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Dear Delegates,

Welcome to GSMUN XIII and especially to the Fifth Geneva Convention! We are very excited to be directing this committee. You will learn about our specific topics as well as the structure of the United Nations in general. Hopefully GSMUN will be a unique and challenging experience that will provide you with opportunities for negotiation, compromise, and above all, diplomacy. You’ll also have the chance to practice your public speaking, think outside the box, and learn to handle the unexpected!

Before we explain this new committee, we’d like to introduce ourselves, your distinguished dais. Ladies first:

Hello! My name is Jill Weakland, and I am a junior. Besides joining the Model UN club as a freshman, I’m also a member of the French National Honor Society and co-president of the Key Club. Despite all these extracurriculars and more, I still find time to watch TV (Burn Notice and Glee are my faves), and I love reading the Harry Potter and Twilight books (don’t hate!). I’m also looking forward to vacationing in Italy this summer. But enough about me, I’m sure you want to learn about the other members of the dais!

Hey everybody! I’m your second chair, Corbin Bagenstose, repping the senior class. Hailing from the dark recesses of Chesterfield, I hope to bring you the latest knowledge from the streets to make this Model UN experience your best yet. When I’m not committing every waking moment to GSMUN XIII, I enjoy eating bagels, turning into a jet, bombing the Russians, and flying into the sun. Oh, and I’m on a boat. Really, I love playing soccer and lacrosse, and like Jill, traveling the world is something I thoroughly enjoy and hope to continue throughout my life. And finally…Matthew:

Hi there, eager delegates! I’m your trusty vice chair, Matthew Gill, again representing the seniors. I reside in the Southside, and I’m not a big fan of fire alarms. I enjoy long walks on the beach or river, whichever is closet. Although I do cherish these hobbies, my life is obviously centered on GSMUN XIII. One of my life goals is to travel the world on Corbin’s back. We’ll see if that happens!

The Fifth Geneva Convention will be similarly structured to a General Assembly committee. Since this is a brand new committee for GSMUN, you should thoroughly research your country and the topics and be prepared for a one-of-a-kind Model UN experience. Feel free to contact us with any questions. We are looking forward to all of your new ideas and resolutions, which have the power to shape the future of warfare. No pressure.

See you in March!

Corbin Bagenstose
corbin.bagenstose@gmail.com

Jill Weakland
jillleighw@gmail.com
In the middle of the 17th century, representatives from 13 nations met in Geneva, Switzerland, to discuss ways to minimize the damage of warfare. Centuries later, in August 1864, many countries signed the First Geneva Convention. It declared the neutrality of hospitals and medics and established the foundations of the Red Cross. Since then, three more Geneva Conventions have been adopted. The last was added in 1949, following the Second World War. The Second Geneva Convention protects the sick and wounded at sea, as well as hospital ships, during wartime. The Third protects prisoners of war and ensures fair judicial proceedings against them. The Fourth aims to protect civilians residing in areas affected by warfare. Civilians must be treated humanely and may not be discriminated against due to race, religion, or political opinion.

In 1977, Protocol I and Protocol II were implemented as a result of increased and diverse conflicts, such as civil wars within countries. Protocol I relates to international conflicts; it reaffirms many parts of the original Conventions and adds new provisions to the document. On the other hand, Protocol II deals with non-international conflicts and is more limited with respect to the sovereignty of individual countries. Protocol III, the most recent addition to the Geneva Conventions, was added in 2005 to offer an alternative emblem to the Red Cross and the Red Crescent. Currently, a total of 194 states have ratified the Geneva Conventions, making them almost universally applicable.

In addition to the Geneva Conventions and these Protocols, important components to the agreements are Common Articles 2 and 3. They specify the applicability of the Geneva Conventions to various types of conflicts. Article 2 deals with international conflicts, and Article 3 discusses control over armed conflicts within the boundaries of a country. Article 3 is especially controversial because some countries feel that these international provisions violate their own laws or cultures, thus threatening their sovereignty. In order to avoid conflicts regarding the sovereignty of states, Article 3 contains a shortened list of provisions to be met rather than those contained in the entire Geneva Conventions. Since most current armed conflicts are non-international, Article 3 carries an even greater significance.

Two other important terms associated with the Geneva Conventions are “Protecting Powers” and “grave breaches.” A Protecting Power is a nation not directly involved in an armed conflict that helps to protect the interests of a country involved. The Protecting Power acts as an intermediary and, among other duties, must certify that the nation involved in the conflict abides by the Conventions. The most severe war crimes are known as grave breaches, and the nations in which the transgressions are committed are expected to enforce the punishment for the crimes. Grave breaches are defined in Article 50 of the First Geneva Convention as

“willful killing, torture or inhumane treatment, including biological experiments, willfully causing great suffering or serious injury to body or health, and extensive destruction and appropriation of property not justified by military necessity and carried out unlawfully and wantonly.”

Sometimes, the international community can effectively deal with grave breaches. The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, for example, was established to judge those responsible for the Rwandan Genocide.

The Geneva Conventions discuss issues of international humanitarian law, including treatment of wounded foot soldiers, prisoners of war, and civilian conditions during armed conflicts. Although the documents are very detailed and lengthy, many sections and phrases in the Conventions are vague and subject to interpretation. For instance, the wording “outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment” of Common Article 3 has been cause for a recent controversy because it is not specific about actions that may be considered torture.

As a result of changing circumstances in the international community and advances in war technology and tactics, the nations of the world
Non-State Actors

Introduction

Non-state actors are bodies or organizations on the international level that are not affiliated with governments or nations. One type of non-state actor is an Inter-Governmental Organization such as the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, the European Union, or the United Nations. These groups are comprised of countries that unite to improve situations in their regions or the world as a whole. Another form of non-state actors is non-governmental organizations (NGOs) such as Doctors without Borders. These organizations bring up specific issues that are important to them, and this exposure, in turn, affects UN policy and funding decisions.

Along with religious organizations, the media, and other parts of civil society, multinational corporations (MNCs) are another noteworthy form of non-state actors. Multinational corporations, for-profit businesses in which operations are carried out in two or more countries, are becoming very powerful on the international level, as they can impact the economy and gain negotiating power in politics. To remind corporations of their influence around the world, approximately 50 major companies pledged to support a shared international agreement called the Global Compact in 1999. Despite these efforts, there is still progress to be made in achieving greater cooperation with the MNCs in the international community.

However, the most significant form of non-state actors with regards to the Geneva Conventions is a violent non-state actor (VNSA). Today, militias, warlords, insurgencies, criminal organizations, paramilitary forces, youth gangs, pirates, and terrorist organizations are all considered violent non-state actors. As described by UN Resolution 49/60, passed in 1995, a VNSA may be described as a terrorist organization if it participates in “criminal acts intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public, a group of persons or particular persons for political purposes… whatever the considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other nature that may be invoked to justify them.” These groups engage in armed conflicts with their own government, other nations, or other violent groups. In fact, most present warfare involve VNSAs. Since 1989, over 100 armed conflicts have included VNSAs, as weighed against only seven wars among nations.

Violent non-state actors provide a unique challenge to the Geneva Conventions due to their aforementioned role. The components of the Geneva Conventions that most specifically address armed non-state groups are Common Article 3 and Protocol II. Article 3 states that each party involved in a conflict must adhere to certain basic provisions, such as the humane treatment of the wounded and sick and the prohibition of violence and torture. In 1977, Protocol II was added to supplement Common Article 3. It extended additional human rights to those involved in domestic conflicts by prohibiting collective punishment, acts of terrorism, slavery, and other maltreatment. However, the main reason the Geneva Conventions do not have a strong effect on non-state armed groups is that only states may ratify the Conventions. Therefore, armed groups feel
that these rules of war do not apply to them, even though they are specifically mentioned in the documents. Because violent non-state actors have a greater presence in armed conflicts today and have the ability to threaten international security, the international community recognizes that the Geneva Conventions must be expanded to accommodate this change.

**Current Status**

Violent non-state actors can engage in hostilities with countries, other groups within their own country, or armed groups in other nations. This causes violence and instability in their country and in the states around them. To control human rights infringements by violent non-state actors, the various aspects of the groups which make them hard to classify or control must be explored and understood.

The first obstacle to the enforcement of the Geneva Conventions is the general lack of central authority in armed NSAs. Ever-changing organizational structures make them difficult to trace, and they are generally not supported by any state. Further complicating the issue are about 190 recognized non-state actors, not including drug cartels and many of the smaller loosely organized NSAs. There is a lack of communication with established governments. Therefore, violent non-state actors may not respond to or accept international treaties. Even if they are accessed, there is no formal system in place that allows armed groups to acknowledge or agree to the Geneva Conventions. One example that shows states’ reluctance to recognize the role of VNSAs in the implementation of international standards is the Rome Conference on the Establishment of the International Criminal Court. Hundreds of NGOs were represented at the Rome Conference along with more than 130 state delegations, but no representatives of armed groups were present.

Most armed groups are concerned with promoting their political, economic, and military objectives, while they are far less concerned with protecting human rights. There are relatively few incentives for violent non-state actors to comply with the Geneva Conventions or other international humanitarian laws. Consequently, it is unlikely that these organizations will meet the terms of any international agreement unless incentives or punishments are established. There must also be a sound monitoring system in place to supervise the conditions of the Geneva Conventions during conflicts.

Motives of VNSAs typically correspond to one or more of several factors: money, religion, ideology, and/or politics. Armed non-state groups, such as al-Qaeda and the Islamic Resistance Movement, are clearly established for purposes of warfare, not peace. They spend their resources on military weaponry and rely on shocking and violent tactics to achieve their goals. Large numbers of violent non-state actors gain power in poor and developing nations, where it is easier to influence the government and surrounding regions. Many armed groups show a characteristic of religious intolerance which can be a powerful motivator to do good or bad. An additional facet to the problem of violent non-state actors is that their soldiers are not educated about humanitarianism. The average soldier may receive two or three months of this training before going into battle. However, soldiers in armed non-state groups are often ignorant of international consensus.

Another hindrance to upholding the Geneva Conventions is the increasingly blurred line between soldiers and civilians. For example, suicide bombers in the Middle East, dressed as civilians, detonate bombs as an attack method. However, since they are civilians, their opponent cannot target them as soldiers under the Geneva Conventions.

An added layer of complexity to expanding the Geneva Conventions is the question of how war crimes will be judged. If the armed non-state group is allowed to conduct its own court proceedings, then the case may not be considered fair. However, allowing the armed group to preside over its war crimes cases could persuade it to agree to the conditions of the international treaty. Other alternatives to this option include holding the trials in an international court or the court of the country in which the organization or offending action is located.

There are many obstacles to overcome
when revising the Geneva Conventions to include violent non-state organizations. From finding better ways to contact groups to implementing a monitoring system and protecting civilians from armed groups, additions to the Conventions must be clear and specific. The Fifth Geneva Convention should protect the human rights of a greater number of people around the world.

**Questions to Consider:**

- What are some initiatives to involve non-state actors and how can these techniques be applied to the Geneva Conventions?
- Do making specifications for armed non-state actors encourage them to continue fighting? If so, should the Geneva Conventions be changed at all?
- How can states engage violent non-state actors with humanitarian laws within their borders?
- What do violent non-state actors gain from accepting the provisions of the Geneva Conventions?
- What are possible ways to monitor the effectiveness of the Geneva Conventions relating to non-state actors, and who will monitor it?
- What will happen if armed groups agree to honor the Conventions, but the State in which the group is located has not ratified the treaty?

- [http://www.icrc.org/eng](http://www.icrc.org/eng) — The International Committee of the Red Cross offers a large website with links to full text of the Geneva Conventions, other treaties and humanitarian news articles.
- [http://www.genevacall.org/home.htm](http://www.genevacall.org/home.htm) — The organization Geneva Call sponsors a helpful website with links to articles and publications about non-state actors.

**Websites for Further Research:**
Unconventional Warfare

Introduction

The growing frequency of unconventional warfare in international conflicts has yet to be addressed under the Geneva Conventions. Unconventional warfare is a method of combat that is forcefully offensive and covert, with the goal of directly affecting the enemy population, forces, or government. Such operations are usually in the form of sabotage, ousts, intelligence gathering, or raids. Often, the goal of unconventional warfare is to surprise and destabilize enemy troops.

The history of unconventional warfare may be divided into four eras to show its progression. The first era, from the mid 1600s to the early 1800s, shows the emergence of simple guerrilla warfare, such as trapping or kidnapping. Because more advanced methods were not fully explored at this point, accomplishments regarding unconventional warfare were limited. The second era, from the early 1800s to 1918, saw the development of crude chemical warfare. Militaries began to release toxic chemicals on the battlefield, such as mustard gas. The third era, from 1918 to 1995, saw the deliberate organization of unconventional warfare operations and the emergence of nuclear warfare. Finally, from 1995 to present, unconventional warfare shifted towards smaller and more targeted acts of terrorism, such as car bombs and cyberwarfare.

The concept of modern unconventional warfare is thought to have evolved in the Middle East in the late 1960s during the Arab-Israeli War (Six Days War). In 1967, the Israeli army handily and easily defeated orthodox Arab forces, claiming the Sinai Peninsula, West Bank, and the Golan Heights. Arabs were convinced that their forces would have been victorious if indigenous resistance groups had also contributed to the fighting, because they would have distracted and surprised the Israeli troops. Since this conflict, Arab countries have relied on these resistance groups, who, instead of utilizing formal warfare tactics, enthusiastically carry out inconsistent but violent guerrilla attacks such as murders or bombings. Unconventional warfare is also a popular solution for poorer countries that cannot afford the more conventional tools of warfare, such as tanks, airplanes, ships, and equipment for a large number of troops.

At first, groups that utilized unconventional warfare made little impact on conventional conflicts. However, many organizations quickly gained strength and influence. The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), founded in 1964, is a collection of numerous guerrilla groups fighting for the establishment of Palestine as an independent state. In the early 1970s, the group executed numerous terrorist attacks across the globe, until the PLO vowed to limit its attacks to only Israel and its territories by the middle of the decade. In late 1988, PLO Executive Committee chairman and representative, Yasser Arafat, publicly renounced terrorism.

Another notable group that utilizes unconventional warfare is Hezbollah, which means “Party of God” in Arabic. Formed as a Shiite Islamist organization in Lebanon in 1982, the guerrilla group focused on resisting the Israeli invasion of Lebanon. The early years of Hezbollah were marked with frequent abductions and slaughter of enemy Israelis. Hezbollah also adopted other unconventional warfare tactics: frequently organizing ambushes, planting explosives, booby-trapping vehicles, and suicide bombings. The party grew powerful and launched numerous terrorist attacks against United States citizens in an effort to prove its strength, as well as ambushes on Israeli and United States embassies around the world. The Lebanese government never attempted to prevent Hezbollah’s attacks. In recent years, Hezbollah has been cooperating more frequently with other Palestinian terrorist organizations.

Perhaps one of the most infamous terrorist groups of our time is al-Qaeda, a worldwide terrorist network nominally led by Osama bin Laden in remote regions of Pakistan, Afghanistan, and parts of Iran and Syria. Al-Qaeda hopes to purge Muslim countries of Western influence and was behind the attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon on September 11, 2001. Al-Qaeda, which is Arabic for “the base,” trains, finances, and guides
militant groups around the world, helping them wage unconventional warfare against Western powers. The group was formally established in 1988, but the al-Qaeda philosophy developed by bin Laden and Abdullah Azzam in the 1970s.

The Use of Unconventional Warfare

Though unconventional warfare was once reserved for Middle Eastern para-military agencies, governments everywhere are recognizing its benefits and training special forces in unconventional warfare tactics. It is attractive to many militaries because it allows an army to surreptitiously enter enemy territory and function in a less restricted environment. The covert nature of unconventional strategy gives governments advantage in major conflicts.

Unconventional warfare was first used by official government troops in World War II, when underground guerilla operations were employed by Allied troops in countries occupied by Germany. However, the use of alternative warfare became public during the Korean and Vietnam wars. During the Korean War, guerilla warfare was almost constant. North Korean fighters utilized guerilla tactics to quickly take lives and wear down South Korean forces. In the Vietnam War, the Vietcong’s use of guerilla warfare forced the United States to counter, using similar tactics. Fighters on both sides hid in trees, threw grenades, and set booby traps to attack the enemy.

The United States initiated its first major guerilla warfare-based mission, Operation Enduring Freedom, shortly after September 11th. Its mission was to locate Osama Bin Laden and other al-Qaeda members. A select group of soldiers, specially trained in unconventional warfare tactics, carried out a variety of unorthodox operations including ambushes.

Due to the fact that unconventional warfare has proven so useful, countries often have difficulty setting a policy for its use. Countries want to utilize unconventional warfare, yet they do not want their enemies using it against them. As a result, governments place their focus on detecting and preventing the attacks of their enemies.

Types of Unconventional Warfare

Hezbollah, al-Qaeda, and groups under the PLO are just a few examples of the countless organizations that utilize unconventional warfare tactics. Because there are numerous unrecognized terrorist organizations and unofficial civilian armies in many countries, it is impossible to determine the exact number of groups that resort to unconventional warfare. However, the wide use of guerilla strategies has developed a variety of unconventional warfare operations. The only requirements for a violent action to be classified as an act of unconventional warfare are offensiveness, covertness, and lack of formality. This broad definition has resulted in a wide array of unorthodox warfare.

When the modern idea of unconventional warfare was developed in the 1960s, the most popular operations were kidnappings, ambushes, assassinations, and civilian killings. These maneuvers are still prevalent today, but new technologies have significantly increased opportunities for unconventional operations. Today, acts of unconventional warfare include chemical releases, cyberwarfare, and intelligence gathering.

Chemical, or biological, warfare is of particular concern today. Although it was first introduced in World War I with the use of tear gas, many believe that it is the future of unconventional warfare. Chemical warfare is considered the most daunting type of unconventional warfare because toxins can be released in a variety of ways. The most common methods of spreading chemicals are through air, water, or food. Airborne chemicals, typically poisonous gasses, are possibly the most harmful, because little can be done to shield a population from exposure once the toxin is released into the air. Water and food-borne toxins are also easily released by terrorist groups. Usually, the attacker will break into food or water treatment plants and poison the product following its final purification. This possibility has made many water and food companies upgrade their security systems and low quality chemical detection technology.
In order to remain clandestine and successful, 21st century bioterrorism has become more creative than ever before. Attacks are targeted towards harming specific people. Instead of releasing a toxin into the air, many modern guerillas will poison enemy uniforms or beds. Another popular means of delivering poisons to the target is the mail system. The terrorist will infect a package with a particular toxin and send it to the victim, as seen in the Anthrax crisis of 2001. Lethal spores, which cause the deadly Anthrax disease, were concealed in an envelope sent to an American media company in October 2001. As a result, 12 workers were infected and five were killed. Cyberwarfare is also growing in frequency. Para-governmental groups hack into computers and websites to release damaging viruses or steal confidential information. Although it may sound minor, cyberwarfare can be extremely dangerous. Because the world is now largely dependent on computers to hold research and war plans, track and control airlines, and manage missiles and rockets, hacking can result in disastrous events. In 1999, a series of cyber attacks, nicknamed “Moonlight Maze,” infected American computers to steal classified government missile information. The culprits, thought to be located in Russia, have yet to be found.

However, the bomb is still the most common modern technology used by terrorist groups. Explosives are ideal for groups that utilize unconventional warfare, as they are simple and cheap to construct yet quick, covert, and destructive. More specifically, car bombs are popular because of their secrecy—rigged cars can enter military zones more easily than open explosives. In the 1980s, anti-PLO groups in Lebanon were the first to strategically use car bombs as an unconventional weapon. Fighters found that cars mask explosives better than simple bombs, thus they were able to covertly infiltrate many PLO headquarters and meeting places.

Suicide bombs are also frequently used. The concept of suicide bombing originated in Sri Lanka in 1987, when a group called the Tamil Tigers used the method over 150 times to gain political influence. This tactic is one of the most common in Middle Eastern conflicts today, with more than 1,800 suicide bombings in the past 25 years. From 2001 to 2005 alone, over 500 Israeli citizens were killed because of suicide bombings performed by terrorist organizations. Because the explosives are attached to a person with the detonator, suicide bombs are useful to terrorists who want to kill the maximum number of people—usually civilians. The bomber can adjust to the situation and detonate when he or she feels it will do the most damage.

Detecting and Preventing Unconventional Warfare

Many military strategists hypothesize that, in the coming years, unconventional warfare will play a larger role in major wars and international conflicts. This presents an issue because unconventional warfare is difficult to detect. Since there are so many varieties of unconventional warfare, operations focused on preventing unconventional attacks can be quite complex. Biological and chemical warfare can be prevented in a number of ways. Food and water treatment plants can install heavy security systems and toxin detectors. Authorities can track and investigate the sale and creation of popular toxins. Gas masks can be distributed to people in areas at risk of air-borne toxin attacks. Installing intrusion detection systems that track internet traffic, file access, and possible security breaches can prevent cyberwarfare in most major companies and government agencies. Effective security systems can also be used to prevent computer viruses and information theft.

Technologies are available to identify automobiles that contain suspicious amounts of common elements used in the rudimentary explosives: nitrogen, chlorine, and potassium. Military strategists have put forth time and effort developing unusual technologies to locate suicide bombers. For example, in 2004, the National Security Council proposed “distributed biological sensors,” small insect-sized robots that can fly through a crowd and pinpoint a person carrying explosives. “Detection by detonation,” where members of the military fire a beam of radiation at approaching vehicles, was also discussed. If
the car is free of bombs and explosives, nothing occurs, if the car contains explosives or a suicide bomber, they will detonate and cause the car to explode immediately instead of harming the target location. Although these ideas are not yet a reality, their planned development shows great promise of future bomb detection.

Though many of these options of detecting and preventing unconventional warfare are efficacious, all are overwhelmingly expensive. In addition to training and supplying a large, formal army, many countries cannot afford to outfit a separate group of soldiers with the equipment necessary to track down possible unconventional warfare operations. Government officials can search for suspicious radio, satellite, or cell phone signals, but this is not effective as most practiced groups are careful to avoid these types of communication. Groups that utilize unconventional warfare are completely aware of these methods of detection, and will do all they can to circumvent them. Unconventional warfare is constantly evolving to adapt itself to the new investigative technologies. New methods of unconventional warfare will inevitably develop to ensure that guerilla warfare remains undetectable.

**Current Actions**

Through diplomacy and understanding, the Geneva Conventions exist to protect human rights in situations of armed conflict. A Fifth Geneva Conventions can accommodate for a larger number of violent non-state actors, the safety and security of people during armed conflicts may be expanded.

Ultimately, for progress to be made, violent non-state actors must accept responsibility for international humanitarian laws. At the same time, it is unrealistic to expect every group to understand and consent to the provisions of the Geneva Conventions. With their changing leaders, locations, size, and status, armed non-state actors can be very difficult to track. Although specific ways to encourage compliance with the Conventions should not be included in new articles, there must be better communication with armed groups so they have incentives to comply with the international humanitarian policies. The United Nations Office for Partnerships is an initiative that allows for communication with non-state actors. Since NSAs are becoming more supportive of United Nations initiatives, the organization helps connect the private sector and non-state actors with the international community.

A more realistic approach is necessary to motivate armed groups to comply with the Geneva Conventions. One possibility of achieving such compliance is through the use of state judicial systems. If immunity can be placed over Geneva Convention-abiding VNSA combatants who are captured by the state, soldiers have an incentive to follow international humanitarian policy. Thus, if a person belonging to a violent non-state group is captured, he may only be tried for violations of the Geneva Conventions, rather than considered guilty of treason and murder by the state. Other solutions to this problem exist and must be examined and discussed in order to find an enforceable solution for non-state actors.

The existing Geneva Conventions need a standard monitoring system for non-state actors and various ways to check whether armed groups are correctly adhering to international policy. Armed non-state organizations can be monitored by their respective states under Security Council Resolution 1540. Under this, member states are required to discourage the use of nuclear, chemical, and biological warfare by non-state actors. To monitor whether countries are complying with the Geneva Conventions, “Protecting Powers” intervene and observe conflicts. The International Committee of the Red Cross visits prisoners of war, protects people in war zones, and provides medical care. Additionally, a defined system must be added to the Geneva Conventions for conflicts involving non-state actors.

Widespread religious zealotry complicates efforts to spread adherence to the Geneva Conventions, particularly in the Middle East. Any agreement with a state or other non-state actor, who is viewed as an enemy of a particular religion or ideology, Supreme Being, or revered prophet, would be viewed as heresy. Any self-proclaimed leader of a non-state organization who entered into such a treaty would likely lose
his or her leadership position. In the increasingly rare situation that a leader emerges whose power transcends his or her followers’ religious beliefs, as seen in the example of Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat, treaties may be entertained but are not usually upheld by followers. Religious differences must be overcome if the Geneva Conventions are to be extended to these non-state organizations.

The Geneva Conventions are ineffective when warriors accustomed to unrestricted warfare fail to recognize these documents. Therefore, aside from establishing the international policy regarding unconventional warfare, it is necessary to reach out to the fighters themselves. Education and cultural exchange among people in unstable nations could help people understand the need for rules and regulations on and off the battlefield. Diplomacy will also play a monumental role; if countries where unconventional warfare is common sign on to the Fifth Geneva Convention, it is more likely that fighters in those countries will abide by the rules.

However, there will likely be numerous organizations that refuse to abide by the laws of unconventional warfare. Many groups that use unconventional warfare are opposed to their country’s government and will not respond to UN education or outreach efforts. Because of this, the Fifth Geneva Convention will have to establish incentives or consequences to encourage adherence to set rules. Governing the ungovernable is a difficult and complex task, but it is an important one that this committee must address.

**Conclusion**

Violence caused by armed non-state organizations can dramatically affect individuals, countries, and entire regions. This violence, usually in the form of isolated terrorist attacks, undermines the orderly mechanisms of organized society, the daily flow of life in populated areas, and the stability of the world. The lack of standard international law systems, sufficient monitoring systems, and responsibility by states are just a few of the many hindrances to human rights in times of war. As the Fifth Geneva Convention adds to the international treaty, the problems of armed non-state groups and vague wording within the past documents must be recognized. Together, representatives have the potential to extend the protection of human rights to more populations and set a new precedent for dealing with warfare.

**Questions to Consider:**

- Does the current version of the Geneva Conventions give any insight to how unconventional warfare should be handled?
- What types of unconventional warfare should be most restricted? How will the rules of unconventional warfare be enforced?
- How can the Geneva Conventions account for the blurred lines between soldiers and civilians?
- How will the UN contact para-governmental organizations and enforce the rules created?
- Under what terms will guerilla organizations accept the rules of unconventional warfare?

**Websites for Further Research:**

- [http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/341/1/1](http://ann.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/341/1/1) — “Unconventional Warfare- One Military View” explains unconventional warfare and its power.
- [http://www.latinamericanstudies.org/bayo.htm](http://www.latinamericanstudies.org/bayo.htm) — “150 Questions to a Guerilla” gives an inside understanding of warfare.
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