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

LINGUISTICS AND LAW IN THE SECURITY SPHERE

The Council has approved conclusions on the European security situation, asserting that European security is indivisible and that any challenge to the European security order affects the security of the EU and its member states.

In its conclusions, the Council condemns Russia's continued aggressive actions and threats against Ukraine, and it calls on Russia to de-escalate, abide by international law and engage constructively in dialogue through the established international mechanisms. As stated by the EU heads of state and government at the European Council meeting in December 2021, any further military aggression by Russia against Ukraine will have massive consequences and severe costs.

The EU confirms its unwavering supportfor the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and other Eastern Neighbourhood partners within their internationally recognised borders, and it calls on Russia to re-engage constructively in existing international frameworks for the sustainable and peaceful resolution of conflicts.

The Council reaffirms the united approach of the EU and the ongoing strong cooperation and coordination with the United States, NATO, Ukraine and other partner countries. It reiterates the importance of further strengthening the resilience and response capabilities of the EU and its close partners, including in countering cyber and hybrid attacks, foreign information manipulation and interference, including disinformation [1, p. 1].

Legal language permeates our lives, even if we are often blissfully unaware of this. Written legal texts of one sort or another in fact govern virtually everything we do. To take an average day, it might begin with the sound of your alarm clock going off. The power which supplies your alarm clock comes from an energy company, with whom you will have entered into a written contract governing the terms of the supply. Despite our day-to-day reliance on the company upholding its end of this contract, you probably haven't given its existence any thought, especially not at this time in the morning [3, p. 2].

Another preliminary context which represents a common site of interactional difficulty, at least for the lay participant, is in the communication of rights. Several linguistic studies have highlighted the potential injustice caused by the interactional strategies and interpretive norms utilised by representatives of the legal process in situations where an individual may wish to invoke a particular legal right. This includes the invocation of the right to a legal representative for a police interview in the US, where the legal process apparently expects a person in a massively disadvantageous position to abandon all communicative norms of indirectness, politeness, and power

relations, and to make their request for a lawyer in only the most literal and imposing manner. Thus utterances such as 'I think I would like to talk to a lawyer', and 'maybe I should talk to a lawyer' have been held by US courts not to be sufficiently clear to amount to an invocation of that right (see Solan & Tiersm2005: 54–62 for an accessible discussion). However, Solan & Tiersma (2005: 62) points out that the same legal system shows itself to be entirely capable o determining the inferred meaning of far more ambiguous requests made by police officers who would otherwise be held to have carried out illegal searches [3, p. 5].

Put simply, the task of a court is to decide between competing versions of events, on the basis of the evidence presented to it. The court can only base its decision on what is presented to it in court; there are consequently detailed and complex rules governing admissibility. The general principle is that only evidence of 'fact' is admissible; a person's 'opinion' is not: the only opinion which counts is the court's, and no witness should usurp that function. However, sometimes the court will need help in interpreting the 'facts' presented to it, for example technical engineering data about a ship which sank, or complex medical information. In order to assist with this, an expert can be called. Their task is to apply their expertise to the facts which are being presented, and to provide the court with their opinion on them. This therefore breaks the fundamental rule about the inadmissibility of opinion evidence. Consequently, a huge body of case law and procedural rules has developed around expert evidence, in order to police the boundaries of its admissibility. There is no need here to go into the complexities of the relevant principles, but it is worth highlighting that one of the main criteria will be whether the expert can provide 'information which is likely to be outside the experience and knowledge of a judge or jury' (R v Turner5, a UK criminal case). The challenge for linguistics, then, is to convince courts that our discipline can offer scientific analysis and insight that goes beyond the knowledge that judges, as gatekeepers, think they already have about the language they use every day. In addition, courts will assess the validity and reliability of the methodology used, applying criteria such as whether there are known error rates6. A further concern, then, is developing methodologies and analytic frameworks which are robust and valid. This is, of course, essential given the use to which such analyses will be put and the hugely significant consequences for those directly involved. It also means that the field of forensic linguistics is increasingly at the forefront of developing reliable and innovative methodologies, especially for the analysis of short texts such as text messages. Thus this most 'applied' of linguistic fields has the potential to make major theoretical contributions.

It must also be noted that of the cases in which the advice of a linguistic expert is sought, a majority never reach court. They may be settled at an earlier stage, or a prosecution might be dropped, or a guilty plea might be entered. Nevertheless, the linguistic evidence may well have played a role in that outcome [3, p. 9].

All in all, there are many areas of common interest between law and linguistics. Law is about justice, and yet the legal system's use and interpretation of language has frequently been demonstrated by linguists to lead to the perpetuation – indeed creation – of injustice. It seems that this is often due to misunderstanding or ignorance of the principles of language and communication, rather than any deliberate intention. Much of the work mentioned in this workis already making that contribution, but it is only a starting point.

Law and linguistics are very important in our life and we must have to know all things about them.

Список використаних джерел

1. European security situation: notions of 'spheres of influence' have no place in the 21st century, URL: https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/press/press-releases/2022/01/24/spheres-of-influence-have-no-place-in-the-21st-century/.

2. Linguistic security as a factor of sustainable development of a region (on the example of Scandinavian Peninsula), URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348421235_Linguistic_security_as_a_factor_of_sustainable_development_of_a_region_on_the_example_of_Scandinavian_Peninsula .

3. Legal language, Initial encounters, URL: https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https://publications.aston.ac.uk/id/eprint/26890/1/Linguistics_and_the_law.pdf&ved=2ah.

Сова Ю.,
здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: **Василенко О.**

PROBLEMS OF COMBATING CRIMES IN THE UNITED MEXICAN STATES

Latin American countries differ significantly from the rest of the world in terms of the structure of the instruments of killing. As of 2021, on average, about 65 % of people are killed with firearms, and 20 % of victims are killed with cold weapons. For comparison, we note that this structure is significantly different in the EU member states: firearms – 20 %, melee weapons – 30 %. This shows that there is an uncontrolled market for firearms in Latin American countries, which shows the organized and armed nature of most crimes.

Having determined the general state and nature of modern crime in the countries of Latin America, we will try to explore the main forms of crime prevention in the individual country of this region – The United Mexican States.

Mexico, officially the United Mexican States is among Latin American countries with a high level of crime. To some extent, this is facilitated by the features of the geographical location of this country. The