ния прилагаемых документов (резюме) и не отличаются информативной четкостью. В англоговорящей культуре они выполняют задачу позиционирования кандидата, создания позитивного имиджа путем выражения его самооценки, подчеркивания квалификации и опыта; того, насколько он соответствует требованиям вакансии. Эти письма, созданные в англоговорящей среде, отличаются большим объемом, конкретикой и наличием информации личного характера. Они призваны решить сверхзадачу — выделить кандидата и тем самым повлиять на решение о его приеме на работу. Большой авторитет власти в нашей культуре, по контрасту, не поощряет саморекламу и самопродвижение.

Аналогично можно выделить несовпадения в практике устного общения, обусловленные разными ценностями и ключевыми концептами, от знания которых и результаты переговоров, и эффективность совещаний, в которых участвуют представители разных культур, зависят в гораздо большей степени, чем знание языка международного общения. Даже такие универсальные категории, как «вежливость» не обладают глобальным статусом, в межкультурном общении проявляются различия их кодировки в разных языках, что определяет коммуникативное поведение их носителей.

При подготовке специалистов, способных осуществлять лингвистическое обеспечение международного профессионального взаимодействия, их надо обязательно ориентировать на непрерывное проведение исследования особенностей устного и письменного дискурса на разных языках, на поиск стабильных оценок по параметрам высокой или низкой контекстности культур, высокой или низкой дистанции власти; поли- или монохромности культуры и т.д., всех тех особенностей, которые обусловливают характерные для разных культур языковые практики. Это поможет создать представление о межкультурной коммуникации и составить надежное основание для модели описания основных различий в межкультурном и внутрикультурном взаимодействии, что явилось бы шагом на пути создания обобщающей теории межкультурной коммуникации.

А.Э. Борис
БГУ (Минск)

MERCENARIES AND THEIR LEGAL STATUS IN AN INTERNATIONAL ARMED CONFLICT

The most widely accepted international definition of a mercenary, though not endorsed by some countries, including the United States, is contained in the Protocol Additional of 1977 to Geneva Conventions (GCs) of 1949 (APGC77) Art. 47 of the respective treaty reads that, firstly, a mercenary shall not have the right to be a combatant or a prisoner of war and defines him as a person who matches the necessary criteria contained in the article. All the criteria must be met, according to the Geneva Convention, for a combatant to be described as a mercenary.

According to the GC III, a captured soldier must be treated as a lawful combatant and, therefore, as a protected person with prisoner-of-war status until facing a competent tribunal (GC III Art 5). That tribunal, using criteria in APGC77 or some equivalent domestic law, may decide that the soldier is a mercenary. At that juncture, the mercenary soldier becomes an unlawful combatant but still must be "treated with humanity and, in case of trial, shall not

be deprived of the rights of fair and regular trial", being still covered by GC IV Art 5. The only possible exception to GC IV Art 5 is when he is a national of the authority imprisoning him, in which case he would not be a mercenary soldier as defined in APGC77 Art 47.d.

If, after a regular trial, a captured soldier is found to be a mercenary, then he can expect treatment as a common criminal and may face execution. As mercenary soldiers may not qualify as prisoners of war (PoWs), they cannot expect repatriation at war's end. The best known post-World-War-II example of this was on 28 June 1976 when, at the end of the Luanda Trial' an Angolan court sentenced three Britons and an American to death, and nine other mercenaries to prison terms ranging from 16 to 30 years. The four mercenaries sentenced to death were shot by a firing squad on 10 July 1976 [Frank McLynn. Killer elite. date of access 27.10.2011 [http://www.newstatesman.com/200001170056].

The legal status of civilian contractors depends upon the nature of their work and their nationalities with respect to that of the combatants. If they have not "in fact, taken a direct part in the hostilities" (APGC77 Art 47.b), they are not mercenaries but civilians who have non-combat support roles and are entitled to protection under the Third Geneva Convention (GCIII 4.1.4).

On 4 December 1989 the United Nations passed resolution 44/34, the International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries. It entered into force on 20 October 2001 and is usually known as the UN Mercenary Convention [International Convention against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries (A/RES/44/34). 72nd plenary meeting 4 December 1989]. Article 1 contains the definition of a mercenary. Article 1.1 is similar to Article 47 of Protocol I, however Article 1.2 broadens the definition. Critics have argued that the convention and APGC77 Art. 47 are designed to cover the activities of mercenaries in post-colonial Africa and do not address adequately the use of private military companies (PMCs) by sovereign states [Guy Arnold. Mercenaries: The Scourge of the Third World. Palgrave Macmillan, 1999].

However, the ddifficulty of defining a mercenary soldier is revealed in modern practice. While the United States governed Iraq, no U.S. citizen working as an armed guard could be classified as a mercenary, because he was a national of a Party to the conflict. With the hand-over of power to the Iraqi government, if one does not consider the coalition forces to be continuing parties to the conflict in Iraq, but that their soldiers are sent by a State which is not a Party to the conflict on official duty as a member of its armed forces, then, unless U.S. citizens working as armed guards are lawfully certified residents of Iraq, i.e., a resident of territory controlled by a Party to the conflict, and they are involved with a firefight in the continuing conflict, they are mercenary soldiers. However, those who acknowledge the United States and other coalition forces as continuing parties to the conflict might insist that U.S. armed guards cannot be called mercenaries.

М.П. Булгакова, Т.П. Бахун
БГЭУ (Минск)

РОЛЬ МИНИМАЛЬНЫХ ТИПОВЫХ КОНТЕКСТОВ В ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯХ СЕМАНТИКИ ИМЕН ПРИЛАГАТЕЛЬНЫХ