

DNY PRÁVA
– 2012 –
DAYS OF LAW

Masarykova univerzita
Brno, 2012

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------------|
| Criminal and Procedural Alternatives in Individual and Collective Criminal Law | 135 |
| Pavel Biriukov | |
| Criminal liability of legal persons in Italy | 136 |
| Lucie Boledovičová | |
| Electronic monitoring as a means to reduce prison population | 137 |
| Szilvia Dobrocsi | |
| Procedural issues regarding the criminal liability of legal persons in Hungary | 138 |
| Libor Dušek | |
| The impacts of the fast-track procedure on crime and criminal procedure | 139 |
| Markéta Filipová | |
| Plea bargaining as a new special form of criminal procedure | 140 |
| Karol Hrádela | |
| The law on criminal liability of legal persons and and affair of Mr. Rath. | 141 |
| Miriám Hrušková | |
| Educational measures as a category sui generis system of alternative penalties applicable to juvenile criminal . . . | 142 |
| Michal Hvozda | |
| Application Problems in the Fast-Track Procedure . . . | 143 |
| Lenka Jamborová | |
| Perspectives of the Future Using of Criminal Warrant as the Traditional Procedural Alternative | 144 |
| Věra Kalvodová | |
| Conditional Release – an Alternative to Serving Prison Sentence | 145 |
| Jana Klesniaková | |
| Chosen procedural alternatives in criminal law from the point of view of compensatory damages | 146 |
| Nurgul Konarbayeva | |
| Criminological anthropology during the dynamic integration of scientific knowledge (Based on the records in the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation). . | 147 |

CRIMINOLOGICAL ANTHROPOLOGY
DURING THE DYNAMIC INTEGRATION OF
SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE (BASED ON THE
RECORDS IN THE REPUBLIC OF
KAZAKHSTAN AND THE RUSSIAN
FEDERATION).

NURGUL KONARBAYEVA

kasiet.n@mail.ru

Competitor of the Department of Criminal Law of HSE NRU of the
RF

Key words: Criminological anthropology, criminals, determination of crime.

Criminological anthropology during the dynamic integration of scientific knowledge (Based on the records in the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation). One of the controversial questions in criminology in the Republic of Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation is the definition of the subject and the validity of the methodology of criminological anthropology, which has both theoretical and practical importance. Criminological anthropology identified the subject and the methodology in the process of its formation and development. But they became the cause of many scientific discussions and polemics. This is due primarily to the following historical factors: a) criminological anthropology branched off not from the law but from psychiatry, its modern interpretation is the result of a long scientific integration; b) the law for a long time, if not since the appearance of the first books on criminological anthropology accepted dominating public opinion, accusing it of being monodisciplinary and unilateral. It was the fact that gave a powerful impetus to formation and development of the science. Since

its formation, criminological anthropology was swept over by a huge wave of sometimes unjustified criticism, the essence of which was that the criminological anthropology was only the recognition of heredity, atavism, and special anthropometric data of a criminal as the cause of committing crimes. At the same time, this trend continued during the Soviet period of development of Criminology. But, indeed, despite the ideology of the time, there were views that criminology developed under political pressure and ideological orientation was inherent in it. On the basis of studies of murders and violent crimes, E.G. Samovichev states that the fact that no one has managed to find out a specific determination of murders does not indicate its absence, but: a) lack of adequate theoretical concepts of the mechanisms of generation of specific forms of human behavior b) methods used for the study of special causes of premeditated murders are inadequate their subject, c) that ideology dominates in this case, but not scientific criminological concept of the absence of specific determinants of criminal behavior (compared to the law-abiding) and features of the perpetrators of the crime. If many authors consider criminology as an interdisciplinary science, a subject and a complex branch of preventive law, in our opinion, it is, above all, the merit of criminological anthropology. Modern criminology has its roots in criminological anthropology; this very fact determines the interdisciplinary nature of criminology, as well as its subsequent development. The emergence of criminology as an independent science is directly related to the anthropological school of criminal law. Criminology branched off from the criminal law due to the valuable works of the representatives of this school. These works include works of Ch.Lombrozo "Crime" and "Criminal anthropology" (later published in Russia, "Recent progress in science of the criminal", 1892), "Anarchists" by E.Ferri, "Criminal Sociology," and of course, "Criminology" by R.Garofalo. Due to the theoretical and practical works of such luminaries, investigating various questions of personality as Ch.Lombrozo, E.Ferri, B.Gomberg, I.S.Noy., J.M. Antonian, EG Samovich, E.F. Pobegailo and others, sufficiently developed school, studying personality theories in criminology was formed, which we risk to call criminological anthropology. Studying the works of the above authors, we made the following conclusions. Criminological anthropology in its development linked criminal behavior

primarily to the individual data of the criminal, hence its multifaceted nature, which covers criminal-psychological and sociological essays and psychiatric works. As a result, the issues of individual have been the object of study of many disciplines such as legal, social, and medical, in general natural sciences. Thus, many disciplines for a long time could not decide on object of criminological anthropology and some authors considered it part of the various disciplines. Any scientific discipline or theory goes through a completely natural reinterpretation of previous stages of its development: some areas are updated, traditional views are revised, new ideas are put forward, data from other neighboring sciences is drawn on and attempts to create integrative system of knowledge using new discoveries, techniques, etc. are made. In our view, this is all very characteristic of modern criminological anthropology, when more or less ingrained traditional beliefs collide with new views, new interpretation of the accumulated facts. This process, known for its costs, as a rule, is enriched by the interaction and exchange. Everything of value is included in the research and practice and secondary is discarded. The emergence, formation and justification for any new trend or the border science, together with a certain methodology, guidelines and research object must have its own zone of contact with other neighboring disciplines, and also be based on their main method of investigation. In this respect, in the study of issues of personality, modern criminological anthropology is formed at the intersection of medical science, anthropology, psychology, genetics and law. Probably we need to treat integrity, not as something imposed from the outside, because it is immanent in every field of knowledge. It is also important humanitarian, philosophical, psychological, or natural science foundation, which prevents the researcher from slipping into the particular problems of specific area of knowledge. In the complex of legal sciences, especially in tandem of Criminal Law and Criminology it is particularly important to emphasize this position, because of its high specialization and differentiation. During global and dynamic integration of scientific disciplines, modern criminological anthropology emerged as a paradigm, which examines individual-typological variability of criminal and psychobiological characteristics of offender in relation to the social environment to assess their criminal legal, predictive and preventive value. According to mod-

ern criminological anthropology, causes of crime will be determined by the fact of internal interaction of biological, personal and external environmental factors with the properties of the individual offenders at different hierarchical levels of their organization. In this regard, prognostic study of this system due to comprehensiveness and complexity of structure and function, determines the need for a systemic approach, and calls for further joint work, the efforts of scientists in the fields of law, genetics, psychology, and medicine.
