
Subject: As if we could pretend this wouldn't come around...

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 18:31:14 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

warrantoExcept, of course for this provision...

Quote:PART I

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1

The High Contracting Parties undertake to respect and to ensure respect for the present Convention in all circumstances.

Not really.

The incredibly flawed Geneva Convention doesn't even address the proper treatment for captured terrorists. Hell, it doesn't even address terrorists in general!

They certainly don't count as prisoners of war, as you should know, because they don't meet the requirements explicitly put forth in article 4 quoted here (I highlighted key points of the article):

Quote:Article 4

A. Prisoners of war, in the sense of the present Convention, are persons belonging to one of the following categories, who have fallen into the power of the enemy:

1. Members of the armed forces of a Party to the conflict as well as members of militias or volunteer corps forming part of such armed forces.
2. Members of other militias and members of other volunteer corps, including those of organized resistance movements, belonging to a Party to the conflict and operating in or outside their own territory, even if this territory is occupied, provided that such militias or volunteer corps, including such organized resistance movements, fulfil the following conditions:
 - (a) That of being commanded by a person responsible for his subordinates;
 - (b) That of having a fixed distinctive sign recognizable at a distance;
 - (c) That of carrying arms openly;
 - (d) That of conducting their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.
3. Members of regular armed forces who profess allegiance to a government or an authority not recognized by the Detaining Power.
4. Persons who accompany the armed forces without actually being members thereof, such as civilian members of military aircraft crews, war correspondents, supply contractors, members of

labour units or of services responsible for the welfare of the armed forces, provided that they have received authorization from the armed forces which they accompany, who shall provide them for that purpose with an identity card similar to the annexed model.

5. Members of crews, including masters, pilots and apprentices, of the merchant marine and the crews of civil aircraft of the Parties to the conflict, who do not benefit by more favourable treatment under any other provisions of international law.

6. Inhabitants of a non-occupied territory, who on the approach of the enemy spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading forces, without having had time to form themselves into regular armed units, provided they carry arms openly and respect the laws and customs of war.

B. The following shall likewise be treated as prisoners of war under the present Convention:

1. Persons belonging, or having belonged, to the armed forces of the occupied country, if the occupying Power considers it necessary by reason of such allegiance to intern them, even though it has originally liberated them while hostilities were going on outside the territory it occupies, in particular where such persons have made an unsuccessful attempt to rejoin the armed forces to which they belong and which are engaged in combat, or where they fail to comply with a summons made to them with a view to internment.

2. The persons belonging to one of the categories enumerated in the present Article, who have been received by neutral or non-belligerent Powers on their territory and whom these Powers are required to intern under international law, without prejudice to any more favourable treatment which these Powers may choose to give and with the exception of Articles 8, 10, 15, 30, fifth paragraph, 58-67, 92, 126 and, where diplomatic relations exist between the Parties to the conflict and the neutral or non-belligerent Power concerned, those Articles concerning the Protecting Power. Where such diplomatic relations exist, the Parties to a conflict on whom these persons depend shall be allowed to perform towards them the functions of a Protecting Power as provided in the present Convention, without prejudice to the functions which these Parties normally exercise in conformity with diplomatic and consular usage and treaties.

As you can well see, these captured terrorists hardly count for prisoners of war.

How does the almighty Geneva Convention tell us we should treat captured terrorists, then? If it has the answer to all possible circumstances, how can it be applied in this situation?

The answer is it can't since it doesn't even mention the proper treatment of terrorists.

SuperFlyingLiberalTool was saying the terrorists get coverage under the Geneva Convention, when upon examination of the actual document, they don't. Way to nitpick at a specific point of my post while completely ignoring the general point I was trying to make, though.

Quote:Quote:Clue for the fucking blind: WE FOUND WEAPONS OF FUCKING MASS DESTRUCTION!!!

We did NOT start the war with "lies, lies, lies" like Lord Ted Kennedy will have to you believe.

Now that we're there, we cannot leave! Get that through your thick skull!!!

WMDs were found prior to the war starting? As well, I thought the war was to free Iraq, and the "found" WMDs were simply a bonus that could be used to justify an illegal invasion. Sarin-flavored jell-o, anyone? I found some over in Iraq; it's mighty tasty! It was in a box with wrapping paper around it with a card on it that says, "To Osama; Love, Saddam; Happy Ramadan!"

WMDs were found; there is no denying it, Warranto. They were found in Iraq and date back to years before Saddam's regime ever fell.

One of the reasons the war was waged was because Saddam did not freely hand over his weapons of mass destruction that we knew he had, not because we couldn't find any. It was partly in an effort to enforce the flawed international law that you so closely cling to.

Javafx*insert smartass smiley post here*

Laugh all you want. It doesn't change the fact he was nitpicking at specific points of my post while seeming to ignore the general point of it.

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]bravo, take a seat next to the other Mindless Drone.

On the contrary, Warranto is one of the liberals here that I can actually respect. Though we may differ in our views on a great many subjects, he is an independent thinker and not married to one party or the other (he's not even American, so why should he be married to an American political party?).

Unlike SuperFlyingLiberalTool, he can actually think for himself and doesn't need to be told how to think. That's why I respect his views more than SuperFlyingLiberalTool.
