

for their implementation. The Berne Club was founded in 1965 and unites 18 countries today. It meets at the level of heads of special services every 6 months and makes decisions only unanimously. It includes heads of intelligence services of EU member states. Since its inception in 1977, the Kilowatt Group has brought together 15 members (9 members of the European Economic Community (now the EU) as well as Canada, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the US and Israel. The NATO Special Committee on the integrates the security services of Allied countries, and is responsible for counterintelligence and counter-terrorism, especially to ensure the security of military troops deployed abroad [2].

Existing cooperation structures include the Conference of Ministers of the Interior of the Western Mediterranean, which was set up in 1982 on the initiative of France, of which France, Spain, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco are members. The goal is to combat Islamic fundamentalism and organized crime. In the same row is the Middle European Conference (MEC), which brings together the heads of intelligence and security services in Eastern and Central Europe. The ILETs (International Law Enforcement Communication Seminars) seminars are designed to bring together, on an informal basis, representatives of special services for legal interception of telecommunications [3].

Summarizing the above, it should be noted that used at the beginning of the XXI century. The measures taken by the European Union to intensify the fight against terrorism in order to enhance the coordination of the activities of the intelligence services of the member states of the organization are quite meaningful and thoughtful, and in the future diligent work of organizations will be able to eliminate the problems of terrorism.

Список використаних джерел

1. Stanley W. NATO in transition. The future of the Atlantic alliance. New York ets.: Praeger for the Council on foreign relations, 1965 – XII. 417 p.
2. Combating terrorism. URL: www.coe.int/en/web/counter-terrorism
3. Preventing terrorist exploitation of new technologies. URL: www.thegctf.org/What-we-do/InitiativeActivities/Detail

Заславська А.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ

Консультант з мови: **Василенко О.**

FOREIGN ANTI-CORRUPTION EXPERIENCES

Corruption is a global problem of the world community and a modern threat of civilization, as it hinders the normal functioning and socio-economic development of society. Corruption as a social phenomenon in

one way or another volume manifests itself in any country, exacerbating all growing contradictions in relations between civil society and the state, especially in conditions of development market relations. Let's consider the experience of certain foreign countries, such as: the Netherlands, the USA, Great Britain, Poland, Finland and Singapore.

The general perception of the Netherlands as a relatively corruption-free country may explain why its anti-corruption policy is relatively underdeveloped. The Dutch anti-corruption policy focuses mainly, albeit not exclusively, on raising awareness and prevention. The number of acts of corruption discovered, or at least criminally investigated, appears fairly low. Each year, approximately fifty criminal investigations into corruption in the Dutch public sector are conducted, mostly relating to bribery. A substantial proportion of these investigations is conducted by the National Police Internal Investigations Department, a highly specialized investigation service for combating corruption [1].

Anti-corruption in this country takes place at the procedural and institutional levels. The following are common measures such as transparency and reporting on corruption issues, and open discussion of their consequences.

Level of corruption in the USA is average. The United States has elaborate and extensive mechanisms for investigating and prosecuting corrupt practices. The US faces a wide range of domestic challenges related to the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. The Biden-Harris Administration has designated anti-corruption as a core national security interest and released the first-ever U.S. Strategy on Countering Corruption. To implement the strategy, the Department is working across the globe to prevent graft, strengthen investigation and prosecution of corruption, promote transparency, and empower civil society and independent media to expose corruption and advance reforms. This makes it harder for criminality and terrorism that affect American security to take root and spread; promotes more democratic, stable governments as partners for the United States; and levels the playing field for U.S. businesses to compete internationally [2].

The anti-corruption legislation of the USA has a systemic nature, which consists of also from legal acts regulating lobbying, banking, exchange and other activities. And although it is not is a guarantee of complete eradication of corruption, but in the USA it is the level is much lower than in other countries of the world. So, the main features of the fight against corruption in the USA there is diversity and inequality of normative acts; decentralized decision-making, as in all other areas in the USA; the broadest interpretation of the concept of corruption, severity of punishment for a crime.

The UK has made important strides in recent years, hosting a major Anti-Corruption Summit in 2016, and launching a national five-year Anti-Corruption Strategy for 2017-20 [3].

Among these 10 points, it is worth highlighting:

- Ending the UK's role as a safe haven for dirty money by introducing the register of who owns property in the UK and making sure Companies House verifies who owns companies in the UK.

- Cleaning up UK politics by reforming political party funding rules and getting a grip on conflicts of interest by giving the Electoral Commission and bodies like the Advisory Committee on Business Appointments proper enforcement powers.

- Leading the way in the global fight against corruption by sharing best practice and enshrining anti-corruption and transparency provisions in all future trade deals [3].

Also, within the framework of anti-corruption strategies in Great Britain and the program of establishing the principles of honesty and integrity in all spheres is being implemented life activities of society, including the state one service Yes, directly corruption processes in the country is monitored by the so-called Nolan Committee, which was founded in October 1994.

Poland had an anti-corruption strategy adopted at the central government level – the Government Programme for Counteracting Corruption – that expired in 2020. The strategy aimed to reduce corruption crimes and raise public awareness on the importance of fighting corruption and strengthening public integrity. It defined three objectives, namely 1) strengthening preventive and educational activities, 2) improving mechanisms for monitoring corruption threats and monitoring legal regulations in the field of preventing corruption and 3) intensifying cooperation and co-ordination of activities between law enforcement agencies. As of February 2024, Poland does not have an anti-corruption strategy in place [4].

In terms of institutions, Poland has central government bodies on anti-corruption (Central Anti-Corruption Bureau), political finance (National Election Commission), lobbying (Ministry of Interior and Administration), a central harmonization unit for internal control and internal audit (Ministry of Finance). However, Poland does not have central body responsible for overseeing conflict of interest [4].

Worthy of attention is the experience of combating corruption in Finland, in which, according to international estimates, one of the highest anti-corruption ratings. Basic anti-corruption principles of this country – the transparency of the process of the transfer of power, ensuring legality in state administration, responsibility and integrity of state officials and employees, which are enshrined in the Constitution.

Finland's National Anti-Corruption Strategy 2021–2023 has the aim of intensifying the fight against corruption in the short term, and in the long term to build a society where attempted corruption is not successful. The strategy also foresees the development of a situation analysis to identify existing public integrity risks. In terms of institutions, the Ministry of Justice oversees the planning and coordination of anti-corruption activities. The preparation and steering group appointed by the Ministry of Justice guides and coordinates the implementation of the Strategy and the associated Action Plan. It reports on the progress of the measures to the Ministerial Working Group on Internal Security and Strengthening the Rule of Law [5].

The country has an independent body for overseeing political finance and the lobbying register (National Audit Office of Finland) and a central government unit for open data policy (Ministry of Finance). However, there is no central government function for public information issues and no central harmonisation unit responsible for internal audit and internal control [5].

Among the newly industrialized countries, the government of Singapore was one of the first to launch a comprehensive fight against corruption who has achieved impressive success in this field. A fairly effective countermeasure system has been created in the country and eradication of corruption. Anti-corruption strategy in this country is characterized by strictness and consistency, the main one the idea of the country's anti-corruption policy consists in "aspiration minimize or eliminate the conditions that create both the incentive and the possibility of a person to commit corrupt actions".

The Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau (CPIB) is the sole agency responsible for combating corruption in Singapore. The CPIB is under the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) and reports directly to the Prime Minister, enabling the CPIB to operate independently. Through more than 60 years of corruption-fighting, a deterrent stance has always been adopted, ensuring that there are no cover-ups and corruption is fought without fear or favour. With a fearsome and trusted reputation, the CPIB acts swiftly and vigorously to enforce the tough anti-corruption laws impartially for both public and private sector corruption. During the investigation process, the CPIB will work with various government agencies and private organizations to gather evidence and obtain information [6].

In summary, the specific experience gained by developed countries in the anti-corruption fight, is evidence that the most effective in this matter are distinguished those states that regarding the solution of the relevant problem use a comprehensive and uncompromising approach.

Список використаних джерел

1. European Commission, Annex Netherlands to the EU Anti-Corruption Report, Brussels, 3.2.2014, COM(2014) 38 final, ANNEX 19. URL: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:058aecf0-d9b7->

2. Anti-Corruption and Transparency. Policy issues. U.S. Department of State. URL: <https://www.state.gov/policy-issues/-transparency/>

3. 10 Actions for the UK to Fight Corruption. Transparency International UK. URL: <https://www.transparency.org.uk/actions-uk-to-fight>

4. Anti-Corruption and Integrity Outlook 2024 – Country Notes: Poland. URL: https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/anti-corruption-and-integrity-outlook-2024-country-notes_684a5510-en/poland_4en.html

5. Anti-Corruption and Integrity Outlook 2024 – Country Notes: Finland. URL: <https://translate.google.com/?sl=uk&tl=Anti-Corruption%20>

6. Singapore's Corruption Control Framework. Swift and Sure. URL: <https://www.cpiib.gov.sg/about-corruption/prevention/>

Захарченко П.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ

Консультант з мови: Сторожук О.

COUNTER-TERRORISM LEGISLATION: PECULIARITIES OF THE US, UK AND CANADA

There is no established definition of terrorism under international law. Instead, there is a great deal of debate over which actions are terrorist and which are acts of legitimate resistance against oppressive governments. Regardless of the failure to agree on a broader definition, there is an overwhelming consensus that terrorism involves the use of threat of violence against civilians for a political purpose.

In the UK, the legal definition of terrorism is provided in section 1 of the Terrorism Act 2000. This defines terrorism as the use or threat of action which:

involves serious violence against a person, involves serious damage to property, endangers a person's life, creates a serious risk to the health or safety of the public or is designed seriously to interfere with or seriously to disrupt an electronic system [1].

The key counterterrorism statute in the UK is the Terrorism Act (2000). Other statutes and updates are written in association with this Act. It deals with a variety of matters including proscribing organisations as illegal, creating offences (for example the collection of information likely to be of use to terrorists) and it also creates powers for the police (such as the power to stop, search, arrest, etc.) [2].

it contains the main powers for arrest and extended pre-charge detention in terrorism cases as well as the main terrorism offences outside the ordinary criminal law, for example, membership of and support for a proscribed organisation [1].