

2. Coulthard M., Johnson A. An introduction to forensic linguistics: Language in evidence. Routledge. 2007.

3. Sumaljag M. V. A Forensic Linguistic Analysis of Police Reports. *OSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, 2018. 23(1), P. 80-103.

4. Duenas P. M. A cross-cultural analysis of the generic structure of Business Management Research Articles: The Method Section. 2007.

5. Leonard R. A., Ford J. E. R., Christensen T. K. Forensic Linguistics: Applying the Science of Linguistics to Issues of the Law. *Hofstra Law Review*, 2017. 45(3), Article 11.

6. Olsson J. Forensic Linguistics and the Law: Some Key Issues and Challenges. In *Forensic Linguistics: Advances in Forensic Stylistics*, 2004.

**Аббасов Ф.,**

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти магістра  
Національної академії внутрішніх справ  
Консультант з мови: **Богуцький В.**

## **LANGUAGES AND MILITARY CO-ORDINATION**

A further way in which information is a relevant area for language planning in the context of security is the language issues related to communication with others. Language issues arise in communication both within coalitions of allies and in communicating with local people in theatres of conflict. Language planning responses to these issues have traditionally focused on developing the language capacities of military personnel who have a need to communicate with others, or in the provision of interpreting and translation services, to facilitate the communication. Language learning may involve the teaching of languages of allies to members of the armed forces for use in a multilingual force in combat situations. During the Ottoman Empire, the janissaries were recruited and enslaved from among the Christian population and as part of the military preparation were taught Turkish, which became the normal language of the janissary corps. In this case, Turkish provided a common language between recruits from

linguistically different areas and provided a common language within the corps regardless of the origins of individuals. The language of the dominating group became to lingua franca among a linguistically mixed collection of subordinated peoples. A similar approach is found in the contemporary French Foreign Legion. Historically in the UK, language learning for military co-ordination involved officers commanding colonial troops the local language of those troops. This was done within a tradition of using local languages as languages of command during the colonial period.

Officers serving in India were encouraged to learn Hindustani, while those who commanded with Gurkha regiments were required to learn Gurkhali. The emphasis here was on the development of language skills for communication within a multilingual defence force. The result of this policy was a military structure which consisted of British officers commanding troops who did not speak the officers' language but which required a common language of communication to function as an effective military force. The solution to the problem of communication was to teach the language of the majority to the minority rather than teaching the language of the dominant group to the subordinated group. Modern military language planning has also focused on the development of shared language resources, but the main emphasis has been on developing a shared language among multinational forces rather than on developing communication within a single military force.

The perception here is that for armed forces to operate together in a co-ordinated way, they need a common language – that is a common language is equated with effective communication. The first language planning decision in this context is the choice of which language will be used as the common language. In reality, this decision is commonly made in relation to the language of the most powerful country involved, which, as in the case of NATO's PffP, is commonly English. In fact the choice of English is usually treated as an unproblematic given for NATO (c.f. also the quotation above) as the following quotation shows. For a country like Lithuania, whose geography compels it to base national warfare on light infantry, the top priority in the defence policy should be the development of well trained and competent units able to communicate with NATO in terms of speaking the same language (English) and working on the same radio frequencies.

Although English may be naturalized as the language of choice for interoperability in NATO contexts, other powers do include the teaching of their own language as an aspect of military cooperation. For example, military co-operation between France and Ukraine involves the teaching of French in Ukrainian military colleges.

While the teaching of one's own language to one's allies is seen as a way of strengthening ties between armed forces and of developing interoperability, teaching one's own language to one's enemy may be seen as treasonable or in some way criminal or unpatriotic. When an American who deserted to North Korea during the Korean War was court marshalled in 2004, he "pleaded guilty to aiding the enemy by teaching English to military cadets in the 1980s" That is, the teaching of one's own country's language to an enemy is something of which one may stand condemned, even if it occurs after the end of active hostilities between the countries involved. While improved communication between allies may be a military advantage improved communication between enemies is problematic and acts against the security of the country.

Language education may also be conceived as military aid – that is a language is taught in order to facilitate the modernisation or the use of weapons or other military technology by the armed forces of countries who do not speak this language. Such language planning approaches construct knowledge of a particular language as an objective good and are based on a belief, among the recipients as much as the donors, that knowledge of the language is tied to some improvement in the military resources of the recipient country. As Waters notes, often, such aid has been "directed to ex-colonies or established spheres of influence; it was often linked with military aid as a way of maintaining a particular ideological cast on the host state; and it frequently insisted that aid monies be spent in purchasing items from the donor society".

The result is a tying together of the economic interests of the donor country with military and security interests and the entrenchment of existing relationships of power and influence. Krivas, from a Lithuanian perspective frames this issue as follows: Enabling our military personnel to communicate in English at a reasonable level of proficiency, we thus provide them with an opportunity to learn Western ways of doing things in the military area, but also to learn the Western

way of life, system of values, etc. At the same time, it enables our Western partners to become convinced that Lithuania is part of the same community of values to which NATO members belong themselves. Here the issue goes beyond shared language as interoperability to a view that proficiency in English would lead to an improvement of military capacity through an assimilation to western approaches not only by the military, but to life in general. Moreover the sharing of a language is portrayed as fundamental to the existence of alliance itself – alliance is an assimilation to the value system and military system of the dominant party to whom one aligns. Further observes that the need to use English made the production of Lithuanian versions of military documents burdensome and expensive and that Lithuanian was removed from the communication system of the military, at least at higher levels.

However, the student slots offered abroad could, by far, not satisfy the huge ELT requirement of the entire national defence establishment. German was not learnt because it was relevant to interoperability, although this was true, but because English was not available. German is therefore perceived as a less desirable mode of communication than English. This perception of the naturalness of English has a corresponding construction of the military culture associated with the English language as modern and technologised and in a dichotomous relationship with the local language as lacking in modernisation, part of the change from obsolete to the modern involves a change of the languages associated with obsolescence and modernity.

### **References:**

1. Aaseng N. Navajo Code Talkers: America's Secret Weapon in World War II. New York: Walker & Company, 1992.
2. Brecht R. D. Language in the US Post September 11: A Practical Design for a Federal Language Strategy, 2003.
3. Brecht R. D., Rivers W. P. Language and National Security for the 21st Century: The Role of Title VI/Fulbright-Hays in Supporting National Language Capacity, 2000.
4. Elliott G., Shukman H. Secret Classrooms: An Untold Story of the Cold War, 2002.
5. Hale W. Turkish Politics and the Military, 1994.

6. Krivas A. Towards interoperability: Actions at home. Baltic Defence Review, 1999.

7. Müller K. E. Addressing counterterrorism: US literacy in languages and international affairs, 2002.

*Авдієнко С.,*

здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра

Донецького державного

університету внутрішніх справ

*Консультант з мови : Мамонова О.*

## **ENSURING LEGALITY AND OBSERVANCE OF HUMAN RIGHTS DURING POLICE DOCUMENT CHECKS UNDER MARTIAL LAW**

Ensuring legality and the observance of human rights is one of the key tasks of police activity, especially under martial law, when the state is forced to restrict certain rights of citizens in order to guarantee national security and public order. Document checks conducted by police officers are a common preventive measure aimed at detecting offenses, preventing crimes, and identifying individuals. However, under martial law, this procedure gains particular significance as it is associated with increased requirements for control, security, and the lawfulness of law enforcement actions.

During martial law, certain problems arise regarding the police inspection of citizens' documents. According to Article 32, Part 1 of the Law of Ukraine "On the National Police," a police officer has the right to require a person to present identification documents and/or documents confirming a certain right of that person in a manner that allows the officer to read and record the information contained therein [1]. However, given the current situation, the procedure for checking documents is often carried out with excessive use of authority and in violation of the legally established procedure, which significantly reduces citizens' trust in the National Police of Ukraine.

Such cases indicate gaps in law enforcement practice and insufficient control over compliance with legality in the exercise of police powers. However, according to S.M. Husarov, the administrative