

implemented the legal regime of martial law, police officers are at equipped checkpoints and, together with other authorities, ensure compliance with the legal regime of martial law.

Список використаних джерел

1. Afonin, D.S., & Bokshorn, A.V. (2022). Osoblyvosti zabezpechennia publichnoi bezpeky i poriadku natsionalnoiu politsiieiu Ukrainy v umovakh voiennoho stanu. [Peculiarities of ensuring public safety and order by the national police of Ukraine under martial law]. Pivdenoukrajinskyi pravnychy chasopys. № 1-2. 224–230 [in Ukrainian].

2. Polozhennia pro dobrovolchi formuvannia terytorialnykh hromad. (2021, December 29). [Regulations on voluntary formation of territorial communities]. Postanova Kabinetu Ministriv Ukrainy № 1449. Retrieved from: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1449-2021-%D0%BF#Text> [in Ukrainian].

3. Pro Natsionalnu politsiiu. (2015, July 2). [On the National Police]. Zakon Ukrainy № 580-VIII. Retrieved from: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/580-19#Text> [in Ukrainian].

4. Pro pravovyi rezhym voiennoho stanu. (2015, May 12). [the legal regime of martial law]. Zakon Ukrainy № 389-VIII. Retrieved from: <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/389-19#Text> [in Ukrainian].

Савело М.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: **Сторожук О.**

FEATURES OF THE FIGHT AGAINST CORRUPTION IN THE USA

At the moment, corruption is one of the most urgent problems of the modern world, which undermines the trust of citizens in state institutions, distorts economic processes and threatens social justice. In the conditions of globalization, the fight against corruption is becoming a priority for many countries. The United States has become one of those countries that has been able to achieve significant success in the fight against corruption, and often ranks high in global rankings of transparency and integrity. I decided to choose this topic because today the topic of corruption is global and has a significant impact on the socio-economic development of the country. Before that, as a law student, I have a personal interest in how different legal systems implement their anti-corruption strategies. The US experience is an interesting example to study because it combines both legislative and administrative mechanisms to fight corruption.

The United States of America has created an effective system of measures of administrative and legal influence aimed at combating corruption, but not only within the borders of the state. The Federal Law on

Combating Corrupt and Racketeering-Influenced Organizations (RICO Law) of 1970 has a historic role in combating corruption. The leading role in anti-corruption activities is played by the US Department of Justice, which develops a national strategy and methodical guidance for fighting crime in the state. The main division of the Ministry of Justice, which directly fights organized crime, is the FBI.

The bodies that carry out anti-corruption activities in the United States are:

- the National Council to Fight Organized Crime;
- the Central Financial Control Office;
- the Special Senate Committee on Ethics;
- the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct of the House of Representatives;
- the Office of Ethics in the US Government [1].

In different American states there are such forms of corruption as legal and illegal. Illegal corruption usually refers to private benefits in the form of money or gifts to a government official in exchange for providing specific benefits to private individuals or groups. A second form of corruption is becoming increasingly common in the US in the form of legislative corruption. We define such corruption as political benefits in the form of company contributions or favors from a government official in exchange for specific benefits to individuals or groups. Such agreements, in turn, are one aspect of the broader issue of institutional corruption, which, according to Lessig, occurs when there is a systemic and strategic influence that is legal or even ethical that undermines the effectiveness of a public institution by diverting it from its purpose or weakening its ability to achieve the ultimate goal, including to achieve the goals of weakening public trust in this body or undermining the legitimacy of its existence.[2]

In the USA, anti-corruption legislation is extremely strict. Yes, for various types of corruption – bribery, kickbacking (payment of part of illegal money to a party to a deal) and other forms of corruption – fines in the triple amount of the bribe or imprisonment from 15 years or more are provided, and in aggravating circumstances imprisonment for up to 20 years [2].

In the USA, punishment is provided for giving and receiving remuneration for services that are part of the duties of a public servant. A civil servant has the right to receive various privileges and rewards only from the government. Liability for violation of this norm shall be imposed in the form of a fine or imprisonment for up to two years, or a combination of punishments. Corruption crimes also include agreements between any persons requesting employment in the federal public service, demanding money, property benefits or receiving them to facilitate employment in the public service [2].

The person guilty of such crimes shall be punished by imprisonment for one year, or by a fine in the amount required or received, or by a

combination of both types of punishment. An exception is the activity of special recruitment agencies that have permission to participate in the recruitment of employees for public service [2].

So, taking into account all the above, it can be said that the United States has created a comprehensive and effective system of combating corruption, using both legislative and administrative mechanisms. Despite severe penalties, including significant fines and long prison terms, corruption remains a difficult challenge in the United States, especially in forms such as legislative corruption. These challenges highlight the evolution of corruption, which can include legal but ethically questionable practices that affect public institutions.

Список використаних джерел

1. International practice of preventing and fighting corruption:
<http://baltijapublishing.lv/omp/index.php/bp/catalog/download/35/577>

2. The main vectors of anti-corruption policy in the USA:
<https://ufpa.org.ua/blog/2331>

Савро А.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра

Національної академії внутрішніх справ

Консультант з мови: Сторожук О.

FEATURES OF DECODING AND USING NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION IN LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

The Nonverbal communication is conveying of emotions, feelings, and messages through actions and expressions rather than words. In our daily life the Nonverbal communication and the verbal communication go hand in hand. In fact sometimes it's our expressions and body language that expresses our emotions better than words. Facial expressions are the most common way of nonverbal communication. Nonverbal communication is the process of communication through sending and receiving wordless (mostly visual) cues between people. It is sometimes mistakenly referred to as body language (kinesics), but nonverbal communication encompasses much more, such as of touch (haptic) and distance (proxemics). Nonverbal communication includes those important but unspoken signals that individuals exhibit, specifically: body language (encompassing carriage/posture, appearance, listening, and eye contact), hand gestures, and facial expressions [1, p. 47].

There is a proverb "Actions speak louder than words". In essence, this underscores the importance of nonverbal communication. Researches in communication suggest that many more feelings and intentions are sent and received nonverbally than verbally. Scientists suggest that only 7% of messages are sent using words, and the remaining 93% are nonverbal expressions [1, p. 50].