

Artículo de investigación

Infrastructure of bribery in public official activity

ІНФРАСТРУКТУРА ПІДКУПУ У СФЕРІ ПУБЛІЧНОЇ СЛУЖБОВОЇ ДІЯЛЬНОСТІ

Recibido: 28 de agosto del 2019

Aceptado: 5 de octubre del 2019

Written by:

Viktor Tsytriak¹¹ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0127-6469>**Iryna Kalinina**¹²ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5199-9545>**Dariia Hurina**¹³ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4613-8561>**Abstract**

The article is focused on the analysis of the infrastructural components of bribery in public official activity. The term "infrastructure" comes from Latin (*infra* – below, under and *structura* – construction, placement) and means a set of components of any object that are subordinate (ancillary) character and provide conditions for the normal functioning of the object as a whole. The concept of crime infrastructure is not enough explored in legal science. The research described in the article was created using different methods of scientific research. The main method of scientific research – the dialectical method. This method allows substantiating the special role of "human", organizational-support and ideological resources in the determination of criminal behavior. The method of analysis helps to see in detail a large number of cases of bribery in public service. Further, the generalization were made regarding the general infrastructure components of bribery in the field of public service activity using the synthesis method. In addition to these methods of scientific research, the authors of the article used the methods of deduction, induction, and comparative method. The public service bribery infrastructure should be understood as a collection of "personnel", material and intangible resources, organizational forms and means that serve the illicit purchase/sale of services of public officials provide functionality and facilitate the

Анотація

Стаття присвячена аналізу інфраструктурних складових підкупу у сфері публічної службової діяльності. Термін «інфраструктура» походить від латини (*infra* – нижче, під і *stuktura* – побудова, розміщення) й означає сукупність складових частин якого-небудь об'єкта, що мають підпорядкований (допоміжний) характер і забезпечують умови нормального функціонування об'єкта в цілому. В правовій науці поняття інфраструктури злочинності є малодослідженим. Дослідження, описане в статті, було створено за допомогою різних методів наукового пізнання. Основний метод наукового дослідження був діалектичний метод. Цей метод дозволив обґрунтувати особливу роль «кадрових», організаційно-допоміжних та ідеологічних ресурсів у детермінації злочинної поведінки. Метод аналізу допомагає детально дослідити велику кількість випадків підкупу у сфері публічної службової діяльності. На основі отриманих результатів аналізу, було зроблено узагальнення щодо інфраструктурних складових підкупу у сфері публічної службової діяльності за допомогою методу синтезу. Крім цих методів наукових досліджень, автори статті використовували методи дедукції, індукції та порівняльний метод. Під інфраструктурою підкупу у сфері

¹¹ Ph. D., Associate Professor, Acting Dean of the Faculty of Public Prosecutions and Investigation of National University «Odesa Law Academy»

¹² Ph. D., Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Special Law Disciplines of Donetsk State University of Management (Mariupol)

¹³ Ph. D., Associate Professor Department of Criminal Law, Process and Criminalistics of Private Institution of Higher Learning "European University"

institution of bribery. The special role of the ideological and "human" resources, as well as organizational and auxiliary resources in the determination of criminal behavior is substantiated. The introduction of measures neutralizing the infrastructural capabilities of bribery as an indirect anti-corruption strategy is proposed.

Keywords: Corruption, bribery, bribe, official crimes, infrastructure.

Introduction

Transformation of ideas about the essence of crime requires not only the study of socio-political, organizational-managerial, economic, legal and other phenomena, as decisive processes of reproduction of illegal activity of individuals, but also the need to appeal to elements of service of interests of crime, which, at first glance, are not criminal in nature and therefore not prohibited by the Criminal Code of Ukraine.

In the legal literature, the importance of knowing insufficiently understood socio-psychological, intangible mechanism of formation and existence of unlawful criminal societies, including in its number of non-criminal elements of crime (Ovchinskyi, & Eminov, 1996). In support of this contention, we consider that the appeal to the intangible mechanism of crime is insufficient. Equally important in this regard is the organizational, technical and another material base of criminal activity, which makes the criminal environment less vulnerable to law enforcement, more mobile, and adaptable to changes in social life. These are social security institutions, processes, and other material elements, which, on the one hand, are designed to improve and optimize the various spheres of life, and, on the other hand, (given their functional characteristics) can be used in criminal activities (this is a crime infrastructure).

The term "infrastructure" comes from Latin (infra – below, under and structura – construction, placement) and means a set of

публічної службової діяльності слід розуміти сукупність «кадрових», матеріальних і нематеріальних ресурсів, організаційних форм та засобів, які обслуговують незаконну купівлю/продаж послуг службових осіб публічної сфери, забезпечують функціональність та сприяють інституціалізації підкупу. Обґрунтовується особлива роль «кадрових», організаційно-допоміжних та ідеологічних ресурсів у детермінації злочинної поведінки. Пропонується запровадження системи заходів нейтралізації інфраструктурних можливостей підкупу як опосередкованої стратегії протидії корупції.

Ключові слова: корупція, хабарництво, підкуп, службові злочини, інфраструктура.

components of any object that are subordinate (ancillary) character and provide conditions for the normal functioning of the object as a whole. For the first time, this term appeared in economics and was characterized by an aggregate of industries serving to manufacture. This includes the construction of roads, canals, reservoirs, ports, airfields, warehouses, energy, transport, communications, water supply, and sewerage; education, science, health, etc. (Prokhorov, 1985). Given the ambiguity of the term, distinguish social, transport, engineering, information, military, market, and several other infrastructures.

It should be noted that the concept of crime infrastructure is not enough explored in legal science. Professor O.F. Dolzhenkov lays the foundations of this problem in the theory of operative-search activity. He defines crime infrastructure as a kind of environment and foundation that does not appear externally criminal, since it is essentially latent, but promotes the consolidation of criminal elements, the creation of organized groups and serves the material, financial, protective, subcultural, human, and other needs of the criminal system (Dolzhenkov, 2003).

The scholar suggested that two areas should be identified within the crime infrastructure.

The first area includes elements that directly serve the processes of criminal activity:

- Convenient ways to approach and exit the crime scene; secure from the point of view of criminals and the revenue channels of the stolen; legal enterprises through which money laundering (casinos, currency exchange offices, firms that facilitate real estate transactions, etc.) are carried out;
- Computer and telecommunication networks facilitating criminal outcomes; bases, repositories for criminals (so-called "raspberries");
- Institutions that carry out physical rehabilitation of criminals (saunas, cottages, medical facilities, etc.).

The second area includes structures that are indirectly involved in criminal processes:

- Training and recruiting for the criminal sphere; "ideological" centers for supporting and developing "thievery laws" and traditions; "schools", "seminars" on the exchange of criminal experience;
- "Think tanks" of organized crime; the criminal subculture as a whole;
- Some mass media and political institutions ("lobby") in the service of criminal societies and so on (Dolzhenkov, 2003).

O.F. Dolzhenkov also notes the special nature of crime infrastructure in the determination of unlawful behavior along with its causes and conditions. "Despite the differences of opinion regarding the bases for the classification of causes and conditions of crime, there is a common belief that they are a necessary component of it. In our view, another element in the mechanism of criminal activity is played by the elements of crime infrastructure. They have no direct criminogenic character, but serve the interests of the functioning of crime as a system, "facilitate" its criminal impact on the state of the operational and tactical situation, as a whole, and its components" (Dolzhenkov, 2003).

The availability of such research gives grounds to consider crime infrastructure as a functional element of bribery in the public service sphere and, following the principle of counteraction, to propose measures to neutralize bribery infrastructure as an indirect strategy.

Methodology and analysis of recent research

The research described in the article was created using different methods of scientific research.

First of all, the main method of scientific research – the dialectical method should be noted. This method allows substantiating the special role of "personnel", organizational-support and ideological resources in the determination of criminal behavior.

Also, one of the main methods of service in this article is the method of analysis. The article analyzed in detail a large number of cases of bribery in public service. Further, on the results of the factual analysis, generalizations were made regarding the general infrastructure components of bribery in the field of public service activity using the synthesis method. In addition to these methods of scientific research, the authors of the article used the methods of deduction, induction, and comparative method. For the creation of this study, a large amount of scientific literature was analyzed on criminal offenses, criminalistics, peculiarities of bribery in the sphere of public official activity, determination of criminal behavior of participants in such criminal relations, as well as on the system of measures for combating this type of crime. Among the scientists whose works became the basis for writing the article, the following should be mentioned Ovchinskyi V.S., & Eminov, V.E. (1996); Dolzhenkov, O.F. (2003); Baulin, Y. V., Borisov, V. I., & Tutyugin, V. I. (2010); Benitskiy, A.S. (2011); Kudryavtsev, V.N. (2007); Karpenko, M. I., & Pashkovsky, V. V. (2013); Sungurov, A. Yu. (2000); Zelinskyi, A.F. (1999); Inshakov, S.M. (2002); Dremin, V.N. (2003, 2009); Gilinskyi, J.I. (2003). The empirical basis for the study was the facts of bribery in public service.

Presentation of key research findings

Attention should be paid to the correlation between the concepts of crime infrastructure and the tools of crime and other means as an element of the objective side of the crime. Thus, the instruments of committing a crime are generally the objects that are used by a person to physically influence material objects (firearms and weapons, tools, vehicles, devices, technical equipment, etc.), and other means are those objects, things, by which the crime was committed, which were used to facilitate the commission of the crime, but did not cause direct physical influence (forged documents, uniforms, tools, etc.) (Baulin, Borisov, & Tutyugin, 2010; Benitskiy, 2011; Kudryavtsev, 2007). Instead, the concept of crime infrastructure is much broader, and its elements include not only tangible objects, but also the intangible component - ideological resources, social

institutions and processes, as noted above. Also, unlike tools of crime and other means, some elements of the crime infrastructure can not be directly used in the commission of crime and their use is not directly causally related to the consequences of crime, however, their existence contributes to the functionality of crime as a system (despite for non-criminal functional purpose of such objects).

Using as a methodological basis the approach to crime infrastructure, developed by O.F. Dolzhenkov, we characterize specific infrastructural components of bribery in the field of public service activities. Tracking the elements of bribery infrastructure as the main material and ideological environment for reproducing corruption behavior, analyzing and comprehending it will not only increase the effectiveness of counteracting this phenomenon but will also identify new priorities for strategy and tactics to combat crime in general.

Therefore, the public service bribery infrastructure should be understood as a collection of "personnel", material and intangible resources, organizational forms and means that serve the illicit purchase/sale of services of public officials provide functionality and facilitate the institution of bribery.

Such an understanding of the concept of bribery infrastructure in public service as a component of the content of relevant social relations, as well as the analysis of criminal proceedings (cases), questionnaire and content analysis of official reports in the media about bribery facts, allows distinguishing and organizing such specific infrastructure components.

1. "Human resources" (corruption network) – a decentralized and often unformalized but consolidated community of bribery participants that exists on the basis and in the satisfaction of common corruption interests.

Single corruption in today's Ukraine is becoming less common. He is being replaced by informal structures – corruption networks, which include groups of civil servants who provide appropriate solutions; commercial and financial structures that realize the benefits, benefits, income; law enforcement cover-up; persons who provide undue benefits and are interested in the activities of employees; mediators, as permanent participants in corruption schemes; other individual and collective entities. Moreover,

high-ranking officials and politicians are usually the leaders of corruption networks.

The activity of corruption networks is mainly manifested in the formation of interdependencies and interconnections between officials vertically and horizontally, at different levels, between different agencies and structures. These interconnections and interdependencies aim at the systematic execution of corruption agreements for personal enrichment, the allocation of budgetary funds in favor of corporations involved in the corruption network, the enhancement of profits or the competitive advantages of financial and credit and commercial entities involved in the corruption network. In addition, corruption networks can be structured by family, friendship, ethnicity, clan, religion, corporate identity, have multiple goals, and include various activities. They are formed on the principles of mutual assistance and solidarity; as well as developed their own systems of rules, the observance of which is a priority for the state, family norms or the interests of their individual participants (Sungurov, 2000). Corruption networks have recently been regarded as the main and most powerful instrument of corruption agreements. However, law enforcement structures are mostly found to be "grassroots corruption" that exists outside of corruption networks and operate at the expense of "extortions" from the population (Karpenko, & Pashkovsky, 2013).

The process of the corporatization of corruption and bribery is observed. As a result, the primitive initial form of relationship that mediates the short (one-off) relationship of the corruptor and the corrupt grows into long-term cooperation and informal contractual relationships.

Official law enforcement websites are increasingly reporting systemic and long-term relationships that mediate the provision/receipt of undue gain. For example, employees of the Department for Combating Organized Crime of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine in Rivne region exposed a group of persons who systematically demanded and received unlawful benefits from citizens for obtaining certificates of passing training, passing state examinations, and issuing driver's licenses. The group included several officials of various levels (Employees of the Department for Combating Organized Crime of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine of the Rivne region exposed the group that traded the driver's licenses, 2014).

Corruption corporatization processes make corruption networks not only more resilient and less vulnerable but also give rise to the phenomenon of the distribution of blame and responsibility in psychology. In particular, as noted by S.P. Glinkina, "the subjective perception of risk is reduced, if the official shares a bribe with the management, the seller gives part of the money to the head of the firm. Moreover, the larger the network of participants in the corruption agreement, the less the feeling of guilt and the risk of damaging the reputation in case of exposure" (Glinkina, 2019). This reduces the responsibility to oneself; the sense of guilt disappears, as there is a possibility of transferring the guilt to another.

This component of the public service bribery infrastructure is characterized by:

- The existence of relationships between corrupt behaviors at the level of horizontal and / or vertical power, at the level of family relations, friendships, other types of social relations (power-subordination in the formation of corruption risks in the form of conflict of interests);
 - The presence of common or separate corruption interests of the participants of bribery, the realization of which is conditioned by committing actions with the use of power, official position;
 - As a rule, the participants of the bribery, experience of corruption behavior, awareness of the conditions and consequences of such activity;
 - Participation of "mediators" as permanent participants in corruption schemes that are "involved" in the sphere of state activity but are not employees (drivers, assistants, consultants, advisers, contractors and others);
 - One-time or periodic participants, preferably initiators or "forced" bribes.
2. Organizational and auxiliary resources – a set of organizational forms and means aimed at optimizing the process of redistribution of money, property or other resources from beneficiaries to beneficiaries in exchange for providing the latter with legal or illegal services.

These include intermediary enterprises that allow for the benefit of a pseudo-economic or other activity (carrying out "non-commodity transactions", fictitious (documented only)

services or works, etc.). Law enforcement practice reveals the facts of the direct transfer of unlawful benefits from hand to hand or through simple methods of masking. However, where the indirect, veiled transfer of undue gain through intermediaries is more commonly used. Such "intermediaries" are, among others, specially created enterprises for the achievement of criminal purposes. After paying for the services of such a structure by an interested person, the employee receives the due remuneration to him in one form or another already directly from "his" firm. This is demonstrated by investigative and judicial practice. Thus, the Security Service of Ukraine uncovered and terminated the criminal activity of the deputy chief of the State Tax Inspectorate of one of the cities of the Odesa region, which established a scheme of systematic solicitation and receipt of unlawful profit from the subjects of business activity for issuing permits - registration of taxpayers. At the request of the deputy chief, businessmen had to transfer money allegedly for the purchase of stationery to the account of a commercial entity owned by his accomplice. After receiving the predefined funds, the entrepreneur transferred them to cash and passed them to the tax specialist (In Odesa, Security Service of Ukraine detained a taxman and his accomplice on a bribe, 2018).

This element of infrastructure may include organizations specially created by the members of the corruption scheme, cooperation with which is a condition for making the relevant decisions by the subject of public service activity or providing them. These organizations help to avoid direct contact between the official on whom a decision is made and those who give illegal benefits and are interested in the former. In this case, an undue benefit, such as in the form of cash, is masked under the guise of legal payment for the services of such an organization, with the subsequent transfer to the official.

- Enterprises through which money laundering proceeds take place. It is the process of the legalization of funds that increases the profitability of the systematic receipt of illegal benefits since it enables the use of civil money freely in the future;
- Charitable foundations and organizations, the specificity of which allows them to receive illegal benefits hidden under the guise of charitable contributions and to legalize the funds already received. The specified element of the bribery infrastructure is

somewhat similar to the previous ones, but has a separate meaning;

- Peculiar funds for financing the current expenditures of the Office, which also go to the reproduction and expansion of corrupt transactions (untreated income, which are used to provide undue benefits). It is about the existence of the so-called "communities", the main source of formation of which are the funds obtained as a result of corruption activities. These "public associations" serve as a kind of fund for financing the current expenditures of the agency, which are not covered by state or local budgets (office supplies, etc.), and are also a source of providing undue benefits in the relations of officials in the vertical of management;
- False accounts opened with third parties for crediting funds and accounts for legalized funds (current, deposit or card in domestic or foreign banking institutions). Today it is possible to speak about the trend of increasing use in corruption of participants of bribery of electronic payment systems, as well as bank cards, which does not require a personal meeting to give/receive undue benefits, as well as so-called "gift" certificates, fuel cards, etc. As for conducting electronic transactions used by participants of corruption bribery, they include transactions with bank (current, deposit, card and other) accounts, transactions with money transfer without opening a bank account, operations on managing an electronic bank account, Internet banking, etc. The use of such payment systems supports the coordination of criminal communications between counterparties to corruption, as well as criminal groups, by optimizing the reliability and dynamism of communications, which in turn contributes to the formation of their own information and economic space. Sometimes, banking institutions can be a major element of a corruption scheme. For example, during 2012-2013 in the Pechersk District Court of Kyiv, a criminal case over criminal activity of officials of the Deposit Guarantee Fund, which provides compensation at the expense of the Fund for losses caused in case of non-payment by a particular banking institution to an individual, was considered. Being participants in the

corruption scheme, the bank's management opened deposit accounts for front-runners, without intending to return the invested funds in advance, and after the bank's deliberate bankruptcy, the front-end depositors received compensation at the expense of the Fund, and the invested funds were available to the management of the banking institution;

- Computer and telecommunication networks, other technical means. The confidentiality of information on the conditions of bribery encourages negotiators to resort to certain technical and other means that would optimize the relationship between them. These are the means of protection against eavesdropping, the use of special means of communication in the negotiations between the contracting parties of bribery in the field of public service, vehicles, other means and accessories necessary for the organization and disguising of bribery;
- Specifics of the organization of certain types of public service activities (specific construction of relations of power-subordination, the uncertainty of administrative procedures, which allows variability of decision-making, etc.).

Taking into account the role of this component of the infrastructure in the mechanism of bribery in public service, it would be advisable when considering its criminological characteristics (in addition to specific criminal acts) to consider also the perilous organizational and auxiliary infrastructure components that do not have criminal features but contain.

3. Ideological resources – criminal psychology, deformed legal and professional consciousness, criminal (corrupt) subculture (traditions, habits, informal rules, slang and symbolism), which shape the orientation of bribery and stereotypes of behavior (skills of conducting corruption negotiations; availability of knowledge of interested persons) on the established "fees" of services of officials).

Psychological aspects of criminal behavior, needs, interests, as well as social values are crucial in its determination (Zelinskyi, 1999; Inshakov, 2002).

This, the conceptual basis for understanding bribery in public service is based on research in which offenses are explained in terms of the dialectical unity of individual psychological characteristics of personality and collective (group) psychology. This means the systematic determination of the activity of the subject, which involves the synthesis of external and internal determination (self-determination) of the crime. Recall that one of the aspects of self-determination and self-reproduction of bribery is an anomaly in the behavior of citizens, a special psychological state of recognition of admissibility, the permissibility of corruption and bribery, their impunity, which compels other persons to commit such acts.

These processes are legitimized by the Ukrainian legal culture. Such stereotypes of behavior, which have become common as a result of repeated repetition, are reproduced in society and are common to its members.

In addition, the individual level of criminal behavior is characterized by some motives and can be explained primarily through the prism of the theory of alienation, according to which the offender is at a certain social and psychological distance from society and its values (Antonyan, Enikeev, & Eminov, 1996).

The corrupt behavior of a public sector official in the form of bribery can be considered as inconsistency of personal moral principles with public norms of morality and law, which can occur both during the performance of official powers (professional deformation) and before taking office. In a transitional Ukrainian society, there are more and more cases where corrupt officials are admitted to the service in corrupt systems.

Moreover, the phenomenon of bribery in the sphere of public service activity is characterized not only and not so much by the pathology of the individual behavior of its participants (counterparties), but by the dominant psychology of the collective, the dysfunction of social institutions, the system of administrative management and the legal system as a whole. In the plane of corruption relations, collective psychology manifests itself in the dominant (dominant) influence on the individual from the environment of criminogenic attitudes, habits, and abilities. Even at the subconscious level, the person is exposed to an inner sense of "acting as everyone". The sources of these processes are diverse. The main objective is social disorganization. The "failure" of the activities of

social institutions leads to gaps in their effectiveness, which is "filled" with unauthorized illegal actions. The person understands that his actions are contrary to the law, but are guided by a certain "justice", certain "own ideas", practical examples of which he encounters in real life, the sources of which are in no way the result of law-abiding thinking.

Therefore, the corruption activity of some individuals involves in their orbit other people who find themselves dependent on this activity. People lead a corrupt way of life, create a criminal environment of existence, which they not only construct but also reproduce at the expense of other people. As a consequence, collective criminal psychology is formed – a kind of new collective thinking based on asocial values (Dremin, 2009).

Moreover, it is quite reasonable for some scholars to think that research efforts should concentrate on the problem of the social genesis of corruption as a large-scale social phenomenon, rather than on the criminal practices of taken separately individuals (Alekseev, 2008).

Psychological aspects of the phenomenon of the spread and reproduction of corruption bribe also include the attitude of society to this problem. Three important features of Ukrainian society's attitude to this problem are directly related to our mass psychology.

The first feature is the tolerance for corruption and bribery, as well as their attitude towards widespread phenomena ("everyone takes," "everyone steals"), a minimal level of evil that does not deserve serious condemnation.

The second important feature of our perception of these processes is that the expressed condemnation on the part of the society is received only by the exorbitant amounts of undue benefit, especially when it is received out of order. For example, the case where the head of one of the district state administrations in Kherson demanded and received an unlawful profit of 6.9 million UAH from a private entrepreneur for issuing orders for the transfer to the 11 citizens of land plots with a total area of 21 hectares for personal farming (Information about the anti-corruption measures taken by the Prosecutor's Office of Zhytomyr region and about persons prosecuted for committing corruption offenses in 2012..., 2013). If the amount of the illegal benefit were smaller, then the public official would be more likely to avoid liability.

A third feature is the inconsistency and contradiction of corruption. In condemning corruption and its individual forms, our public consciousness views its manifestations in everyday life as natural human relations, which find expression in the language: they say that the bribe-taker "helped the person" and the bribe-giver – that he "thanked" for the help provided.

Recently, the importance of subcultural attributes in the institutionalization of corruption in general and its most widespread and dangerous form of bribery in the sphere of public service activity has to be asserted. In the process of counterparty corruption, common rules, a common ideological basis, certain value orientations, which are considered unacceptable, have been drawn up. So Y.I. Gilinskyi notes that the processes of formation of corruption practices, regular and long-term, are evidenced by the existence of certain rules of the game, norms known to the subjects of corruption activity; certain slang and symbolism (for example, the well-known and understandable gesture of rubbing the thumb of the forefinger and middle finger) of corruption; service fee is established and known to the interested parties (Gilinskyi, 2003).

In the domestic legal culture, such expressions as "seek an exit to..." (hereinafter referred to as the name of an official), "give honor", "show respect", "money in advance" and so on have long been legitimized.

Subcultural attributes include certain rules for masking negotiations between contractors of bribery for relationships that lie in the plane of legitimacy; abbreviations known only to bribes and more. Thus, the amount of money in the process of agreement of participants in corruption relations can have a figurative expression in a certain number of copies of documents that need to be transferred, kilograms of potatoes, the use of other metaphors. For example, officials may not use the words "money", "rollback", "millions", and replace the word "bribe" with "dissertation". In telephone conversations, they discuss not the question of dissertation protection, but the question of who to whom and how much should give money for the provision of land for construction, as clearly demonstrated by psychological and linguistic expertise. Accordingly, it may be so: "dissertation" is money; "scientific council" is the officials who have allocated this land, "scientific supervisor" – the bribe-taker (Shulepova, 2013; Alexandrova, 2013).

In this aspect, we fully share the assertion of Professor V.M. Dremin that a special culture has emerged in society, which can be called corrupt. The specified cultural environment is characterized by all features of the subculture, including specific worldview, value orientations, ideology, features of group psychology (Dremin, 2003).

Conclusions

So, the public service bribery infrastructure should be understood as a collection of "personnel", material and intangible resources, organizational forms and means that serve the illicit purchase/sale of services of public officials provide functionality and facilitate the institution of bribery.

Thus, such an understanding of the concept of bribery infrastructure in public service as a component of the content of relevant social relations, as well as the analysis of criminal proceedings (cases), questionnaire and content analysis of official reports in the media about bribery facts, allows distinguishing and organizing such specific infrastructure components.

1. "Human resources" (corruption network) – a decentralized and often unformalized but consolidated community of bribery participants that exists on the basis and in the satisfaction of common corruption interests.
2. Organizational and auxiliary resources – a set of organizational forms and means aimed at optimizing the process of redistribution of money, property or other resources from beneficiaries to beneficiaries in exchange for providing the latter with legal or illegal services.
3. Ideological resources – criminal psychology, deformed legal and professional consciousness, criminal (corrupt) subculture (traditions, habits, informal rules, slang and symbolism), which shape the orientation of bribery and stereotypes of behavior (skills of conducting corruption negotiations; availability of knowledge of interested persons) on the established "fees" of services of officials).

To expose the corruption environment, it is advisable to use the category of bribery infrastructure, which refers to the aggregate of tangible and intangible resources, organizational forms and means that serve the illegal

purchase/sale of services of public sector officials, provide functionality and facilitate the institution of bribery. The components of the infrastructure are "human resources" (corruption network); organizational and support resources; ideological resources.

References

- Alekseev, S.V. (2008). Corruption in a transitional society: a sociological analysis. *Center of Scientific Research*. Retrieved from: http://ceninaku.ru/page_23202.htm.
- Alexandrova, Yu. (2013). *High Security Bribe*. *Gaschet.ru*. Retrieved from: http://www.gazeta.ru/politics/2013/07/22_a_5496849.shtml
- Antonyan, Yu.M., Enikeev, M.I., & Eminov, V.E. (1996). *Psychology of the criminal and investigation of crimes*. Moscow: Lawyer.
- Baulin, Y. V., Borisov, V. I., & Tutyugin, V. I. (2010). *Criminal law of Ukraine: General part*. Kharkov: Pravo.
- Benitskyi, A.S. (Ed). (2011). *Criminal law: General part*. Kyiv: Istina.
- Dolzhenkov, O.F. (2003). *Warehouses and infrastructure of organized malignancy*. Odesa: Fenix.
- Dremin, V.N. (2003). *Organized crime and criminal culture: interdetermination mechanisms*. Odesa: Fenix, 2003.
- Dremin, V.N. (2009). *Crime as a social practice: an institutional theory of the criminalization of society*. Odesa: Legal literature.
- Employees of the Department for Combating Organized Crime of the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Ukraine of the Rivne region exposed the group that traded the driver's licenses. (2014). *UkrWestInform*. Retrieved from <http://uzinform.com.ua/news/2014/06/18/68847.html>
- Gilinskyi, J.I. (2003). *Corruption: theory and Russian reality. Criminology: yesterday, today, tomorrow. Proceedings of the St. Petersburg criminological club*. Bishkek: Publishing house Promtekhkom.
- Glinkina, S.P. (2019). Fatal threat of corruption. Retrieved from www.imepi-eurasia.ru/baner/Glinkina.doc.
- In Odesa, Security Service of Ukraine detained a taxman and his accomplice on a bribe. (2018). *Security Service of Ukraine: Official Website*. Retrieved from: <https://ssu.gov.ua/en/news/1/category/2/view/5307#.oT9qeecr.dpbs>
- Information about the anti-corruption measures taken by the Prosecutor's Office of Zhytomyr region and about persons prosecuted for committing corruption offenses in 2012 (according to the requirements of Part 1 of Article 19 of the Law of Ukraine "On Principles of Prevention and Combating Corruption"). (2013). Prosecutor's office of Zhytomyr region. Retrieved from: <http://mvs.gov.ua/mvs/control/main/uk/publish/article/815413>
- Inshakov, S.M. (2002). *Criminology*. Moscow: Jurisprudence.
- Karpenko, M. I., & Pashkovsky, V. V. (2013). Modern signs of corruption crime and their content. *Legal Science*, 5, 54-61.
- Kudryavtsev, V.N. (2007). *General theory of crime qualification*. Moscow: Lawyer.
- Ovchinskyi, V.S., & Eminov, V.E. (Eds). (1996). *Fundamentals of the fight against organized crime*. Moscow: Infra.
- Prokhorov, A.M. (Ed). (1985). *Soviet encyclopedic dictionary*. Moscow.
- Shulepova, E. (2013). The ex-governor of the Pipe did not admit guilt. *Russian newspaper*. Retrieved from: <http://www.rg.ru/2013/07/02/reg-cfo/dudka-anons.html>.
- Sungurov, A. Yu. (2000). *Civic initiatives and the prevention of corruption*. SPb. : Norma.
- Zelinskyi, A.F. (1999). *Criminal Psychology. Scientific and practical publication*. Kyiv: Yurinkom Inter.