

The success of the interrogation largely depends on the choice of the best sequences of questions. Practice shows that firstly it is best to ask questions about the circumstances that characterize good features of interrogatee, then about the neutral characterized circumstances. In this way a psychological contact is established with the interrogatee, it reduces his/her mental stress, which is inevitable while bringing a person into a dialogue on the events that are interested to the court. At least there are asked questions that affect the interests of the interrogatee.

Scientists propose to use "group method" of asking questions, according to which there are three blocks of questions. The first block contains questions that encourage a questioned person to give all information in the form of free story. The second set of questions aimed at demonstrating to interrogatee inaccuracies and discrepancies in his words. The third block involves a direct reference to the errors in the interrogatee's testimony, referring to specific evidence. This group method means logical and effective influence on the person and helps to expose lies.

We have to remember that the pre-trial interrogation has the searching character. The judicial interrogation is not as search, but test-convincing, and therefore the questions should be mainly aimed at verifying the gained knowledge.

That's why simple recommendation connected with main rules of psychology and criminalistics tactic can much rise the level of gained testimony.

DIFFERENT VIEWS ON DEMOCRACY AT PRESENT TIME

JULIA ZABIAKA

National law University by Yaroslav the Wise

The word 'democracy' has its origins in the Greek language. It combines two shorter words: 'demos' meaning whole citizen living within a particular city-state and 'kratos' meaning power or rule.

Democracy also means a belief in the individual: since the individual is believed to be both moral and rational;

a belief in reason and progress: based on the belief that growth and development is the natural condition of mankind and politics the art of compromise;

a belief in a society that is consensual: based on a desire for order and co-operation not disorder and conflict;

a belief in shared power: based on a suspicion of concentrated power (whether by individuals, groups or governments).

Liberal democracy (that is, one that champions the development and well-being of the individual) is organised in such a way as to define and limit power so as to promote legitimate government within a framework of justice and freedom. There are four critical elements to the framework:

- legitimacy;
- justice;
- freedom; and
- power.

I believe that democracy is a certain type of freedom.

If freedom is to exist, there must be:

- self-determination such that citizens may make decisions, learn from them and accept responsibility for them;
- the capacity to choose between alternatives;
- the autonomy to do what the law does not forbid; and where prohibitions do exist, they should be for the common good; and
- respect for political and civil liberties. For example, government intervention in political, economic and moral matters affecting the citizenry is limited or regulated; and the scope for religious, political and intellectual freedom of citizens is not limited.

What follows is a short list of definitions provided by field experts.

Jim Kilcullen (economist) puts the question about what democracy means. He speculates that in ancient Greece some cities were democracies, others were oligarchies. Democracy meant rule by the people, oligarchy meant rule by the few. So a city was a democracy if: city affairs were subject to an Assembly; to which all male citizens belonged; and in which decisions were made by simple majority vote.

<http://www.humanities.mq.edu.au/Ockham/y67xa.html>

To Andrew Heywood (politician)democracy is :

Rule by the people. Democracy implies both popular participation and government in the public interest, and can take a wide variety of forms.

Palgrave Macmillan, Political Ideologies: An Introduction, Third edition, 2003, p.330.

Dr John Hirst (historian) defines democracy as a society in which the citizens are sovereign and control the government.

Papers on Parliament Number 42, The Distinctiveness of Australian Democracy, p.10/13

Joseph Schumpeter (economist and political scientist) sees the democratic method as that institutional arrangement for arriving at political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide by means of a competitive struggle for the people's vote.

Schumpeter adds that 'the classical theory of democracy attributed to the electorate an altogether unrealistic degree of initiative which practically amounted to ignoring leadership.' Further, Schumpeter claimed that

the purpose of democratic method [is] not to select representatives who carry out the will of the people, but to choose individuals who [will] govern on their behalf.

<http://www.cric.ac.uk/cric/events/schumpeter/papers/27.pdf>

There is a growing sentiment across democracies worldwide about vulnerability to a diverse range of threats – from violent extremism to economic, technological, environmental and geopolitical risks. This acute public awareness – particularly the fear generated by violent attacks driven by ideology – can accentuate societal divides, sharpen latent conflicts, and destabilise society. The growing tension between the concern for safety and the protection of freedoms is one of the key challenges facing democracies today.