

- Assess cybersecurity and privacy risks and threats in order to focus cybersecurity efforts on the most critical risks and threats.
- Strengthen overall security governance, especially security policies and procedures.
- Evaluate business processes to ensure that proper controls are in place for the collection, use and storage of private information.
- Develop clear roles and responsibilities for cybersecurity and privacy management.
- Set up a security and privacy incident monitoring system and appropriate reporting mechanisms.
- Execute periodic cybersecurity assessments.
- Ensure proper safeguards of private and important information transmitted outside of China's borders (including security assessment).
- Design a proper security incident response plan and perform periodic drills [4].

Список використаних джерел

1. The Internet in China, People's Daily Online, June 2010. URL: <http://en.people.cn/90001/90776/90785/7017177.html>.
2. Cyberspace Administration of China, Draft Security Assessment Measures for Cross-Border Transfer of Private Information and Important Data (in Chinese). URL: http://www.cac.gov.cn/2017-04/11/c_1120785691.htm.
3. Hong Kong's Personal Data (Privacy) Ordinance. URL: https://www.doj.gov.hk/eng/blis_decommission/index.html/blis_pdf.nsf/CurAllEngDoc.
4. China's Cybersecurity Law and its Impacts - Key Requirements Businesses Need to Understand to Ensure Compliance. URL: <https://www.protiviti.com/HK-en/insights/china-cybersecurity-law-and-impacts>.

Лобас В.,

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

LINGUISTICS AND LAW IN THE SECURITY SPHERE: FOREIGN EXPERIENCE

Linguistics and law are related to conservation issues national security, and when this happens, the inclusion of security brings certain ideologies into politics. One argument often found in security-focused linguistic politics is the idea that security requires society as a whole to have an understanding and knowledge of those nations or other groups that constitute possible security threats and language education is seen as a way to develop such understanding and knowledge.

There are general issues related to language education policy related to national security, as well as specific policy initiatives at certain historical

moments. Example: Turkey, where the Kurdish language is equated with terrorism.

Linguistics and law is an attempt by nations or other actors to address perceived problems related to language and so national security is one possible domain for language planning and policy work.

When linguistics is associated with a threat then it becomes a part of the process of securitisation and at the policy level is removed from its ordinary domain into the realm of security. For language this would mean that language is moved from a context in which thinking about language is framed in terms of its use for communication, as its ordinary domain, and becomes associated with either the enactment of a threat or ways of responding to or reducing threat. In terms of the relationship with language, political security may involve threats related to sub-state groupings that challenge state control, such as internal minorities [2, p. 77].

Linguistics policy and law as an element of securitisation can take a range of forms but in the language education contexts, two main strategies can be identified which can be seen as representing polar opposites in language and security. Linguistics can be seen as indexical of the threat that security policy wishes to resolve, as in the case of Turkey, in which Kurdish language and identity have come to be constructed as constituent elements of the threat to national territorial integrity. Where this is the case, language policy seeks to remove the language from the linguistic ecology of the state in order to resolve the threat.

In the Turkish context language has been securitised in order to address an internal conflict between the Turkish state and an ethnolinguistic minority, the Kurds. The language policies of the Turkish republic have not recognised Kurdish as a minority language. Initially, the lack of recognition of Kurdish was framed within a discourse of national identity and state building. Within this discourse, internal ethnic divisions were denied as creating divisions within Turkish identity and Kurds were considered as linguistically and culturally primitive Turks. Turkish language planning did not specifically ban the use of Kurdish (Rumpf, 1985), which in any case would have required acknowledgement of the existence of the language, but instead followed a policy favouring Turkish as the only language of Turkey [1, p. 180]. However, the Turkish government from the 1980s began to ban the use of Kurdish in a number of public contexts, which ranged from the banning of Kurdish language printed media and the singing of folksongs in Kurdish to the replacement of place names of Kurdish origin with Turkish forms.

Linguistics and law as an element of securitisation can take a range of forms but in the language education contexts two main strategies can be identified which can be seen as representing polar opposites in language and security. Language itself can be seen as indexical of the threat that security policy wishes to resolve, as in the case of Turkey, in which Kurdish language and identity have come to be constructed as constituent elements of the threat to national territorial integrity. Where this is the case, language

policy seeks to remove the language from the linguistic ecology of the state in order to resolve the threat [2, p. 40].

In such securitising discourses, language is seen as benefiting an enemy and the security response is to remove the benefit. Language policy in this case is repressive, seeking to exclude the ‘enemy’ language from valued public contexts, especially education, where the language would benefit from the symbolic value attached to such contexts and to its recognised public use (Bourdieu, 1982). Such activities can be seen as responses to language that seek to destroy the symbolic capital that such languages may possess and that may provide support for a perceived enemy at least at the symbolic level

The relationship between linguistics and security found in policy focused on security is the idea that ensuring security requires that a society as a whole has an understanding and knowledge of those nations or other groups which pose possible security threats and language education is seen as a way to develop such understanding and knowledge. The language planning response in such contexts is to increase the learning of languages at various levels of education to offset a lack of capacity [3, p. 210].

The language planning responses consider language as a barrier for effective national security but construct the problem and the solution in different ways. They reveal that language becomes a problem only when it is discursively constructed as a problem and that language becomes associated with security also as the result of discursive processes.

Список використаних джерел

1. Journal of International Relations, 11(2), 171–201.
2. Baele, S. J., & Sterck, O. C. 2014. Diagnosing the securitisation of immigration at the EU level: A new method for stronger empirical claims. *Political Studies*, n/a-n/a. doi: 10.1111/1467-9248.12147.
3. Crossey, M. 2008. English for global peacekeeping. *Current Issues in Language Planning*, 9(2), 207–218.

Лунгу О.,

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра
Донецького державного університету
внутрішніх справ

Консультант з мови: **Мамонова О.**

FIGHT AGAINST CRIME IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Crime is a historically volatile social and criminal phenomenon, representing a system of crimes committed in a particular territory at a given time. The paradox is that this phenomenon has always accompanied human activity. If we can't stop it, we must decrease its level as strong as it is possible, this is the main purpose of each civilized and humane state.

The analysis of international experience in the fight against crime shows that under present conditions criminal acts pose a real threat to democratic development and national security in most countries of the