

Disasters are the hardest in poor countries. Even in Las Collinas, a suburb of San Salvador, where houses were not in the mudslide's path, few people died and buildings were destroyed.

The rebuilding will cost \$ 1 billion, or 50% of the budget. The earthquake may carry a political cost, too. Environmentalists try to stop the housing development high-risk areas.

The important question is what the small and poor countries of Central America can do to protect themselves from natural disasters.

A UN report said each country needed «a permanent state institution, staffed by trained disaster-management professionals» and armed with a mandate for preventive work.

Salvador's civil-defence agency falls short. Despite complaints from some villages that aid did not reach them for three days, foreign aid workers say agency responded as fast as it could.

Regional co-ordination has improved. Salvador and its neighbours still have a long way to go.

Пасиевич В.В.
ФП, 3 курс, ПВ-2
научный руководитель Латыш В.А.

Попытки поддержания силами НАТО мира в Югославии вызвали критику ряда государств. Но критике подверглась не сама идея поддержания мира, а способы и методы воплощения этой «мирной политики» НАТО в жизнь. Нарушение Югославией норм международного права не означало, что на её территории и всем другим странам и организациям разрешено не уважать и нарушать данные нормы права. Действия НАТО не подвергались критике до тех пор, пока не были затронуты интересы других государств. После длительных дипломатических баталий между государствами выяснился основной принцип международного права: «КТО СИЛЬНЕЕ, ТОТ И ПРАВ». Т.е. к международной ответственности можно привлечь только слабое государство, если это выгодно сильному. И всё международное право нужно лишь для прикрытия цивилизованного общества, когда возможно осуществлять свою политику в других государствах в рамках

закона, а при противоречиях с законом: на первом месте интерес, на втором месте закон.

NATO, YUGOSLAVIA AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

While NATO tried to quickly enforce peace in Kosovo, **the way that NATO carried out its actions received harsh criticisms as well.** Just because Milosevic's regime was clearly in grotesque violation of many international laws did not *automatically* justify *any* reaction without close examination and analysis.

«Amnesty International believes that in the course of Operation Allied Force, civilian deaths could have been significantly reduced if NATO forces had fully adhered to the laws of war.

NATO did not always meet its legal obligations in selecting targets and in choosing means and methods of attack. In one instance, the attack on the headquarters of Serbian state radio and television (RTS), NATO launched a direct attack on a civilian object, killing 16 civilians. Such attack breached article 52 (I) of Protocol I and therefore constitutes a war crime.»

Even though there will always unfortunately be civilian casualties in any wars, there are still international rules of war that help define situations when civilian deaths count as violations of those laws or not.

And if international law was something that could be ignored, even the US Congress had not approved war and therefore this bombing was illegal according to US law as well as international law.

NATO's military action against Yugoslavia violates international law in three important ways:

1. NATO's military action against Yugoslavia is illegal:

Article 2 (4) of the UN Charter expressly prohibits all members of the United Nations from threatening or using force 'against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.' This prohibition is generally recognized as being of the highest legal and moral force at international law.

2. NATO's military action is not justified under a so-called «humanitarian exception» at international law

Supporters of the NATO military action against Yugoslavia argue

that it is justified under a new or emerging exception under international customary law to the prohibition in Article 2(4) of the UN Charter. They claim this new exception allows use of force against a State without Security Council approval if this is the only way to prevent human rights abuses on a massive scale, and the only way to avert a humanitarian disaster.

3. NATO's military action undermines the United Nations and its aims and values

The NATO military action against Yugoslavia is being conducted under the rubric of 'democracy, human rights and the rule of law' (British Prime Minister, Tony Blair, Parliamentary Debates, 26 April 1999).

In fact the NATO military action does not strengthen or support these values. On the contrary, it attacks and undermines them.

The United States claims it is acting for the sake of human rights and freedom, but that raises one interesting question: what about the handful of situations during which it has done nothing? During the 1994 Rwanda Genocide (500,000 innocent Rwandans dead), the United States was the only country to veto a Security Council resolution meant to send peacekeeping forces to control the situation. Their actions enabled the genocide to continue unhindered.

How about Colombia? Colombia has the same rate of political murders at the hands of the government as Kosovo, yet it is still the highest recipient of U.S. arms and aid in the Western Hemisphere. And Turkey? They have relentlessly pursued the Kurds and caused refugee flights of a magnitude greater than that of Kosovo, yet still remain the highest importer of U.S. arms in the world. Does the United States have the moral authority to wage such a bombing campaign, against international opinion? No.

Стах А.Н.
ФП, 3 курс, ПВ-1,
научный руководитель Витушко В.А.

С каждым годом проблема отмывания денег становится все более актуальной. Международное Сообщество очень обеспокоено распространением «грязных» денег, годовой оборот которых по разным оценкам