

defining what they cover and what they mean legally; 2) the principle of proportionality – making sure guarantees are fair and reasonable; 3) obligations of guarantors – explaining the obligations of the person or entity giving the guarantee; 4) compliance with international standards – ensuring the Ukrainian law follows best global practices in contract law and financial security.

Guarantees are very important in civil law because they give extra protection and confidence in legal agreements. Their correct use requires following legal rules, professional legal analysis, and fair enforcement. It is also important to have a transparent system for monitoring guarantees to prevent misuse and make sure they meet legal standards.

In conclusion, understanding guarantees in civil law and following legal and ethical rules is the key to maintaining trust in contracts. Guarantees help protect creditors and make sure obligations are met, contributing to a more reliable legal system.

References:

1. Civil Code of Ukraine: Law of Ukraine from January 16, 2003, No. 435-IV.
2. Spasybo-Fatieieva V.M. "Guarantee in Civil Law of Ukraine." Kharkiv: Pravo, 2015.
3. Kravchuk M.V. "Ensuring the Fulfillment of Obligations in Civil Law of Ukraine." Kyiv: Yurinkom-Inter, 2018.
4. Stefanchuk R.O. "Legal Nature of Security Instruments in Ukrainian Civil Law." *Journal of Civil Law*, 2020.
5. United Nations Convention on Independent Guarantees and Stand-by Letters of Credit, 1995.

ANIMAL RIGHTS

KATERYNA KHMELIUK, student

ALLA I. RADU, Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Scientific Adviser

Ivan Franko National University of Lviv

Recently, much attention has been paid to different forms of discrimination. Scholars have been discussing the problem of whether animals have rights similar to those of humans. The problem is important in regard to whether the animal is the subject or object of law. A lot of us have pets, meet them in the street or zoo. Besides, we consume products that are animal tested. So, the problem is important, has many aspects and concerns all of us.

Animal rights is a concept that refers to the care for the humane treatment of non-human creatures. Moral and political issues related to animals have been addressed within the framework of many different philosophical doctrines and metaphysical teachings [4].

Aristotle was one of the first to say that animals have memory, feelings and a psyche that differ in each species. Ancient Greek philosophers Plutarch and Pythagoras spoke about the possibility of avoiding cruel treatment of animals.

R. Descartes' aphorism "*An animal can only be an object, not a subject of action/ Animal non agit, agitur*" denies the right of an animal to be a person. Until the middle of the 19th century, zoopsychologists supported this view [6].

Animal rights were seriously discussed only at the end of the 19th century. The founder of the Humanitarian League, H. Salt, proposed considering animals in the categories of human morality and recognizing their lives to be equal to human lives [2].

In the 1980s, animal rights philosophers P. Singer and T. Regan developed a modern ideology based on the animal rights. In his review of "Animal. Men, and Morals" for the New York Review of Books, P. Singer laid out the fundamental ideas to the animal rights movement.

Currently, there are two main philosophical approaches to the issue of animal rights: utilitarian (adhered to by P. Singer) and rights-based (adhered to by G. Francione, T. Regan). P. Singer does not support the concept of natural rights and the idea that animals can own them. He believes that the primary needs of animals (especially the need to avoid pain) should be considered no less valuable than similar needs of humans. That is, the suffering of beings, whether human or not, is equal [3].

T. Regan says that animals are, as he calls them, "subjects-of-a-life" and therefore should be endowed with natural rights that cannot be ignored [1]. G. Francione says that animals have only one right that must be legitimized: the right not to be owned. He is sure that focusing on "animal welfare" can actually only worsen the situation, because it reinforces a possessive view of them and allows the society to use them.

Some experts disagree with the theory of animal rights, because the existence of rights necessarily implies the existence of obligations. To refute this position, I shall cite the opinion of the American eco-lawyer C. Stone. In his work "Should Trees Have Standing?" he states that natural objects possess rights from the start. The fact that they do not have capacity does not prevent their trustees or defenders, such as environmental organisations, from defending their rights in court [5].

In conclusion, I'd like to note that I fully agree with C. Stone. Animals cannot break each other's rights, because there are no rights in nature. Animal rights are part of an artificial concept. We can speak of the rights only in regard to relations between people or those between people and animals. Thus, animals must be protected by people or a state. They are not liable for deeds that break the law. But still animals are able to feel pain or desire to live, their natural rights must be defended. To do this we need to accept the idea of animals as the subjects of law. Further on special trustee's institute shall guarantee animal rights.

References:

1. Regan, Tom. (2001). *Defending Animal Rights*. University of Illinois Press, 67.
2. Salt, H. *Animals' Rights: Considered in Relation to Social Progress*.
3. Singer, P. *Animal liberation or animal rights?*

4. Slovoedia Encyclopedia of Political Thought, Prava tvarin
<http://slovopedia.org.ua/40/53407/261269.html>
5. Stone, Christopher D. Should trees have standing?
<https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=vk9uAgAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR5&dq=Stone+C.+Should+trees+have+standing%3F&ots=iwuq4hZk75&sig=9eJKUTDcMP0a-XXYhcX0LGuLMcE>
6. Turska, V. I. The content and characteristic of the concept of "Animal rights".

PARTICIPATION OF JUDGES IN LEGAL REGULATION: GENESIS AND CURRENT STATE

DANYIL KHOMUTETSKYI, PhD student

OLENA OVCHARENKO, Associate Professor, Doctor of Science in Law,
Scientific Adviser

SVITLANA MYKYTIUK, Associate Professor, PhD in Philology, Language
Adviser

Yaroslav Mudryi National Law University

It is well known that the classical factor in the regulation of social relations is a written law (the product of legislative authority) that establishes, changes or terminates the basic rule. However, this rule may be unclear, and contain shortcomings and gaps that complicate its application, and therefore the law needs to be properly interpreted by those who apply it – judges.

At the same time, sometimes this interpretation of the norms rises to a qualitatively higher level, becoming almost an independent rule itself. This can be called the starting point of the academic idea of the unity of these judicial rules, which means the unity of judicial practice. It seems appropriate to analyse the development of the unity of judicial practice in the context of the stages of academic thought development described in academic works [1].

In the classical stage of academic development, the unity of judicial practice was ensured mainly through the hierarchical structure of courts, where higher courts had the right to overturn decisions of lower courts in case of non-compliance with the law. At the same time, the courts were mostly guided by written law. Thus, the main factor in the unity of judicial practice was the legislation that defined the framework of judicial activity.

As for the role of the highest courts, their activity was primarily aimed at controlling the legality of lower court decisions. Accordingly, the issue of the unity of judicial practice was focused on the shortcomings or gaps in legislation.

As we approach the *non-classical stage*, there have been significant changes in the views on the role of courts, legislation, and court practice in ensuring the unity of court practice itself. The importance of judicial precedent, i.e. a court decision in a particular case that is binding on similar cases in the future, was growing.

In general, the non-classical stage of scientific thought development is characterized by an increasing role of judicial discretion, which may lead to