

## **LAW-POPULARIZING WORK OF CHINA**

Since China implemented the first “five-year plan” of law-popularizing work in 1986, law-popularizing education has undergone a policy change from propagating the party’s democratic legal system to propagating the basic strategy of governing the country according to law. Now, law-popularizing education has achieved three historic changes, from the education on popularizing the general knowledge of law to the education on improving the legal quality, from the education of monotonously popularizing legal clause to the education of respecting legal spirit and the concept of law, from the administrative management to institutionalized, standardized and legal management.

Through the five “five-year plan” of law-popularizing work, the legal awareness of our citizens has been strengthened. In our country, the social atmosphere of learning law, knowing law, abiding law, loving law and law-enforcement has gradually taken shape. After more than 30 years of organized and planned law-popularizing work, now the Chinese government is deepening its understanding of law-popularizing work itself, at the same time we must face the drawbacks of law-popularizing work, we also must conduct a comprehensive review of law-popularizing work. At present, the main body of China’s popularization of law is mainly related state organs. However, due to historical culture and system construction, the law-abiding conditions of the personnel of state organs in our country are unsatisfactory. Due to the imbalance in social development and the immaturity in all aspects and conditions, the government is only the temporary predominant function of undertaking law-popularizing work. With the development of society, the general public should become the main body and promoter of law-popularizing work.

Because college students are also an important part of society, therefore, my country also has relevant policies and directives: all types of schools at all levels should conduct legal education of students. Moreover law-popularizing education of college students also has an important meaning of their individual growth.

However, there is still some problems in law-popularization education for college students such as outdated educational concepts, limited level of teachers and boring teaching forms and contents.

First, the law has even been described by some old textbooks as “the ruling class’s violent tools and machinery of repressing the ruled class”. What’s more, in the traditional view, people have a great misunderstanding of the law that “as

long as they do not commit crimes will never deal with the law”.

Second, the form of education is still confined to the traditional classroom teaching model, such as less legal education activities, only one copy of the law manual. Third, law teachers in many colleges and universities are come from the Social Science Department, Moral Education Department, Academic Affairs Office, the Communist Youth League, they are unprofessional in law. So this will also affect the teaching of basic law courses.

Now, our country places more and more emphasis on the rule of law, and the rule of law has been incorporated into the fundamental national policy of the constitution. We need to do a good job in law-popularizing education among college students.

First, teachers in higher education institutions need to innovate the form of law-popularizing education. They can hold mock courts, watch the video or TV shows concerning law of CCTV with students. And they can hold interesting lectures on law in colleges and universities. By updating and adding new content. It can mobilize the enthusiasm of students to study law, use law.

УДК 347.631.22 (043.2)

**Петрова М. П.,**  
Варненский свободный университет  
им. Черноризца Храбра, г. Варна, Болгария

### **ДОПУСТИМА ЛИ ПРЕЗУМПЦИЯ ОТЦОВСТВА В СЛУЧАЕ СМЕРТИ УСЫНОВЛЯЮЩЕГО ПО СЕМЕЙНОМУ ПРАВУ РЕСПУБЛИКИ БОЛГАРИИ**

В судебной практике возник случай, когда при усыновлении ребенка усыновляющий-супруг умер, не дождавшись решения суда об усыновлении [2]. Суд постановил решение, согласно которому допустил полное усыновление ребенка усыновляющей-супругой и присудил изменение в имени ребенка, который в будущем будет носить отчество и фамилию умершего супруга. Решение вступило в силу. Но усыновительница осталась недовольной тем, что в акте о рождении ребенка должностное лицо по гражданскому состоянию (орган ЗАГСа) отказал вписать отцом ребенка умершего ее супруга. Она настаивала на том, что в данном случае должна применяться по аналогии норма первого пункта 61 статьи Семейного кодекса, регламентирующая презумпцию отцовства, когда ребенок родился в течение брака или до трехсот дней после его прекращения. Более того, она сочла отказ вписать в акте о рождении ребенка ее супруга отцом дискриминационным. Безусловно,