In some Italian towns and cities you may be fined for dropping litter and in some towns or cities it's an offence to sit on monument steps or to eat and drink in the immediate vicinity of main churches, historic monuments and public buildings. It's also an offence to enter or bathe in public fountains. A fine of up to €10,000 can be imposed for urinating in a public place [2].

The Municipality of Capri forbids the use of any disposable plastic objects such as bags, cutlery, plates, cups, food packaging, trays, straws on the island of Capri. Violations can incur a fine of up to 500 euros [2].

Illegal traders operate on the streets of all major Italian cities, particularly tourist cities like Florence, Venice and Rome. You should not buy from illegal street traders. If you do, you could be stopped by the local police and fined [2].

It's illegal to remove sand, shells or pebbles from coastal areas in Italy. Doing so may result in heavy fines. It's also forbidden to collect various species of flowers, plants and herbs from mountain and wooded areas [2].

The law of each state is individual. Italy is a country of interesting customs and an important legal system.

Список використаних джерел

1. Law of Italy. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Law_of_Italy.
2. Local laws and customs. URL: https://www.gov.uk/foreign-travel-advice/italy/local-laws-and-customs.

Курапова В.,
здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: **Могилевська В.**

ENSURING RESPECT FOR INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW

The changing nature of warfare in the 21st century poses a multitude of challenges to the perceived applicability of International Humanitarian Law (IHL) for both State and non-State actors in contemporary conflicts. These issues, including but not limited to: ambiguity in the distinction of violent conflict, the changing type of actors involved, issues of asymmetric warfare, challenges of negative reciprocity, and an inhibited ability to engage with all parties to conflict, are detrimental to the overriding purpose of IHL. Still, the oftentimes inefficient nature of the international system, as well as lack of consensus regarding new legislation means that formal changes in IHL to more flexibly reflect the reality of situations will not be developed anytime in the near future. Therefore, it is in the best interest of all parties to non-international conflicts to aspire to better respect the existing norms of IHL, which can only be attained if States recognize the dire need for inclusive engagement with all types of non-State actors. In addition, practices of positive reciprocity must be carried out by all parties,

in order to better serve the ultimate goal of International Humanitarian Law: the reduction of human suffering, and the preservation of human dignity in times of violent armed conflict.

It is perhaps readily apparent that one of the most prominent challenges to the effectiveness of International Humanitarian Law is the issue of non-compliance by the multitude of non-state actors formerly mentioned. But analogous to this problem is the fact that non-State actors are not autonomously or voluntarily Party to the treaties and conventions under which they are legally bound. Instead, IHL as ratified by States around the world includes the definitions of, and stipulations for NSAs in times of armed conflict imply because they are de facto parties to the conflict. The theory referred to as the 'principle of legislative jurisdiction' is a majority view of the international community, holding that non-state actors are bound under IHL by reason of their being active on the territory of a Contracting Party (a State Party to the Geneva Conventions and/or its Additional Protocols) [1]. But without their participation in the creation of these laws, and even oftentimes without their knowledge of them, it is difficult to expect comprehensive compliance, and ironically, «there are no groups that feel less represented by the State than armed opposition groups» [2]. Aside from a contradiction regarding the treatment of NSAs in domestic law versus IHL, the mere fact that non-State actors are not privy to the international laws governing them does little to ensure that they will abide by their standards. Thus, arguably at the heart of this issue is the denial of consent and participation in rule making. In addition, the argument of IHL's inherent «legitimacy» has little substance from the perspective of non-State actors, and willingness to comply on the part of an actor is crucially dependent on the perception of its having consented to, or at least having participated in the formation of the law one is bound by. As such, in a period when violent non-State actors increasingly exert influence in modern warfare, the reality that only States are party to the treaties of IHL is a negative factor hindering effective compliance.

In reality however, war has never been a clear-cut matter, and throughout history there have always been instances of combat that fall outside the scope of man-to-man battle in the field. While new technologies and unique developing patterns do have an effect on the way in which war is generally fought, obstacles to Just War have always been present. Thus, the relevance of IHL in the 21st century is entirely dependent upon its perceived relevance by actors involved, and subsequently their willingness to comply with its stipulations. Though these changes in the nature of conflict remain problematic to the determination and application of appropriate bodies of international law, they are not the sole reason for violations of IHL by both State and non-State actors party to conflict. An inherent issue of IHL is the fact that it seeks to operate in «an international society of states not willing to uphold the rule of international law», which inhibits the very mechanisms already in place for successful implementation [3]. As such, the lack of political will illustrated by national

governments to abide by existing law is considerably the most detrimental factor inhibiting the goal of gaining compliance by non-State actors.

While International Humanitarian Law does not perfectly reflect the realities of warfare in contemporary conflict, it is important to realize that long-standing humanitarian norms are not so archaic that they cannot be applied in practice. The duty of lawyers in any field is to interpret existing laws and employ them as best as possible to a present situation, and the same truism applies to non-international conflicts and IHL in the world today [4]. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the ways in which IHL can and should be implemented given the current circumstances and available mechanisms for securing enhanced compliance.

Список використаних джерел

1. Ryngaert, Cedric, Non-State Actors and International Humanitarian Law, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven Faculty of Law, Nstituut Voor Internationaal Recht, K.U. Leuven, 2008, 5.

2. Ryngaert, Cedric. Non-State Actors and International Humanitarian Law, 5.

3. Sassòli, Marco, Current and Inherent Challenges, 52.

4. Interview, Marco Sassòli.

Лелюх Ю.,
здобувач ступеня вищої освіти бакалавра
Національної академії внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: **Богуцький В.**

JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEMS IN EUROPE

In the last 20 years, youth justice systems in Europe have undergone considerable changes, particularly in the former socialist countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

Recalling the need to guarantee the effective implementation of existing binding norms concerning children's rights, without preventing member states from introducing or applying higher standards or more favourable measures;

Definitions For the purposes of these guidelines on child-friendly justice (hereafter «the guidelines»):

– a «child» means any person under the age of 18 years;

– «parent» refers to the person(s) with parental responsibility, according to national law. In case the parent(s) is/are absent or no longer holding parental responsibility, this can be a guardian or an appointed legal representative;

– «child-friendly justice» refers to justice systems which guarantee the respect and the effective implementation of all children's rights at the highest attainable level, bearing in mind the principles listed below and giving due consideration to the child's level of maturity and understanding and the circumstances of the case.