

models that optimize server operations and automate preparation of digital evidence, enabling experts to perform analysis 24/7.

Technological advancements from artificial intelligence to digital forensics enable faster and more accurate evidence analysis, while organizational models differ among countries, showing that the optimal approach combines centralized standards with regional operational capabilities.

Ukraine, integrating into European and international structures, gains opportunities to develop its forensic science in accordance with modern global standards.

References:

1. INTERPOL Official Website — sections: Innovation Centre, Forensics, Databases.

2. European Network of Forensic Science Institutes (ENFSI) — official documents and working groups.

Цисов О.,

здобувач вищої освіти ступеня бакалавра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: Галдецька І.

IMPROVING THE LEGAL MECHANISM FOR SETTLING ARMED CONFLICTS WITHIN A STATE: FORMULATION OF THE SCIENTIFIC PROBLEM

Currently, armed conflicts are increasingly occurring in different countries of the world. Unfortunately, Ukraine is no exception in this matter. Under such conditions, the world practice of making management decisions in the security sector proves that the settlement of armed conflicts within the state occupies one of the first places in the system of ensuring state security.

Armed conflicts occurring within a state represent one of the most complex challenges for national and international legal systems. They typically involve a combination of political, social, ethnic, and economic factors, which makes their legal qualification and subsequent regulation significantly more complicated than in cases of traditional

interstate conflicts. One of the central scientific problems is the differentiation between internal disturbances, insurgencies, and non-international armed conflicts as defined by international humanitarian law (IHL). Misclassification of such situations may lead to legal uncertainty, inadequate state responses, or violations of international obligations [1].

The relevance of improving the legal mechanism for settling internal armed conflicts has significantly increased due to the proliferation of hybrid forms of warfare, the involvement of non-state armed groups, and the spread of transnational threats. Traditional approaches, based primarily on applying domestic law, no longer meet modern security realities. Instead, states are increasingly required to integrate standards of IHL and international human rights law (IHRL) into their national legislation and law enforcement practices. This integration is complicated by inconsistencies in legal terminology, gaps in domestic law, and varying interpretations of the thresholds of armed conflict under the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols [2].

A crucial theoretical and practical problem is determining the proper balance between a state's right to maintain internal security and its obligation to protect human rights during internal armed conflicts. Excessive reliance on force, insufficient regulation of special operations, and the lack of transparent accountability mechanisms often result in human rights abuses, undermining public trust in state institutions. Modern international experience demonstrates that effective conflict settlement requires a comprehensive approach that includes transitional justice instruments, mediation, reintegration of former combatants, and restoration of democratic governance [3].

Another key challenge is ensuring effective cooperation between national institutions and international organisations. States experiencing internal armed conflict often receive support from the United Nations, the Council of Europe, and regional organisations. However, the effectiveness of such cooperation depends on the clarity of domestic legal procedures and the adaptability of national legislation to international standards. Without this alignment, international assistance becomes fragmented and insufficiently effective. Comparative research shows that states with harmonised conflict-related legislation achieve faster stabilisation and more sustainable post-conflict recovery. The role of transitional justice also constitutes

an important scientific dimension. Internal armed conflicts often result in long-term trauma, destruction of institutions, and erosion of social trust. Transitional justice mechanisms — such as truth-seeking, prosecution of grave crimes, reparations, institutional reforms, and guarantees of non-recurrence — are essential for sustainable peace. However, their implementation in domestic law is frequently irregular or incomplete. Research indicates that states which successfully integrate transitional justice into their legal frameworks achieve faster reconciliation and more stable post-conflict governance [4].

Thus, the scientific problem lies in developing a coherent, modernised legal mechanism that integrates the norms of domestic law, IHL, IHRL, and best international practices. Addressing this problem requires identifying gaps in current legislation, analysing international standards, and formulating proposals aimed at enhancing the predictability, transparency, and effectiveness of state actions during internal armed conflicts. Only by integrating these components can states develop effective, transparent, and resilient legal frameworks capable of protecting human rights, ensuring national security, and promoting long-term peace in the face of modern and evolving security challenges.

References:

1. International Committee of the Red Cross. Non-international armed conflict. How does law protect in war? 2021. <https://casebook.icrc.org/law/non-international-armed-conflict>
2. Visnyk of Jurisprudence of Uzhhorod National University. Tereziia P. Criteria for Defining an Armed Conflict. 2023. <https://visnyk-juris-uzhnu.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/08/10-1.pdf>
3. Tsarenko O.M., Tsapyuk R.V. Modern armed conflicts: compliance with the standards of international humanitarian law. 2025. <https://app-journal.in.ua/wp-content/uploads/2025/02/150.pdf>
4. Cherviakova O.V. Transitional justice mechanisms and processes. 2023. <https://pb.univd.edu.ua/i/article/view/768>.
5. Geneva Academy of International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights. Classification of armed conflicts. (RULAC). <https://www.rulac.org/classification>