

maintaining security, preventing terrorist activities, and strengthening the international legal order.

The general conclusion is that the fight against transnational terrorism remains an important task for the world community, and the joint efforts of countries are a key element in ensuring international security and stability.

Список використаних джерел

1. Жаровська Г.П., Transnational crime as a threat to the national security of Ukraine, P. 33.

2. The White House, Washington. URL: <https://georgewbush-whitehouse.archives.gov/nsc/nssall.html>.

3. Спринцев П.С., Foreign experience in preventing criminal offenses committed by organized group, 2021, P. 699.

4. Мокляк В., Сучасний досвід США у запобіганні тероризму, 2017, P. 219.

5. Марков К.А., International terrorism as an international crime, 2021, P. 597.

6. U.S Department of State Archive, The Global War on Terrorism: The First 100 Days. URL: <https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/ct/rls/wh/6947.htm>.

7. Wikipedia, September 11 attacks. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/September_11_attacks.

Кудрявцева В.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти
бакалавра Національної академії
внутрішніх справ

Консультант з мови: Литвиненко Я.

MEASURES TO PREVENT TERRORISM IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The events of September 11, 2001, stand as a pivotal juncture in modern history. The subsequent sections of this essay delve into the multifaceted strategies employed by the United States in the aftermath of these events, analyzing legislative and policy changes, intelligence sharing, military operations, international cooperation, aviation and border security enhancements, cybersecurity measures, community engagement, and the intricate balance between safeguarding national security and preserving civil liberties. These measures underscore the dynamic nature of U.S. counterterrorism efforts in response to evolving global threats.

In the wake of attacks, the U.S. government orchestrated a swift response through a series of critical legislative and policy adjustments. Considered the significance of key initiatives, notably the USA PATRIOT Act and the establishment of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). These changes were pivotal in redefining the nation's approach to counterterrorism, granting law enforcement and intelligence agencies enhanced powers and reshaping the security landscape. The enduring debates surrounding the balance between security and civil liberties are also explored, as these initiatives brought forth complex questions about the preservation of individual freedoms in the pursuit of enhanced national security [1].

Crucial shift in U.S. counterterrorism efforts focused on improving intelligence sharing. The Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI) was created in 2004 to serve as the principal advisor on intelligence matters to the President and the head of the U.S. intelligence community. Its mission was to break down the divisions that had hindered efficient information sharing among diverse intelligence agencies. The ODNI played a pivotal role in coordinating intelligence efforts, sharing critical information, and ensuring the prompt dissemination of vital intelligence, all of which were vital in the fight against terrorism [2].

Military and intelligence operations assumed a pivotal role in dismantling terrorist networks worldwide and disrupting their operational capabilities. In response to the attacks, the United States launched military campaigns in Afghanistan and Iraq, aiming to destabilize the Taliban and eliminate potential threats associated with weapons of mass destruction. These campaigns aimed to weaken terrorist networks, disrupt their operational capabilities, and reduce their capacity to plan and execute attacks against U.S. interests. Intelligence operations, including covert actions and surveillance, complemented military efforts, playing a critical role in identifying and eliminating key leaders within terrorist organizations. It is important to emphasize the transformative impact of these military and intelligence operations while acknowledging the complexities and challenges they introduced.

The global reach of the terrorist threat necessitated robust international collaboration. Recognizing that terrorism knows no borders, the United States actively engaged with international entities and nations to collectively combat the global challenge. Notable collaborations included the invocation of NATO's Article 5 for the first time in history, underlining the unity of NATO members in the face of the terrorist threat. Additionally, the United Nations played a

vital role in passing resolutions that compelled member states to take measures to combat terrorism, reinforcing the framework for intelligence sharing and information exchange among nations [3].

Aftermath attacks, considerable emphasis was placed on enhancing aviation and border security. Efforts in aviation security encompassed the deployment of advanced screening technologies, the implementation of more rigorous security procedures, and the Federal Air Marshal program's expansion. Additionally, measures were enacted to protect cockpit security, preventing unauthorized access. Meanwhile, border security underwent significant transformation, with investments in surveillance systems, infrastructure enhancements, and the expansion of border patrol capabilities, all aimed at preventing the entry of potential threats and illicit goods. These measures underscored the nation's commitment to fortifying entry points and averting potential threats.

The safeguarding of critical infrastructure emerged as a top priority landscape. Security measures for power plants encompassed increased physical security, the implementation of advanced monitoring and surveillance technologies, and the development of response protocols in case of an attack. Protection of communication systems involved cybersecurity enhancements, redundancy in communication networks, and contingency plans for maintaining communication during disruptions. Similarly, transportation networks saw heightened surveillance, improved access control, and safety measures to mitigate the impact of potential attacks. These efforts aimed not only to secure physical infrastructure but also to ensure the continuity of critical services.

The escalating threat of cyberterrorism prompted an escalation of cybersecurity measures. This included the development of comprehensive cybersecurity legislation, such as the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act (CISA), to provide a legal framework for safeguarding critical infrastructure and sharing threat intelligence. Public-private collaboration was encouraged to fortify cybersecurity practices, and protocols were established for responding to cyber incidents efficiently. Additionally, substantial investments in research and development fostered innovative technologies and solutions to counter emerging cyber threats [4].

Preventing radicalization and identifying individuals at risk of extremism assumed pivotal roles in U.S. counterterrorism efforts. Community engagement efforts aimed to build stronger partnerships between government agencies and local communities. By fostering trust and communication, these partnerships encouraged residents to

report suspicious activities and behaviors, fostering a supportive environment for countering extremism. Concurrently, counter-radicalization programs sought to dissuade individuals from adopting extremist ideologies and provided pathways for disengagement and rehabilitation. These programs included mentorship, counseling, and education, redirecting individuals away from extremism.

Improved coordination among federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies played a pivotal role in bolstering the capacity to respond to potential threats. Effective intelligence sharing was central to this effort, with federal agencies working closely with state and local law enforcement to exchange critical information about potential threats, suspicious individuals, or activities. Resource sharing allowed for the efficient deployment of training, equipment, and technical support, strengthening the capabilities of state and local law enforcement. Joint operations and standardized response protocols enabled a coordinated and agile response to security concerns, minimizing confusion and optimizing resource utilization.

The implementation of counterterrorism measures raised significant concerns about striking a delicate equilibrium between security and civil liberties. Many counterterrorism efforts, such as the USA PATRIOT Act and enhanced surveillance programs, ignited vigorous debates about the potential erosion of individual privacy and civil liberties. Legal challenges emerged, leading to judicial reviews on the constitutionality of various measures, reflecting the complexity of these issues. Oversight mechanisms, including congressional committees and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court (FISC), were instituted to monitor and review government actions [5].

The United States undertook a multifaceted approach to prevent terrorism. The enduring challenges of maintaining the delicate balance between security and civil liberties remain, as counterterrorism efforts continue to evolve in the face of an ever-changing landscape of global threats. The lessons learned and the persistent commitment to safeguarding the nation emphasize the resolute nature of U.S. counterterrorism endeavors.

Список використаних джерел

1. Department of Justice. The USA PATRIOT Act. 2001. URL: https://www.justice.gov/archive/ll/what_is_the_patriot_act.pdf.
2. Office of the Director of National Intelligence. Who we are. URL: <https://www.dni.gov/index.php/who-we-are>.
3. North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Collective defence and Article 5. Last updated 2023. URL: https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_110496.htm.

4. Cybersecurity & Infrastructure Security Agency. Cybersecurity information Sharing Act. 2021. URL: <https://www.cisa.gov/resources-tools/resources/cybersecurity-information-sharing-act-2015-procedures-and-guidance>.

5. Intel.gov. Hearing of the House Judiciary Committee on Oversight of the Administration's Use of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act (FISA) Authorities. 2019. URL: <https://www.intelligence.gov/ic-on-the-record-database/results/714-hearing-of-the-house-judiciary-committee-on-oversight-of-the-administration-s-use-of-the-foreign-intelligence-surveillance-act-fisa-authorities>.

Кузьміна А.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти
бакалавра Національної академії
внутрішніх справ

Консультант з мови: Драмарецька Л.

FOREIGN EXPERIENCE IN ORGANIZING FORENSIC ACTIVITIES IN THE PROCESS OF CRIMINAL PROSECUTION

The effectiveness of expert forensic activities depends on the state of its organization, as well as compliance with the urgent needs of practice of the fight against crime and modern scientific and technological advances that are designed to meet these needs to the fullest extent possible. The problem of the state of organization of forensic expert activity is particularly acute in Ukraine today. Therefore, it will not be superfluous in this case to analyze certain issues of forensic expert activity in criminal proceedings in some foreign countries. Such foreign experience may be useful in particular, for the organization of forensic activities in Ukraine, and, in general, for improving the entire procedure for obtaining evidence in criminal proceedings.

It should be noted that the system of organization of forensic expert activity in its specific expression, as well as the status of an expert, are regulated by the current legislation and departmental regulations of a particular country.

Legal regulation of forensic expert activity in most European countries, as well as in Ukraine, is based on the current criminal procedural legislation. Departmental regulations mostly define the very procedure for carrying out internal system activities. Therefore, the problem of the organizational structure of forensic units in some