household or a private citizen acting in self-defense. He could, if he deliberately lied. And why would the famed New England Journal of Medicine publish this article? They could, if they agreed with the lie. Topics include safe storage of weapons and ammunition, the presence of weapons as a cause of violence, the number victims, the costs to society, the number of self defense uses, firearm accidents, and firearm suicides, among others. You could choose your side depending on your philosophy. You need to read volumes of books and scientific articles in order to understand how we know. At about the same time, two books discussed government as mass murderers of civilians. Lethal Laws and Death by Government: Genocide and Mass Murder both attempted to explain that disarmed citizens were at much greater risk of death from government rather than from negative aspects of civilian gun ownership. This information contributed to the understanding that free armed people and their friends, families and towns are better off, despite the negative aspects of weapons. Although it is important to know the positive and negative costs of owning firearms, we need to begin again to discuss the basic foundations of our freedom. At this point, because the recent mass murder took place in a church and because the murderer was fond of Civil War and Nazi symbols, both the First and Second Amendments have come under fire. People crazed with ignorant anger believe that they, not laws, control the kind of speech that is permitted in our country. They believe that emotional harm gives them the right to deny the speech of others. Whenever we abridge the freedom of others, and refuse to defend their rights, we enfeeble that right for ourselves, and we send that right to our children in a weakened form. Banning disgusting political speech will bottle up our true expressive desires and create a powder keg of anger in the affected minority, in this case, progeny of confederate war veterans. As Jews, we authors accept, even welcome, the time when marchers bearing Nazi swastikas planned to enter a neighborhood in which lived many Holocaust survivors, because we see that the strength of our First Amendment was mirrored in the potential behavior of Nazi sympathizers. We accepted the discomfort. Whatever emotional distress we felt was balanced by the surge of liberty that benefited all of us. Many years have passed during which decisions of all kinds seem to weaken our nation. People function for the whim of the moment and forget the principles that determine the strength of our future. Freedom is never free. Sometimes, the cost is blood. Often, the cost is hard work. And as we see, the cost can be anguish and mental pain. Still, our liberty is beyond value. We feel that the costs are minimal when compared to the benefits. We need to stop the destructive mob momentum. We all need to use our First Amendment rights and speak out. Why should we let the time come when the Second Amendment is the last remaining freedom amendment and our children need it as their last resort? The firearm MUST remain the symbol of individual sovereignty. She

has collaborated and written on firearm politics for the past 25years, and is a Senior Fellow in Criminology at the Independence Institute in Denver, CO.

Chapter 6 : Sovereignty | Definition of Sovereignty by Merriam-Webster

Bear Meaning, and Messages For the most part, black bear symbolism is about introspection. Specifically, the bear meaning is letting you know that it is time to go inward and explore the notion of your very existence.

Like every other nation, the United Kingdom has a range of national symbols signifying sovereignty on land, at sea and in the air. Because of our long and complex history, the UK quite possibly has a greater range of these symbols than any other country, and they have developed and matured in an unstructured manner over a very long time. One of the particular quirks about the UK is our lack of a written constitution in the form of a single and complete piece of legalisation. If we had a written constitution then it is reasonable to suppose that it would embrace symbols of sovereignty. The lack of such a document means that UK symbols of sovereignty are not encapsulated in any one reference and no single authority is responsible for them. This includes the national flag. Another dimension is the continued use of the Royal Prerogative for certain aspects of national life and the ambiguous manner in which this affects the national flag. Symbols of Sovereignty 2. Any discussion about symbols of sovereignty must first establish what is meant by the term. These symbols can, and do, extend to a large number of icons including flags, badges, uniforms, achievements of arms and many other manifestations great and small. As a constitutional monarchy, UK symbols of sovereignty naturally include a wide range of royal badges, standards, crowns and other monarchical devices. However this paper concentrates on just one symbol – the most widespread and best known of all and the only one available to the entire population to employ on land as they choose – the national flag. But even the term national flag must be given a caveat. The UK is one of a relatively small number of states whose national flag on land is different to that at sea. Indeed the UK has a large number of national flags for use afloat in the many red, white and blue ensigns authorised for use by designated bodies, and nowadays many of these ensigns are also used on land in the capacity of a national flag by entitled organisations. However, for two reasons, this paper does not cover them. Firstly there are so many of them, and their uses are so widespread and variable that the paper would lose focus if it tried to embrace them, and secondly unlike flags on land they are already subject to a legal governance regime under the Merchant Shipping Act. Nor, for broadly parallel reasons, does the paper consider the national flags of the constituent nations and territories of the United Kingdom which face similar ambiguities, but concentrates solely on the Union Flag. Furthermore, it goes without saying that it is entirely apolitical and cannot be arrogated by any political movement or pressure group. The Union Flag 4. Our national flag has two accepted names, both of very long standing. Union Flag is the more formal term and Union Jack the more populous but both are equally acceptable and there is much recorded evidence to support this duality. This paper uses the name Union Flag for convenience and it may be helpful to begin with a brief history of the flag to show how it became what it is today. The formal definition heraldic blazon of the current Union Flag was published by the College of Arms in and reads thus: Although that is a very neat shorthand description it is not the precise manner in which the flag is customarily made except for military Colours which retain that format, because the design was amended by the Admiralty during the early 19th century to give a greater contrast between the red and blue elements by widening some of the white stripes and borders. A more accurate description of the flag in use today, if rather fulsome, is as follows, although it is not statutory in any sense at all. It benefits from having a picture of the flag to hand when reading it: The saltires are counterchanged. The overall width of the diagonals is six units, comprised of three units of white, two units of red and one unit of white. When flown, on the side of the flag nearest the flagpole the broadest white diagonals are uppermost, and on the side furthest from the flagpole the narrowest white diagonals are uppermost. The diagonals run from corner to corner with the centre line of each six unit wide diagonal intersecting opposite corners of the flag and crossing the centre line of the other six unit wide diagonal in the centre of the flag. A red cross six units wide runs from the edge to edge, centred on the flag. This red cross is bordered by a white fimbriation two units wide. No specification is given for white. Nevertheless in June Garter King of Arms declared the proper proportions for a flag on land were 3: In October Garter agreed it would be sensible to repeat the declaration in an appropriate format but this has yet to be done. The Scottish

saltire when flown as a flag on its own is properly made in a lighter blue Pantone , closer to the original blue of the first Union Flag in the 17th century although darker saltires are also seen. The reason for the darker blue in the Union Flag today is most probably a decision by the Admiralty long ago, concerned at the colours fading when flown at sea. In the blazon the term azure covers any shade of blue. Following the personal union of the English and Scottish monarchies in 1707, the first Union Flag was declared by Royal Proclamation on 12 April and this flag was only for use at sea. Thus both names are recorded in Hansard. The device was borrowed from the achievement of arms of a leading Irish family, the Fitzgeralds. The Union Flag is a royal banner and despite its fame and fortune no government statute or other constitutional instrument has ever declared it to be the national flag of the United Kingdom. Apart from the two parliamentary answers quoted above from Hansard, the flag has never formally been given to the people. It is the de facto national flag but not de jure. Consequently there is no single authority responsible for its governance or the protocol surrounding it, nor even for its design, proportions and colours. Some people argue pointlessly about whether it may be called the Union Jack and very many people do not know which way up to fly it, or even if they may fly it. This ignorance flourishes largely because children are not taught the history of their flag within the national curriculum. Several things are not in doubt however. It is the flag of the people as well as the nation. It has spawned well over different maritime ensigns, land flags, colonial and Commonwealth flags and flags of office, of which over unique designs still fly today, all bearing the Union Flag as their primary distinguishing feature. In one form or another it is flown all over the globe by the citizens of several sovereign countries as well as our own, because it forms the defining element of a considerable number of national, provincial, state, island and territorial flags. It is one of the oldest, most widespread, most popular and most enduring national symbols and it deserves to be treated with dignity and respect. Therefore matters relating to the national flag should be addressed by an office that exercises authority throughout the realm. Governance of the flag cannot, by definition, be devolved to subordinate governments, assemblies, administrations or departments, or to any other authority that lacks a comprehensive nationwide remit. And herein lies another problem, because very few United Kingdom authorities any longer have a truly UK nationwide remit. A forensic examination of the several authorities which have a say in the management of the national flag would not be helpful at this point, however a list of those involved illustrates why there is no cohesive voice about our most important symbol of national unity. These several authorities sometimes refer, or defer, to one another on an ad hoc basis but there is no consistent policy or knowledge base running through them all. Meanwhile the Scottish Government especially the office of the Lord Lyon King of Arms , the Welsh Assembly and the Northern Ireland Executive all have their say within their particular areas of responsibility, but without coordination. There are loose halyards everywhere you look and nobody is empowered to draw them together. This is in marked contrast to other advanced nations and just one example will suffice. In Australia the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet is responsible for national symbols of sovereignty and this includes the national flag. This is a federal remit and not devolved to state governments. The Australian Government publishes an excellent guide Australian Flags which is free to all who request one from their political representative The Department runs a comprehensive website devoted to national symbols www.gov.au. The Governor General, Prime Minister, State Governors and political leaders alike all promote the national flag actively and enthusiastically, and whilst state governments manage their own internal affairs, it is the national government that oversees national symbols unequivocally. Australians understand the importance of their flag in promoting national unity, and there is even a scheme under which a national flag is provided free to schools, community associations and other not-for-profit organisations which request one. Canada and New Zealand reflect a broadly similar approach and the enthusiasm for national flags, to underpin community cohesion, in the United States of America needs no further emphasis here. Flags in Law Notwithstanding devolved differences, throughout the UK the national flag, as with all other flags and banners, is classified as an advertisement. Advertisements are subject to planning legislation; however the Union Flag is one of a number of flags specifically exempt from advertising consent regulations and may be flown on land freely. There is no Flag Act in the UK, and whilst such an Act would no doubt address the current deficiencies in governance, the challenge of achieving consensus in drafting a Flag Bill is well recognised. At the very least there would most probably be firm views

expressed by the Scots, Irish and Welsh on their aspirations for the re design of the flag. However the good governance of our national flag should readily be achievable without recourse to statute. It does however require the acknowledgement and acceptance of a single authoritative focus empowered to liaise and advise nationwide, and sometimes to direct, on matters relating to the national flag. A national flag is but a means to an end and not an end in itself. Its purpose is to be an unambiguous focus for the unity of the citizens of a nation – whatever their individual background or personal aspirations. Up until the end of WWII the UK was a remarkably homogenous nation with, by and large, one overall culture, shared traditions and a common creed. Consequently the need to promote unity and cohesion throughout society is ever more important, and the national flag is just one means to do this, but a very obvious, low cost and effective means. The proper governance of the national flag can only help to promote the unity of the nation, and other countries all over the world fully recognise this fact. The national flag of the United Kingdom, despite its longevity, ubiquity, lasting worldwide popularity and uncontested importance, has no single authority exercising governance oversight on its behalf. A disparate group of uncoordinated authorities have elements of delivery responsibility for the flag. This is untidy and inefficient and it causes endless wrangling, misunderstanding and woolly thinking to prevail, even at the very heart of government. Evidence for this includes government authorities sometimes displaying the flag upside down or flying a dirty or frayed flag from a public building. The status of our national flag has been ambiguous for well over years, drifting within that ill-defined space between Crown and State, and that is long enough. Meanwhile the current situation is unprofessional and militates against any official body becoming well versed in matters of policy relating to the flag or maintaining a bank of knowledge and corporate history concerning day-to-day matters. Most significantly, it fails to promote and exploit the most effective symbol of national unity for our increasingly diverse and rapidly changing nation. Public bodies and private citizens alike are confused as to who is in charge of the national flag. This is muddling through to an extreme degree and is unacceptable in the 21st Century. Contrast this with the superlative manner in which the UK manages major national events and state occasions, and for which we are rightly admired worldwide. It is wholly incoherent not to consider the national flag with the same degree of professionalism and pride. Two recommendations are made: It is recommended that a focus be established within the government of the United Kingdom, to act as coordinating authority for the proper governance of the national flag. This authority should have a mandate throughout the United Kingdom, the Crown Dependencies and the Overseas Territories, drawing on the expertise of existing disparate authorities and organisations. It is recommended that a minister within the Cabinet Office should have the governance of the Union Flag included within his or her portfolio of responsibilities.

Chapter 7 : The Firearm Is The Symbol Of Individual Sovereignty

The Sovereignty Wars is intended to help today's policymakers think more clearly about what is actually at stake in the sovereignty debate and to provide some criteria for determining when it is.

Menu Sovereignty Sovereignty is often synonymous with independence. Although Llywelyn is the lawful King, international law regards him as a prince because he is forced to live in exile. A Pretender Prince is an aspirant or claimant to a throne that has been abolished, suspended, or is wrongly occupied by another. However, the international personalities that he treaties with and his supporters regard him as a King. Llywelyn has proven that the Britons still have a lawful claim to sovereignty, and that he had a right to claim the native royal titles after submitting to a Y chromosome test, and adhering to the native laws. Both of which are easily proven for the case of the Britons. England committed regicide in the brutal murders of Llywelyn ap Gruffudd and his Brother, and there is a plethora of evidence to show they have attempted to silence the voice of the Britons via force and coercion. Many feel that it is a symbol associated with the Tudor monarchy, but truthfully the Red Dragon predates the Tudor monarchy by several centuries. The Tudors used the Red Dragon to gain Welsh support after putting forward their fraudulent ancestry. Many have been fooled into believing that the Tudors added the green and white colours to the red dragon of the Britons, but this is incorrect as it is well documented that green and white were the military colours of the Britons long before the Tudors came into power. It has been stated in Welsh literature the Britons would regain their independence under the pure banner of St. Llywelyn has proven with the public international law that this historical display of national symbols and arms has kept the sovereignty of the Britons well intact, and that the true sovereign law of the land is the Welsh law. Llywelyn also proved that there were no other claimants to the position of leadership of the nation of Britons or the native incorporeal hereditaments royal titles at the time his claim was lodged, which would later bar all other parties under the legal principle of laches. It is important to note that it is not the multiple court decisions that have granted Llywelyn the position of leadership that he claimed, but rather the Welsh laws themselves and the laws of nations. Since his legal cases Llywelyn has created treaties with other nations and international personalities, which is how sovereigns maintain their sovereignty and their titles. There is no requirement in the international law for the de jure sovereign to register their claim with the usurping government, on the contrary the international law states the United Kingdom has no right to interfere with the succession to the leadership of the nation of Britons. Despite this Llywelyn still corresponded with the United Kingdom Government Legal Department in an attempt to open channels of communication. Llywelyn sent the United Kingdom copies of his DNA test results, court orders, the claim he lodged, and identified himself as Rex Britannorum. The UK also does not deny that Wales was illegally annexed, and will now be owed reparations once it regains independence, as a result of the fraud committed by the English parliament and the Tudor monarchy. More on this may be seen in detail on our correspondence page. By inheriting and exercising the titles, Llywelyn created a long running diplomatic protest on the international record amalgamated to his blood line, and an avenue for the Britons to have access to their historical claim to sovereignty and restore them to where they would be had there not been unfair play from England. He has rights recognised under international law to work towards an independent Cymru, appoint and seat a government, raise an army, create treaties and alliances with other nations, and bestow honours and titles.

Chapter 8 : Sovereignty | Define Sovereignty at calendrierdelascience.com

What is sovereignty? Often taken for granted or seen as the ideology of European states vying for supremacy and conquest, the concept of sovereignty remains underexamined both in the history of its practices and in its aesthetic and intellectual underpinnings.

Chapter 9 : sovereignty | Definition of sovereignty in US English by Oxford Dictionaries

God's sovereignty is a stumbling block for atheists and unbelievers, who demand that if God is in total control, that he eliminate all evil and suffering from the world. The Christian's answer is that the human mind cannot grasp why God allows evil; instead, we are called to have faith in God's goodness and love.