

УДК 343.98

DOI: 10.37635/jnalsu.27(3).2020.142-154

Володимир Андрійович Журавель

Національна академія правових наук України
Харків, Україна

МЕХАНІЗМ ЗЛОЧИНУ ЯК КАТЕГОРІЯ КРИМІНАЛІСТИКИ

Анотація. Сучасний етап розвитку криміналістики характеризується активним формуванням її загальної теорії, визначенням об'єктно-предметної сфери дослідження цієї галузі знань. Актуальність досліджуваної в статті проблематики обумовлена необхідністю розробки сучасної наукової концепції предмета науки криміналістики, виокремлення кола закономірностей, що вивчаються. Метою дослідження є аналіз сучасних наукових підходів до розуміння механізму злочину як структурного елемента предмета науки криміналістики. Задля досягнення цієї мети були використані такі загальнонаукові та спеціальні методи дослідження, як діалектичний, історичний, формально-логічний, системно-структурний, правового прогнозування, системного і семантичного аналізу. Доведено, що механізм злочину як цілісна система обставин, процесів, факторів, що обумовлюють виникнення матеріальних та інших носіїв інформації про саму подію злочину, її учасників, забезпечує можливість висунення робочих слідчих версій, планування розслідування, цілеспрямованого пошуку наслідків злочину, встановлення злочинця, потерпілого (жертви), сприяє кримінально-правовій кваліфікації скоєного, а відтак без сумніву виступає об'єктом криміналістичного пізнання. Наголошено, що механізм злочину лише обумовлює виникнення слідів (матеріальних та ідеальних), а тому сліди як наслідки і як результат відображувального процесу виходять за межі його внутрішньої структури (будови). Тому процес відображення механізму злочину в оточуючому середовищі, а відтак і виникнення інформації про злочин та його учасників слід вважати окремим аспектом предмету криміналістики. Зазначено, що криміналістичне вчення про механізм злочину досліджує природу, сутність і зміст функціональної сторони злочинної діяльності, закономірності процесів взаємодії учасників злочинної події між собою і з оточуючою матеріальною обстановкою (середовищем), а також закономірності, що обумовлюють виникнення джерел криміналістично значущої інформації про сам злочин і його учасників. Процес же безпосереднього утворення матеріальних та ідеальних слідів, закономірності відбиття в них необхідної інформації мають досліджуватися іншим окремим криміналістичним вченням про механізм слідоутворення. Звернуто увагу на те, що механізм злочину має зв'язки з іншими категоріями криміналістики і передусім з криміналістичною характеристикою злочинів. Констатовано, що криміналістична характеристика злочинів – це наукова абстрактна категорія, в якій відображена якісно-кількісна інформація ретроспективної спрямованості як результат пізнання механізму певних різновидів злочинів, тобто механізм злочину – це об'єкт що відображується, а криміналістична характеристика – це форма його відображення.

Ключові слова: суб'єкт, жертва, обстановка, спосіб, знаряддя, засоби, сліди злочину, злочинна діяльність, предмет злочинного посягання.

Volodymyr A. Zhuravel

*National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine
Kharkiv, Ukraine*

CRIME MECHANISM AS A CATEGORY OF CRIMINALISTICS

Abstract. *The current stage of criminalistics' development is characterized by the active formation of its general theory, the definition of the object-matter area of research in this field of knowledge. The relevance of the issues studied in the paper is due to the need of a modern scientific concept of the matter of criminalistics development, identifying the range of patterns studied. The paper is aimed at analysing modern scientific approaches to understanding the crime mechanism as a structural element of the matter of criminalistics science. To achieve this goal, general and special research methods such as dialectical, historical, formal-logical, system-structural, legal forecasting, system and semantic analysis were used. It is proved that the crime mechanism as a holistic system of circumstances, processes, factors that determine the emergence of material and other information carriers about the crime event itself, its participants, provides the opportunity to put forward working investigative versions, investigation planning, targeted search for the consequences of the crime, offender's identification, victim's identification, contributes to the criminal legal qualification of the offense, and therefore undoubtedly acts as an object of criminalistics' cognition. It is emphasized that the crime mechanism only determines the occurrence of traces (material and ideal), and therefore traces as consequences and as a result of the reflective process go beyond its internal structure (building). Therefore, the process of reflecting the crime mechanism in the environment, and hence the emergence of information about a crime and its participants should be considered as a separate aspect of the matter of criminalistics. It is noted that the criminalistics teaching on the crime mechanism studies the nature, essence and content of the functional side of criminal activity, patterns of interaction of participants of a criminal event with each other and with the surrounding material situation (environment), as well as patterns that determine the sources of criminalistics' significant information on the crime itself and its participants. The process of direct formation of material and ideal traces, the patterns of reflection of the necessary information in them should be studied by another separate criminalistics teaching on the mechanism of trace formation. Attention is paid to the fact that the crime mechanism has connections with other categories of criminalistics and, above all, with the crimes' criminalistics characteristics. It is stated that crimes' criminalistics characteristics is a scientific abstract category, which reflects the qualitative and quantitative information of retrospective orientation as a result of cognition of the mechanism of certain types of crimes, i.e. that the crime mechanism is a reflected object, and criminalistics characteristics is a form of its reflection.*

Keywords: subject, victim, situation, method, weapon, means, vestiges of crime, criminal activity, subject of criminal encroachment.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the history of its establishment and development, criminalistics has traditionally studied the functional side of the crime (criminal activity), i.e. it was mainly interested in answers to the questions: where, when, at what time, in what circumstances, in what way, with what tools was a socially dangerous act committed. In general, being well aware of what the subject matter of criminalistics, criminalists for a long time could not offer a universal, unifying term that would most accurately and comprehensively

cover the content of the subject matter in this field of knowledge. Such term appeared in the early 1970s and it was the "crime mechanism".

As a scientific category, the concept of "crime mechanism" was first used by O.M. Vasiliev in defining the subject of criminalistics, which he considered as the science of organising a systematic investigation of crimes, effective detection, collection, and study of evidence in accordance with criminal procedure law, and prevention of crimes by special techniques and means developed based on natural, technical, and some other special sciences based on *studying the crime mechanism* (emphasis ours – V.Zh.) and development of proofs [1]. Subsequently, R.S. Belkin formulated the definition of criminalistics as a science of *the laws of the crime mechanism* (emphasis ours – V.Zh.), the emergence of information about the crime and its participants, collection, research, evaluation, and use of evidence, and special tools and methods of judicial investigation and prevention of crimes based on knowledge of these laws [2]. Later, this concept became dominant and in most of the proposed definitions of the subject of criminology there is an indication of the regularity of the crime mechanism. Summing up, A.F. Volobuev states that "the crime mechanism, being its functional (dynamic) side, is part of the objective reality and therefore acts as an object, and some of its properties act as the subject matter" [3]. Indeed, the mechanism of crime as a holistic system of circumstances, processes, factors that determine the emergence of material and other media about the event of the crime, its participants, provides the opportunity to put forward working investigative versions, planning investigations, targeted investigation, identification of the perpetrator, the victim(s), contributes to the criminal law qualification of the offence, and therefore should undoubtedly act as the object of criminalistic cognition.

The crime mechanism as a criminalistic category, as well as the specifics of the development of a separate doctrine of this object of criminalistic cognition in different years were studied by such criminalists as O. V. Aivazova, O. P. Antonov, R. S. Belkin, O. M. Vasiliev, A. F. Volobuev, Y. P. Garmaev, O. Y. Golovin, A. V. Dulov, E. P. Ishchenko, E. I. Zuev, Z. I. Kirsanov, M. K. Kaminsky, S. Yu. Kosarev, V. Ya. Koldin, Yu. G. Korukhov, A. M. Kustov, O. F. Lubin, V. O. Obratsov, M. V. Saltevsy, O. G. Filipov, O. V. Chelysheva, S. N. Churilov, V. Yu. Shepitko, A. V. Shmonin, M. P. Yablokov, etc. At the same time, regarding the definition and content of the term "crime mechanism", its connections with other criminalistic categories, conceptual approaches to the development of a separate forensic doctrine of the mechanism of crime, scientists have made far ambiguous opinions in modern criminalistic literature. On many issues, criminalists have not yet reached an agreed position. This once again necessitates further independent study of the problems that arise in this area.

1. MATERIALS AND METHODS

These specified problematics relate to the scientific problems of the general theory of criminalistics connected to the definition of its object-subject area, outlining the boundaries of scientific research in this subject area, the development of conceptual approaches to building a separate criminalistic doctrine of the crime mechanism. The basic materials that served as the starting point for the preparation of this study are the dissertations of A.M. Kustova [4] and O. F. Lubin [5], as well as a monographic study by

A.F. Volobueva [3]. Therewith, unfortunately, the above-mentioned problems are understudied in Ukrainian criminalistics. That is why the emergence of A. F. Volobuev's monograph "The crime mechanism and its connection with the conceptual provisions of criminalistics" was positively received by the scientific community.

To solve the outlined problems, a set of general scientific and special methods of scientific cognition was used in the study. In particular, the dialectical and historical methods of cognition allowed to study the evolution of scientific views on criminalistics, enrichment of its terminology, including with such a term as "crime mechanism". The method of semantic analysis is used to specify the meaning of the term "crime mechanism", its features, structure, integrative functions, differences from other criminalistic categories. The comparative method allowed to analyse the recently proposed approaches in the forensic literature to define the concept of "crime mechanism", the creation of a separate criminalistic doctrine of the crime mechanism, the separation of structural elements of the crime mechanism and its inherent patterns, the cognition of which enriches the content of criminalistics and serves as the basis for the implementation of technical means, tactics, and methodological recommendations for the investigation of criminal offences.

The use of formal-logical and system-structural methods led to the conclusion that the crime mechanism is a complex dynamic system of circumstances that determines the content of criminal activity and includes the situation of the crime, a set of actions of the offender and their accomplices; the attitude of the subject of the crime towards their actions and their consequences; the behaviour of the victim and the actions of persons who became accidental participants in the crime; links between actions and criminal outcome.

The method of systematic analysis provided a generalisation of the accumulated theoretical knowledge on the development of the term "crime mechanism", its correlation with key categories of criminology, in particular the criminalistic characteristics of crimes. The method of legal forecasting provided an opportunity to identify possible areas for further development of scientific views on the category of "crime mechanism", its integration into the terminology of criminalistics, the prospects of creating a separate criminalistic doctrine of the crime mechanism. Thus, it can be argued that the applied methodology provided objective cognition: a) of the crime mechanism as an integral element of the subject matter of criminalistics; b) patterns of evolution of the establishment and development of this criminalistic category, the development of its content and structure; c) the prospects of creating a separate criminalistic doctrine of the crime mechanism.

2. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The term "mechanism" has an interdisciplinary meaning and is used in various fields of legal knowledge, in particular in criminal law and criminology to describe the mechanism of negligent crimes [6], criminal law mechanism to combat offences [7], the mechanism of qualification of crimes [8], the mechanism of legal regulation fight against crime [9]. In criminalistics, the development of the term "crime mechanism" has come a long and difficult way, where, according to A. M. Kustov, the following stages can be distinguished:

1. Inclusion of one of the main elements of the crime mechanism in the subject of criminalistics – the method of its commission – the end of 19th century – 1940s.

2. The beginning of the use of the term "crime mechanism" in criminalistics, as well as in criminal law and criminological aspects – the 1970s.

3. The emergence of the scientific term "crime mechanism", the study of methods of preparation, commission, and concealment of crimes – the late 1970 – early 1980s.

4. The establishment and development of the modern doctrine of the crime mechanism – the 1980s – the present time [4].

Proceeding from the etymology of the term "mechanism" – a system, internal structure that determines the order of a certain type of activity [10], the special literature offers various definitions of "crime mechanism", where the main features are as follows:

1. The process of committing a crime, including its method and all the actions of the offender, accompanied by the formation of material and non-material traces, which can be used to detect and investigate crimes [1].

2. Dynamic system of illegal behavioural acts, which are implemented in certain conditions, direction, and sequence, and the phenomena caused by them, which have criminalistic significance [11].

3. The set of interacting material systems and processes that form the event under investigation and cause the emergence of sources of forensic information [12].

4. Spatial-temporal development of the crime event, the order, combination of sequence and dynamics of individual elements that create it [13].

5. The set of material objects and processes in the preparation, commission, and concealment of a crime [14].

6. The movement of the elements of the structure of the crime (objects, subjects, instruments of the crime) to the point of interaction; the process of interaction itself; further movement (action) of elements before the onset of the criminal result [15].

7. The system of processes of interaction of the participants of the crime, both direct and indirect, with each other and with the material environment associated with the use of appropriate tools, means, and other individual elements of the situation [16].

8. Complex (multi-element) dynamic system, developed primarily by the actions of the subject of the crime, aimed at achieving a criminal result in relation to a particular object of encroachment, as well as the actions of the victim and others, including those who happened to be at the scene [17].

9. Temporary and dynamic order of connection of separate elements, situation, factors of preparation, commission, and concealment of a crime, allowing to recreate a picture of process of its commission [18].

10. The system of interacting of certain elements (their complexes) in space and time, focused on the occurrence of a socially dangerous consequence in the form of a criminal result, as well as the evasion of the subject(s) of a socially dangerous act from criminal liability and punishment [19].

These and many other definitions of the term "crime mechanism" given in the criminalistic literature eloquently testify to the debatability and ambiguity of the interpretation of the criminalistic category under consideration [20; 21]. Furthermore, the controversy is added by those scientists who use the term "crime commission mechanism" [22; 23] instead of the "crime mechanism", with which it seems impossible

to agree, because "commission" is only one aspect, elements of the system of criminal activity (behaviour) along with preparation and concealment as independent acts in the structure of activity, and therefore it is more apt to speak of "crime mechanism" as a full-fledged structure of the functional side of criminal activity.

Scientists also express far from unambiguous opinions regarding the structural elements of the crime mechanism. Thus, R.S. Belkin defined the elements of the crime mechanism as a complex dynamic system as follows: the subject of the crime; the attitude of the subject of the crime towards their actions, their consequences and accomplices; subject of encroachment; method of crime (as a system of deterministic actions); criminal result; the situation of the crime (place, time, etc.); behaviour and actions of persons who turned out to be accidental participants in the event; circumstances that promote or prevent criminal activity; connections and relations between actions (method of crime and criminal result, between participants of the event, between actions and situation, subject of crime and object of encroachment, etc.) [24].

A.M. Kustov considers the following to be the main elements of the crime mechanism: activity (rarely – individual actions and movements) of the subject of the crime (perpetrator, criminal group, group of persons with prior consent of organised group, criminal group); complex (set) of actions, deeds, and other movements of the victim of the crime; complex (set) of actions, deeds, and other movements of persons who turned out to be indirectly connected with the criminal event; certain elements of the situation used by the participants in the criminal event; subject of criminal encroachment. According to the scientist, these components of the crime mechanism in constant motion and development. With this in mind, information about them can be used in the process of detecting and investigating a particular crime [25].

According to Z.I. Kirsanov, the structure of the crime mechanism includes the following elements: the person(s) implementing the criminal plan by purposeful behaviour (actions); method of crime (preparation, commission, and concealment); the victim, their behaviour related to the crime; the subject of criminal encroachment; tools, means of crime, and other objects used for criminal purposes (such as tools for the manufacture of instruments of crime); persons indirectly involved in the crime, such as those who unknowingly assisted in the acquisition or concealment of the tools or means of the crime; material situation (environment) in which the crime was prepared and took place or measures were taken to conceal it, i.e. areas and premises (for example, the place of hiding), household items, objects or things left by the offender or the victim at the scene, as well as material processes that took place during the crime (e.g. fire, accident, production processes, etc.) [26].

A.F. Volobuev, unlike previous scientists, along with the subject, situation, object of encroachment, victim and method, includes traces of the crime in the structure of the crime mechanism, considering them to be the last element, because traces are a consequence (result) of the crime [3]. In the development of the proposed structure, A. F. Volobuev identifies two groups of inherent patterns of crime: 1) natural connections between the elements of the crime mechanism and the relations between the specific features of the subject of the crime and their chosen subject of encroachment; the connections and dependencies between the specific features of the subject of the crime and their chosen place and time of the crime and the favourable situation, connections

and dependencies between the specific features of the subject and their chosen method of criminal encroachment (including selected means and tools); connections and dependencies between the chosen subject of the method of criminal encroachment and traces of their actions, both material and non-material, 2) natural connections that are manifested in the development and manifestation of individual elements of the crime mechanism (connections and dependencies that appear in the formation of traces, connections and dependencies that are manifested in the formation of the identity of the offender, connections and dependencies that are manifested in the formation of aid to the crime) [3]. Summing up, A.F. Volobuev notes that “in the light of the modern doctrine of the crime mechanism, the indication of the regularity of the crime mechanism and the regularity of information about the crime and its participants in R. S. Belkin's definition of the subject of criminalistics is incorrect, because the origin of information about the crime traces) is a component of the crime mechanism. Therefore, it should be considered more accurate to indicate only the laws of the crime mechanism, which cover the considered dependencies and connections of both levels and are established by forensic science as a result of studying such an object as criminal activity [3].

Admittedly, there is no doubt that material and ideal traces are a means of reflecting the circumstances of the crime and carry forensically significant information about the perpetrator, the victim and their actions. And this is natural, because in criminalistics the description of the crime is performed with consideration of the causal, spatiotemporal, informational, and other connections of individual acts of activity. In particular, the spatial relation reflects the position and interposition of material objects within a particular space, such as the positional relationship of objects at the scene; the nature of the spatial area of individual operations and episodes; the general orientation of the event and related processes in space; lack of spatial connections between individual objects and the event of the crime. Temporal connection describes the sequence of manifestation of certain phenomena and processes, shows the specifics of their course. As for the crime, it shows the ratio of elements of the mechanism of the crime in time, the duration of certain events, their beginning and end, the possibility of committing certain actions in a fixed time interval. Causation can manifest itself in two forms: 1) when all criminal consequences are conditioned by the wilful actions of the offender; 2) when the subject of the crime is a material element of the mechanism of the investigated event, and the voluntary actions of which do not significantly affect the consequences of the crime. Therewith, K. T. Aitbayev draws attention to the fact that there is an obvious dependence between space-time and causal relations, the so-called space-time isomorphism, when spatial changes of things are also their time changes; space and time covered by motion can interflow [27]. In view of the above, I. Yu. Baimuratov states that the following levels of interaction can be distinguished in the mechanism of crime as a complex structure: elementary simple interaction (reflective act); interaction (paired display systems); complex (multilateral) interaction of three or more objects; all processes of interaction as a part of the mechanism of the investigated event [28]. In this aspect, the opinion of V. E. Kornoukhov is also clear that it is impossible not to investigate the crime mechanism when covering the content of the doctrine of traces of crime, and the mechanism is determined by the characteristics of the offender. Therewith, a person manifests oneself by committing and concealing a crime, the variability of

which is determined by criminal situations, which leads to the variability of traces of the crime, which, moreover, is determined by the circumstances [29].

Assessing the feasibility of including traces in the structure of the crime mechanism, it is necessary to assume that the mechanism is an internally closed dynamic system of processes and states of the investigated event that occur during the interaction of persons, material objects and that is, the crime mechanism only determines the appearance of traces. In turn, the traces as consequences and as a result of the reflective process go beyond the internal structure of the crime mechanism and therefore it seems controversial to include them in this structure. A. F. Volobuev himself refers to the connections and dependencies that are manifested in the formation of traces to the second level of patterns of the crime mechanism crime, i.e. to connections that go beyond the internal structure of interacting elements and have an external, side effect [3]. Moreover, the process of reflecting the crime mechanism in the environment, and hence the emergence of information about the crime and its participants, should be considered a separate aspect of the subject of criminalistics. In this regard, A. M. Kustov fairly points out that the laws of the crime mechanism constitute an element (part) of the subject of criminalistics, the second element is the laws of origin (development) of information about the crime and its participants, the third is the laws of law enforcement to detect, investigate, and solve a criminal event [30].

Considering the above, the criminalistic doctrine of the crime mechanism examines the nature, essence, and content of the functional side of criminal activity, the patterns of interaction of participants in a criminal event with each other and with the surrounding material environment, as well as patterns due to which emerge the sources of criminalistically significant information about the crime and its participants. The process of direct formation of material and ideal traces, the patterns of reflection of the necessary information in them should be studied by other separate criminalistic doctrines (R. S. Belkin mentions the doctrine of the trace formation mechanism [31]; A. M. Kustov – the doctrine of detection, record, and study of sources of criminalistically significant information [25]).

A. F. Volobuev's thesis that "the doctrine of the mechanism of crime should be developed precisely as the doctrine of the object of forensic investigation (and its subject)" also needs some clarification [3]. Undoubtedly, the prevailing scientific concept nowadays is that the mechanism of crime is the object of forensic knowledge. But the mechanism of crime as a functional aspect of criminal activity is only one of the components of the object of forensic knowledge. Therewith, recently there have been constant proposals to expand the object-subject sphere of criminalistics in the criminalistic literature [32]. In particular, O. S. Andreev proposes to supplement the structure of the object of criminology with such an element as "post-criminal behaviour of persons associated with criminal activity" [33; 34]. Moreover, the doctrine of the object of criminology defines only general, conceptual approaches to understanding its components, while a more in-depth study should be carried out within individual criminological doctrines, including the doctrine of the crime mechanism. As A. M. Kustov points out, the criminalistic doctrine of the crime mechanism should deservedly take its place among such separate criminalistic theories as criminalistic identification and diagnosis, the doctrine of the identity of the offender and the victim, investigative

situations and criminalistic characteristics of certain crimes and others, which have already been developed, substantiated, and applied [25].

The study of the crime mechanism also presupposes the need to clarify the question of the correlation with other criminalistic categories and, above all, with the criminalistic characteristics of the offence. Notably, two approaches have been developed in criminalistics regarding this matter. According to the first one, the criminalistic characteristics of crimes are actually separated from the crime mechanism and interpreted as an abstract scientific concept that is the result of scientific analysis of a particular type of criminal activity (type or kind of crime), generalisation of its typical features and characteristics [35; 36]. As A. M. Kustov notes, despite some external similarities of the constituent components, the mechanism of the crime and the criminalistic characterisation of crimes are not identical and substitute concepts. These are two independent scientific categories that have the right (according to their significance for the general theory of criminalistics and practice) to exist and further development and research [37]. Among the arguments in favour of his position, A. M. Kustov points out that criminalistic characteristics of crimes contain a system of typical information, data on methods of preparation, commission, and concealment of crimes of a particular kind (genus), but they do not contain information on the dynamics of relations through actions between accomplices, victims, and other participants. In the crime mechanism of a certain type, elements of this system are shown in dynamics, in interrelation, step-by-step, typical actions of the criminal on preparation, commission, and concealment of a criminal event are specified, as well as typical and other behavioural acts of the victim and other persons casually involved in a criminal event [38].

Proponents of the second approach assume that the crime mechanism is the subject of criminalistics, the result of the knowledge of which is the knowledge about it, accumulated in the criminalistic characterisation of crimes. In this regard, O. V. Chelysheva writes that the elements of the crime that could potentially be included in the crime mechanism should be described in the criminalistic characteristics [39]. O. Yu. Antonov emphasises that the development of criminalistic characteristics of certain types of crimes is impossible without studying the essence of the term "crime mechanism", its elemental composition and the natural connections between its elements [40]. E. V. Smakhtin points out that the patterns of the crime mechanism together form a forensic characterisation of the crime as some abstract model [32]. S. N. Churilov proposes to refer to the generalised data on the crime mechanism of a certain type with the term "criminalistic characteristics of the crime mechanism", considering it identical to the concept of "laws of the crime mechanism" [41]. O. V. Aivazova notes that the crime mechanism reflects the dynamic nature of criminal activity, while the systematised results of its scientific cognition in a complete, more static state are presented in the form of criminalistic characteristics of crimes [42]. O. Yu. Golovin emphasises that the crime mechanism should be the object of scientific research, the result of which will be the development of forensic characteristics [43]. Summing up, A. F. Volobuev states that "the crime mechanism is an object of cognition (reality), and criminalistic characteristics are a set of knowledge about this object (part of the content of criminalistics). And this is the only difference between them when the elements coincide, as is the case with adequate reflection" [3].

Thus, criminalistic characterisation of crimes is a scientific abstract category, which reflects the qualitative and quantitative information of retrospective orientation as a result of knowledge of the crime mechanism of certain types, i.e. the crime mechanism is an object that is reflected [44], and criminalistic characterisation is a form of its reflection [45-47].

CONCLUSIONS

The crime mechanism is an internal, systemic, complex, dynamic order of interaction of criminologically significant elements of criminal activity of the subject and factors of objective reality that reflect the content of criminal activity and cause the emergence of criminalistically significant information. This system includes the situation of the crime; the subject of criminal encroachment; a set of actions of the criminal and persons related to them to prepare, commit and conceal crimes; the subject's attitude to the crime, their actions and consequences thereof; the behaviour of the victim and the actions of persons who became accidental participants in the crime; links between actions and criminal outcome.

The crime mechanism is an internally closed dynamic system of processes and states of the investigated event, which arise in the course of persons' interaction in the crime, material objects, and which generates the emergence of sources of criminalistic information, i.e. the mechanism of the crime only causes traces. In turn, traces as consequences and as a result of the reflective process go beyond the internal structure of the crime mechanism. Criminalistic doctrine of the crime mechanism explores the nature, essence, and content of the functional side of criminal activity, patterns of interaction of participants in a criminal event with each other and with the surrounding material environment, as well as patterns that determine the sources of criminalistic information about the crime. The process of direct formation of material and ideal traces, the patterns of reflection of the necessary information in them are the subject of study of another separate criminalistic doctrine of the trace formation mechanism.

REFERENCES

- [1] Vasiliev, A.N. (1971). *Criminalistics*. Moscow: Moscow State University Publishing House.
- [2] Belkin, R.S. (1986). *General theory of soviet criminalistics*. Saratov: Saratov University Publishing House.
- [3] Volobuev, A.F. (2019). *The crime mechanism and its connection with the conceptual criminalistics' provisions*. Kryvyi Rih: R.A. Kozlov Publishing house.
- [4] Kustov, A.M. (1997). *Criminalistics teaching on the crime mechanism*. (Doctoral thesis, Academy of Management of Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, Moscow, Russian Federation).
- [5] Lubin, A. F. (1997). *Methodology of criminalistics studying of the mechanism of criminal activity*. (Doctoral thesis, Nizhny Novgorod Academy of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, Nizhny Novgorod, Russian Federation).

- [6] Bakishev, K.A. (2018). The mechanism of a careless crime (On an example of road transport offences). *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 9(5), 1571-1590.
- [7] Serkevych, I., Yevkhutych, I., Hazdayka-Vasylyshyn, I., Sozanskiy, T., & Pasyeka, O. (2019). Mechanism of legal regulation of fight against cybercrime in Ukraine. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 22(6), 1-6.
- [8] Turkin, M.M., Savtsova, N.A., Neznamova, A.A., & Shilovskaya, A.L. (2019). The mechanism of classifying intellectual property offenses as economic offenses. *International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering*, 8(3), 6094-6097.
- [9] Malysenko, K.A., Malysenko, V.A., Bekirova, E.S., Arkhipova, S.V., & Anashkina, M.V. (2019). Criminal-legal mechanism of counteraction of insider activity in the stock market. *Journal of Advanced Research in Law and Economics*, 10(3), 842-849.
- [10] Ozhegov, S.I. (1978). *Dictionary of the Russian language*. Moscow: "Russian Language" Publishing house.
- [11] Obratsov, V.A (1979). On some prospects for the integration and differentiation of knowledge in criminalistics. In *Actual problems of Soviet criminalistics* (p. 102). Moscow: Voenizdat.
- [12] Koldin, V.Ya., & Korukhov, Yu.G. (1986). The crime mechanism and material sources of criminalistics' information. In: V.Ya. Koldin (Ed.). *Criminalistics of socialist countries*. Moscow: Yuridicheskaya literatura.
- [13] Zuev, E.I. (Ed.). (1988). *Criminalistics (current issues): a training manual*. Moscow: Akademiya MVD SSSR.
- [14] Kirsanov, Z.I. (1992). *System of general theory of criminalistics: scientific methodical manual*. Moscow: Akademiya MVD SSSR.
- [15] Kustov, A. M. (1997). *Criminalistics teaching on the crime mechanism*. (Doctoral thesis, Academy of Management of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, Moscow, Russian Federation).
- [16] Dulov, A.V. (Ed.). (1996). *Fundamentals of the study of objects of criminalistics. Criminalistics: a training manual*. Minsk: NKF "Ecoperspective".
- [17] Lavrov, V.P. (1999). The teaching on the way of a crime. In A.F. Volynskiy (Ed.), *Criminalistics characteristics of crimes. Criminalistics*. Moscow: The Law and Law, UNITY-DANA.
- [18] Yablokov, N.P. (Ed.). (2001). *Criminalistics*. Moscow: Yurist.
- [19] Ermolovich, V.F. (2001). *Criminalistics characteristics of crimes*. Minsk: Amalfeya.
- [20] Luke, T.J., & Alceste, F. (2020). The mechanisms of minimization: How interrogation tactics suggest lenient sentencing through pragmatic implication. *Law and Human Behavior*, 44(4), 266-285.
- [21] Harust, Y., Melnyk, V., Kiiashko, Y., & Halunko, V. (2019). Economic crimes: Innovative mechanisms of counteraction by law enforcement agencies. *Asia Life Sciences*, 2(2), 247-263.
- [22] Samoilov, A.V. (2015). The mechanism of crime committing and criminalistics characteristics of crimes. *Provincial Scientific Notes*, 2, 28–32.

- [23] Ignatov, A.N. (2017). On the categories of “mechanism of criminal behaviour”, “mechanism of crimes” and “mechanism of committing a crime”. *Humanitarian, Social Economic and Social Sciences*, 6-7, 126-132.
 - [24] Belkin, R.S. (1997). Course of criminalistics: in 3 vols. In *Vol. 1: General theory of criminalistics*. Moscow: Yurist.
 - [25] Kustov, A.M. (2002). *Criminalistics and the crime mechanism. A series of lectures*. Moscow: Moscow Psychological Social Institute Publishing House; Voronezh: NPO “MODEK” Publishing House.
 - [26] Kirsanov, Z.I. (1994). *Criminalistics teaching in the crime mechanism and its reflection*. Moscow: Nauka.
 - [27] Aitbaev, K.T. (2007). Problems of the crime mechanism. *Journal of the National Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Kazakhstan*, 6, 66-71.
 - [28] Baimuratov, I.Yu. (2004). *Criminalistics analysis of the mechanism of the investigated event*. (Candidate thesis, Moscow State University, Moscow, Russian Federation).
 - [29] Kornoukhov, V.E. (2010). *Methods of crime investigation: theoretical foundations*. Moscow: Norma: INFRA-M. 224 p.
 - [30] Kustov, A. M. (2016). Criminalistics concept of the crime mechanism. *MFYUA Journal*, 2, 164-169.
 - [31] Belkin, R.S. (1997). Course of criminalistics: in 3 vols. In: *Vol. 2: Private criminalistics theories*. Moscow: Jurist. 464 p.
 - [32] Smakhtin, E.V. (2017). Criminalistics: crisis or the need to clarify the content of the matter? *Russian Law: Education, Practice, Science*, 5, 26-30.
 - [33] Andreev, A.S. (2013). Theoretical and applying issues of clarification of the object of criminalistics science. *News of Tula State University. Economic and Legal Sciences*, 5, 27-37.
 - [34] Andreev, A.S. (2015). The content and structure of the criminalistics teaching on post-criminal behavior of persons involved in criminal activity. *Kazan Science*, 3, 120-123.
 - [35] Belkin, R.S. (2000). *Criminalistics encyclopedia*. Moscow: Megatron XXI. 334 p.
 - [36] Protasyevich, A. A., & Foygel, E.I. (2018). A criminalistic description of the advenal person as a basic criterion for developing the methodology of investigating advenal crimes. *Russian Journal of Criminology*, 12(4), 485-495.
 - [37] Kustov, A.M. (1997). *Criminalistics teaching on the crime mechanism*. (Doctoral thesis, Academy of Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, Moscow, Russian Federation).
 - [38] Kustov, A.M. (Ed.). (2014). *Criminalistics theory of the crime mechanism*. Moscow: Yurlitinform.
 - [39] Chelysheva, O.V. (2014). The crime mechanism and criminalistics characteristics. *Journal of Criminalistics*, 2 (10), 11-17.
 - [40] Antonov, O.G. (2011). To the question on the concept of the mechanism and criminalistics characteristics (model) of crimes and criminal activity. *Journal of Udmurt University. Economics and Law Series*, 2, 111-118.
-

- [41] Churilov, S.N. (2008). What is the meaning and significance of the term “criminalistics characteristics of the crime mechanism”. *Journal of Criminalistics*, 2 (26), 16-19.
- [42] Aivazova, O.V. (2014). Criminalistics characteristics of crimes as a systematized reflection of the mechanism of criminal activity: the results of scientific polemic. *Journal of Tomsk State University*, 389, 153–157.
- [43] Golovin, A.Yu. (2012). Criminalistics characteristics of a crime as a category of modern criminalistics. *News of Tula State University. Economic and Legal Sciences*, 1-2, 43-55.
- [44] Cui, C., Li, Y., Wu, Y., & Wang, L.A. (2018). Memory Forensic Method Based on Hidden Event Trigger Mechanism. *Computer Research and Development*, 55(10), 2278-2290.
- [45] Chmieliauskas, S., Laima, S., Fomin, D., Characiejus, D., & Utkus, A. (2019). Homicide victims and mechanisms in Lithuania from 2004 to 2016. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 65, 27-31.
- [46] Teichmann, F.M.J. (2019.) Methods of bribery in multinational corporations. *Journal of Financial Crime*, 26(4), 1078-1084.
- [47] Kleemans, E., & Van Koppen, V. (2020). Organized crime and criminal careers. *Crime and Justice*, 49(1), 385-423.

Volodymyr A. Zhuravel

Doctor of Juridical Science, Professor
Full Member (Academician) of NALS of Ukraine
Chief Scientific Secretary
National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine
61024, 70 Pushkinska Str., Kharkiv, Ukraine

Suggested Citation: Zhuravel, V.A. (2020). Crime mechanism as a category of criminalistics. *Journal of the National Academy of Legal Sciences of Ukraine*, 27(3), 142-154.

Submitted: 10/06/2020

Revised: 22/07/2020

Accepted: 26/08/2020