

UDC 343.4

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32849/2663-5313/2022.10.10>**Andrii Dobroskok,***PhD in Law, Director, Yaroslav Kondratiev Law Lyceum of the National Academy of Internal Affairs, 1, Solomianska square, Kyiv, Ukraine, postal code 03035, dobroskokandrii@ukr.net***ORCID:** orcid.org/0000-0002-7047-8566Dobroskok, Andrii (2022). Criteria for vandalism prevalence and trends in modern conditions. *Entrepreneurship, Economy and Law*, 10, 62–69, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32849/2663-5313/2022.10.10>

CRITERIA FOR VANDALISM PREVALENCE AND TRENDS IN MODERN CONDITIONS

Abstract. Purpose. The purpose of the article is to study vandalism state and trends in Ukraine based on relevant criteria. **Results.** The interpretation of the content of vandalism and, as a result, the use of this concept to officially explain acts related to destructive violent behaviour has now significantly expanded and has gone beyond the criminal law definition. A significant part of acts of vandalism due to minor public danger remains without proper attention from law enforcement agencies, as the grounds for their qualification under the relevant articles of the CC of Ukraine are often insufficient, and the CoAO does not contain special rules that would allow for appropriate response measures. In this regard, it seems relevant to study vandalism state and trends in Ukraine based on the relevant criteria. It is established that the status and trends of vandalism in Ukraine are best determined by characterising the quantitative and qualitative indicators of the prevalence of vandalism offences. It is substantiated that the main quantitative indicators of vandalism should be considered: 1) the place of vandalism in the overall structure of crime; 2) the number of vandalism offences in which persons were served with a notice of suspicion; 3) the number of proceedings in cases of vandalism that were sent to court with an indictment; 4) the prevalence of certain types of vandalism. The main qualitative indicators of vandalism are recognised as follows: 1) geography of vandalism; 2) time when an act of vandalism is committed; 3) how an act of vandalism is committed; 4) means and instruments of vandalism; 5) a place where an act of vandalism is committed. **Conclusions.** Common places where vandalism is committed are cemeteries, graves, burial sites, places of worship, morgues, various religious buildings and "sacred" places. The vast majority of cases of lucrative and religious vandalism are recorded in such places. For example, valuable items, as well as elements of monuments and fences, are stolen from graves and cemeteries. Moreover, it is here that various rites and ceremonies are performed, and most acts of desecration and abuse are committed. Less common, but no less important for analysis, are places with a special status: nature reserves, memorial complexes, cultural and archaeological heritage sites, etc. The vast majority of acts of environmental vandalism are committed here.

Key words: types of vandalism, desecration of a grave, burial place, crime, crime rate.

1. Introduction

In order to comprehensively depict the current state of vandalism and its main trends in Ukraine, we have analysed the only reports on criminal offenses for the last five years, summarised by the Prosecutor General's Office of Ukraine and posted on its official website (Official website of the Prosecutor General's Office of Ukraine, 2020). The study and comparison of statistics made it possible to formulate a range of useful conclusions and generalisations for practical application.

Criminal offenses that we propose to qualify as vandalism are a relatively small share of the overall crime structure. For example, while in 2014, 1763 such crimes were committed, which amounted to 0.33% of all registered criminal offenses, in 2018, 2193 were committed,

i.e. 0.45%. However, as we noted above, official statistics cannot objectively reflect the actual prevalence of vandalism, as a significant number of acts of vandalism are classified under such general articles as theft, hooliganism, destruction and damage to property, etc. and, accordingly, will not be taken into account in our analysis.

The issue of vandalism has been under focus in the works by O. Bandurka, V. Vasylevych, O. Dzhuzha, V. Dziuba, O. Kolb, A. Nebytov, M. Khavroniuk, V. Shakun, and others. Without detracting from the scientific value of the achievements of these scientists, it should be noted that no comprehensive study of vandalism prevention has been conducted in domestic science. For example, today most issues related to determining the motives for

vandalism, the ways and external forms of vandalism, the determinants that cause vandalism, the mechanism of formation of this deviation, measures to prevent it, etc. remain virtually unexplored.

Therefore, the purpose of the article is to study vandalism state and trends in Ukraine based on relevant criteria.

2. General principles of the prevalence of vandalism in modern conditions

Despite all the shortcomings, official statistical reporting allows us to identify the most global trends in the protection of public morality:

- against an overall decrease in crime by 8% (from 529,139 crimes in 2014 to 487,133 crimes in 2018), there is a significant increase in the level of vandalism – by almost 20% (from 1763 crimes in 2014 to 2193 in 2018). In the overall crime structure, the share of such crimes increased by 0.12%;

- the largest number of acts of vandalism was recorded in 2018 (2193 crimes), and the smallest – in 2014 (1763 crimes). At the same time, 2053 such crimes were registered in 2015, 1782 crimes in 2016, and 1972 crimes in 2017;

- the most significant increase in the number of crimes was in the following: illegal possession, desecration or destruction of religious shrines (from 3 crimes in 2014 to 5 crimes in 2018); obstruction of a religious rite (from 1 crime in 2014 to 4 crimes in 2018); desecration of a grave, other burial place or the body of the deceased (from 1608 crimes in 2014 to 2030 in 2018); illegal explorations at an archaeological heritage site, destruction, ruining of or damage to cultural heritage sites (from 52 crimes in 2014 to 77 crimes in 2018); destruction, damage or concealment of documents or unique documents of the National Archival Fond (from 0 crimes in 2014 to 3 crimes in 2018); public denial or justification of fascist crimes, propaganda of neo-Nazi ideology, production and/or distribution of materials justifying the crimes of fascists and their supporters (from 1 crime in 2014 to 38 crimes in 2018);

- the number of crimes such as damage to religious buildings or places of worship decreased (from 7 crimes in 2014 to 2 crimes in 2018); intentional destruction or damage to territories under state protection and objects of the nature reserve fund (from 28 crimes in 2014 to 17 crimes in 2018); desecration of state symbols (from 58 crimes in 2014 to 17 crimes in 2018); violence against the population in the area of military operations (from 4 crimes in 2014 to 0 crimes in 2018).

The next criterion to be analysed is *the number of crimes in which individuals have been served with a notice of suspicion*. The impor-

tance of this indicator is due to actual reflection of the number of detected crimes, i.e. crimes in which a person has been identified. The basic value we propose to use is the total number of detected crimes and their ratio to the total number of registered crimes. For example, in 2014, this ratio was 37.7%; in 2015, 33.3%; in 2016, 26.9%; in 2017, 37.9%; in 2018, 39.4%. The average figure for the analysed period is 34.7%. With regard to vandalism, the analysis of statistical data reveals different trends:

- compared to other crimes, the share of detected vandalism cases is much higher, averaging 54.2% over the analysed period. This means that every second reported case of vandalism was detected, i.e. the perpetrators were identified;

- the share of detected vandalism cases increased by almost 10%: from 52.2% in 2014 to 61.7% in 2018. The lowest number of vandalism cases was detected in 2016: 773 crimes, which is 43.4% of the total number of registered vandalism cases;

- the high rate of vandalism crimes in which persons were served with notices of suspicion is relative. For example, only two types of vandalism are characterised by a high detection rate that exceeds the average statistical indicator (we recall that it is 34.7% for the analysed period). For example, these are the desecration of a grave, other burial place or the body of the deceased (57.6%) and the desecration of state symbols (36.3%);

- the following types of vandalism have a lower than average detection rate: damage to religious buildings or places of worship – 30%; illegal occupation, desecration or destruction of religious shrines – 17.9%; obstruction of a religious rite – 10.3%; public denial or justification of the crimes of fascism, propaganda of neo-Nazi ideology, production and/or distribution of materials justifying the crimes of fascists and their supporters – 10.1%; intentional destruction or damage to territories under state protection and objects of the nature reserve fund – 7.3%; illegal exploration at an archaeological heritage site, destruction, ruining of or damage to cultural heritage sites – 6.7%. At the same time, three types of vandalism have a zero percent detection rate, meaning that no one has ever been served with a notice of suspicion of committing them during the analysed period. These are the destruction, damage or concealment of documents or unique documents of the National Archival Fond; looting and violence against the population in the area of military operations.

Another criterion for evaluating statistics on vandalism is *the number of proceedings that were sent to court with an indictment*. On aver-

age, the share of such proceedings is 88.1% of the total number of criminal offenses in which persons were served with notices of suspicion, or 30.6% of the total number of recorded criminal offenses. The highest analysed indicator was in 2018 and amounted to 90.3% and 35.6%, respectively; and the lowest 86.7% – in 2016 – and 23.3%, respectively. With regard to vandalism, we can observe different correlations and trends:

- compared to other crimes, the share of vandalism proceedings that were sent to court with an indictment was significantly higher and averaged 90.7% of the total number of criminal offenses in which persons were served with a notice of suspicion of committing vandalism, or 49.1% of the total number of registered vandalism cases in the analysed period. These figures were highest in 2015 (96.3 and 53.8%, respectively) and lowest in 2016 (80.1 and 34.7%, respectively);

- compared to 2014, in 2018, the share of vandalism proceedings that were sent to court with an indictment increased by more than 11% (from 83.9% and 43.8% to 95.6% and 58.9%, respectively);

- the relative nature of statistical data characterising the ratio of the number of vandalism proceedings that were sent to court with an indictment to such indicators as the number of detected vandalism cases and the total number of registered vandalism cases is worthy of attention. For example, only one type of vandalism is characterised by a high rate of referrals to court with an indictment that exceeds the average statistical indicator (we recall that during the analysed period it accounted for 88.1% of the total number of criminal offenses in which persons were served with a notice of suspicion and 30.6% of the total number of recorded criminal offenses). For example, it is the desecration of a grave, other burial place or the body of the deceased: 90.9% and 52.3% respectively. Another type of vandalism has only one of the two indicators slightly higher than the average: it is the deliberate destruction or damage of territories under state protection and objects of the nature reserve fund: 88.9% and 6.5% respectively;

- the following types of vandalism have lower than average statistical indicators: damage to religious buildings or places of worship – 83.3% and 25.0%, respectively; illegal explorations at an archaeological heritage site, destruction, ruining or damage to cultural heritage sites – 86.3% and 5.8%, respectively; illegal possession, desecration or destruction of religious shrines – 80.0% and 14.3% respectively; desecration of state symbols – 77.8% and 28.2% respectively; public denial or justifi-

cation of the crimes of fascism, propaganda of neo-Nazi ideology, production and/or distribution of materials justifying the crimes of fascists and their supporters – 77.8 and 7.9% respectively; obstruction of religious rites – 50.0 and 5.3% respectively;

- three types of vandalism are characterised by zero rates of referrals to court with indictments. For example, these are destruction, damage or concealment of documents or unique documents of the National Archival Fond; looting; violence against the population in the area of military operations.

In more detail, the quantitative characteristics of vandalism can be assessed by comparing *statistical data that reflect the prevalence* of each of the types of vandalism we have identified, namely:

- the most common type of vandalism is desecration of a grave, other burial place or the body of the deceased (Article 297 of the CC of Ukraine). The share of registered crimes under this article in the overall structure of vandalism is 92.4%. Moreover, against a general decrease in the crime rate in 2014-2018 (by 8%), a significant increase in the number of registered cases of desecration of a grave, other burial place or the body of the deceased can be noted (by 422 crimes, i.e. by 20.7%). The lowest number of crimes under Article 297 of the CC of Ukraine was registered in 2014 – 1608, and the highest in 2018 – 2030. On average, 1 to 4 crimes under Part 4 of Article 297 of the CC of Ukraine were recorded per year, but in 2015, there was an almost 4-fold increase (15 crimes). On average, a person was served with a notice of suspicion of committing this crime in 57.6% of cases. This figure was the lowest in 2016 – 45.9%, and the highest in 2018 – 65.4%. Approximately 52.3% of proceedings of the total number of criminal offenses under Article 297 of the CC of Ukraine were sent to court with an indictment. The lowest figure was in 2016 – 36.8%, and the highest – in 2018 – 62.5%;

- the second most common type of vandalism is the illegal explorations at an archaeological heritage site, destruction, ruining of or damage to cultural heritage sites (Article 298 of the CC of Ukraine). The share of registered crimes under this article in the overall structure of vandalism is 3.4%. Over the past 5 years, the number of registered cases of illegal explorations at an archaeological heritage site, destruction, ruining or damage to cultural heritage sites has increased by 32.5% (25 crimes). The lowest number of crimes under Article 298 of the CC of Ukraine was registered in 2014 – 52, and the highest – in 2017 – 78. The detection rate of these crimes is extremely low. For example, on average, a notice of suspicion was

served to a person in 6.7% of cases. This figure was the lowest in 2016 – 1.5%, and the highest in 2018 – 11.7%. About 5.8% of proceedings of the total number of criminal offenses under Article 298 of the CC of Ukraine were sent to court with an indictment. This figure was the lowest in 2016 – 1.5%, and the highest in 2018 – 11.7%;

- the third most widespread type of vandalism is the desecration of state symbols (Article 338 of the CC of Ukraine). The share of registered crimes under this article in the overall structure of vandalism is 1.3%. Unlike the previous types of vandalism we analysed, over the past 5 years the number of registered cases of desecration of state symbols has decreased by 70.1% (by 41 crimes). The lowest number of crimes under Article 338 of the CC of Ukraine was registered in 2016 – 10, and the highest – in 2014 – 58. The detection rate of these crimes is relatively high. On average, a notice of suspicion was served to a person in 36.3% of cases. This figure was the lowest in 2016 at 19.0%, and the highest in 2015 at 53.8%. Approximately 28.2% of proceedings out of the total number of criminal offenses under Article 338 of the CC of Ukraine were sent to court with an indictment. This figure was the lowest in 2014 – 13.8%, and the highest in 2018 – 47.1%;

- the fourth most widespread type of vandalism is the intentional destruction or damage to territories under state protection and objects of the nature reserve fund (Article 252 of the CC of Ukraine). The share of registered crimes under this article in the overall structure of vandalism is 1.3%. Over the last 5 years, the number of registered cases of intentional destruction or damage to territories under state protection and nature reserve fund objects decreased by 39.3% (by 11 crimes). The lowest number of crimes under Art. 252 of the CC of Ukraine was registered in 2015 – 16, and the highest – in 2016 – 36. Traditionally, the level of solving these crimes is low. For example, on average, a notice of suspicion was served to a person in 7.3% of cases. This figure was the highest in 2014 – 28.6%, while in 2015, 2016 and 2018, no suspicion was served on any of the facts of committing this crime. Approximately 6.5% of proceedings out of the total number of criminal offenses under Article 252 of the CC of Ukraine were sent to court with an indictment. This figure was the highest in 2014 – 28.6%, while from 2015 to 2018, no proceedings under this article were sent to court with an indictment;

- the fifth most widespread type of vandalism is public denial or justification of fascist crimes, propaganda of neo-Nazi ideology, production and/or distribution of materials

justifying the crimes of fascists and their supporters (Article 436–1 of the CC of Ukraine). The share of registered crimes under this article in the overall structure of vandalism is 0.9%. Over the past 5 years, the number of registered cases of public denial or justification of fascist crimes, propaganda of neo-Nazi ideology, production and/or distribution of materials justifying the crimes of fascists and their supporters has increased by as much as 37 times (from 1 to 38 crimes). The lowest number of crimes under Article 436-1 of the CC of Ukraine was registered in 2014 – 1, and the highest – in 2018 – 38. The detection rate of these crimes is extremely low. For example, on average, a notice of suspicion was served to a person in 10.1% of cases. This figure was the highest in 2015 – 25.0%, while in 2014 and 2016 no suspicion was served on any fact of committing this crime. Approximately 7.9% of proceedings out of the total number of criminal offenses under Article 436-1 of the CC of Ukraine were sent to court with an indictment. This figure was the highest in 2015 – 25.0%, while in 2014 and 2016 no proceedings under this article were sent to court with an indictment;

- the sixth most widespread type of vandalism is the illegal maintenance, desecration or destruction of religious shrines (Article 179 of the CC of Ukraine). The share of registered crimes under this article in the overall structure of vandalism is 0.3%. Over the past 5 years, the number of registered cases of illegal possession, desecration or destruction of religious shrines has increased by 40.0% (by 2 crimes – from 3 to 5). The lowest number of crimes under Article 179 of the CC of Ukraine was registered in 2014 and 2015 – 3, and the highest – in 2016 – 10. Traditionally, the detection rate of these crimes is low. For example, on average, a notice of suspicion was served to a person in 17.9% of cases. This figure was the highest in 2018 – 40.0%, while in 2015 no suspicion was served on any fact of committing this crime. Approximately 14.3% of proceedings out of the total number of criminal offenses under Article 179 of the CC of Ukraine were sent to court with an indictment. This figure was the highest in 2018 – 40.0%, while in 2015 and 2017 no proceedings under this article were sent to court with an indictment;

- other types of vandalism are the least common, and therefore their commission does not significantly affect official statistical reporting. For example, damage to religious buildings or places of worship accounts for only 0.2% of the total vandalism; obstruction of religious rites – 0.2%; destruction, damage or concealment of documents or unique documents of the National Archival Fond – 0.03%; loot-

ing – 0.01%; violence against the population in the area of military operations – 0.09%. All of them are characterised by a rather low level of detection and referral to court with an indictment.

Therefore, the analysed official statistics enables to determine the prevalence and dynamics of vandalism over the past five years. At the same time, the above data and our conclusions are not enough to provide a holistic picture of modern domestic vandalism. A number of its *qualitative indicators* need to be further disclosed. However, it is impossible to do this on the basis of official statistics review: first, official statistics do not separate vandalism crimes into a separate group; second, it does not record a number of indicators that play a secondary role in the overall crime structure but are quite important for developing measures to counter and prevent vandalism. In this regard, our further research will be based on the data obtained as a result of studying the materials of criminal proceedings on vandalism, on the conclusions drawn by other scholars, experts and specialists, as well as on the results of a sociological survey.

3. Particularities of the places of committing vandalism

The study enables to make some conclusions, which are organised into several independent blocks for ease of perception.

Geography of vandalism. The prevalence and steadily increasing number of criminalised acts of vandalism is observed in all regions without exception. The level of vandalism is somewhat higher in Luhansk and Donetsk regions, as well as in the areas bordering the Autonomous Republic of Crimea, compared to the overall statistical indicators. This is primarily due to a rather high level of aggressive xenophobia and national intolerance in these regions, which is a consequence of the occupation and actual hostilities. In the western regions of Ukraine, the level of vandalism also remains consistently high, due to the active work of various national-democratic and chauvinistic movements. In general, our study did not show any significant geographic differences in the prevalence of vandalism in Ukraine. The only differences are in the direct objects of attack, as well as the emotional and motivational atmosphere of vandalism.

There are certain differences between urban and rural vandalism. For example, in large cities, which are more saturated with public infrastructure, vandalism of the following types prevails: graffiti, petty and malicious hooliganism, destruction and damage to property. Obscene inscriptions, immoral images, smashed payphones, broken windows, damaged public transportation equipment, etc. are all typical

of urban vandalism. In small towns and villages, vandalism is more likely to be motivated by lucrative motives, due to the relatively low socio-economic level of life. For example, there are frequent cases of destruction of graves and cemeteries, and theft of various valuable materials from burial sites. In addition, various natural resources, garden and park and architectural ensembles, green spaces, etc. are often targeted for destruction. In other words, public, nationalist, political, and anarcho-nihilistic types of vandalism are more common in cities, while religious, cemetery, lucrative, and environmental vandalism is more common in villages.

Time when an act of vandalism is committed. The results of our study show that acts of vandalism are committed with approximately the same level of intensity throughout the year. At the same time, certain differences in the structure of vandalism depending on the time of year can be identified. For example, acts of lucrative vandalism are most often committed in winter and in the first two months of spring. Some scholars explain this dependence by the fact that in the warm season it is easier to find seasonal work or other one-time income and fresh vegetables, fruits, mushrooms appear, thus partially solving the food problem for low-income people who are most prone to lucrative vandalism (Husak, 2015, p. 144). Public vandalism, on the contrary, is more common in the summertime. This is due to the fact that teenagers, who are mostly prone to it, have a lot of time free from school and controlled leisure. Nationalist and political vandalism becomes more active in the fall, due to the end of the vacation period and the general increase in political and economic activity in the country. The most "favourable" period for environmental vandalism is the second half of spring, summer and the first half of autumn, which is associated with active agricultural work.

In addition to seasonality, the intensity of vandalism depends on the time of day. There is no clear gradation and no clear priority, while it is possible to state a dependence on a certain type of vandalism. For example, lucrative vandalism is mostly committed in the evening and much less often during lunchtime and at night. This is primarily due to the specificities of visiting cemeteries, burial sites and other public places, from the territory of which valuable objects or their parts are most often stolen. Breaking windows, damaging payphones, painting fences and other cases of public vandalism are mostly committed at night, and less frequently during the day and evening. This is due to the specificities of visiting public places, as well as the availability of free time among young people who are prone to this type

of vandalism. Demonstrative cases of political and nationalist vandalism are mostly recorded during the day, during various political rallies and public events, while vandalism by radicalised informal groups, on the contrary, intensifies in the evening and at night, after sports matches, concerts and performances.

How an act of vandalism is committed. A characteristic feature of modern vandalism is how extraordinary it can be committed. Moreover, the choice of how to impact a protected object depends on many factors: the personality of the vandal and the availability of special skills; the specifics of the object of the attack; the place and time of the crime; the expected goal, etc. In total, more than 50 different ways of committing vandalism can be identified. However, according to the results of the criminal proceedings we have studied, there are several of the most popular among them.

First, acts of vandalism can involve inflicting various damages to protected objects. For example, this includes its complete destruction (by breaking, tearing, dissolving, etc.), demolition, dismantling, breakage, removal of structural parts and elements, painting or pouring various substances, pollution, excavation, arson, explosion.

Second, acts of vandalism can involve the misuse of the object. The most popular of these is stealing the object, removing clothing, jewellery or awards from the body, for example for the purpose of further sale. Less frequently, stolen objects are used for other purposes: for rituals, ceremonies, revenge, etc.

Third, acts of vandalism can express a vandal's negative attitude towards someone or something, which is almost as prevalent. The most popular are the following: painting the object, applying obscene inscriptions, indecent images, or offensive symbols to the object, adding additional elements of an immoral or cynical nature to the object, pasting posters and leaflets. Sometimes, vandalism is committed by public ridicule, demonstration of contempt, mockery of the object or events related to it, as well as by gross violation of the order of ceremonies, rituals, rites, etc.

Fourth, acts of vandalism can allow the vandal to satisfy his or her needs due to sexual or other mental disorders. Among them are dismemberment or disfigurement of the body, illegal exhumation, necrophilia, eating of remains, relieving natural needs on or with the object, and other lewd and immoral acts. Since the share of such acts of vandalism in the overall structure of vandalism is insignificant, these methods are extremely rare.

Means and instruments of vandalism. The choice of means and tools used to unlawfully

affect protected facilities always depends on the method of committing the crime chosen by the vandal. And since, as we have shown above, among all possible methods of vandalism, the most popular are those that involve inflicting various damages to protected objects, frequently, vandals use destructive tools such as sledgehammers, hammers, knives, saws, drills, chisels and other tools that can cause various mechanical or physical damage to an object. No less popular are various chemicals, including paints, solvents, combustibles, fuel oil, reagents, chemicals, etc. Sometimes domestic animals, including dogs and cattle, are used as tools.

Our analysis of the ways in which vandalism is committed has shown that a significant number of them are caused by the direct activity of the perpetrator and do not involve the use of any special or additional means and tools. For example, a vandal can personally damage a protected object, break, tear, or trample it. Moreover, theft of an object often does not require the use of any tools. Thus, the above gives grounds to assert that the means and instruments of vandalism should be considered as its optional feature.

A place where an act of vandalism is committed. The extraordinary variety of external forms of vandalism, as well as its prevalence, determines the special nature of the places where it is committed.

The results of our research show that most acts of vandalism are committed in public places (train stations, airports, parks, streets, stadiums, entrances, shopping centres, cinemas, educational institutions, sports grounds, public transport, etc.) First, this is due to an important feature of vandal behaviour such as demonstrative nature (vandals usually seek to give their actions as much publicity as possible, and therefore prefer publicly accessible objects); second, the fact that a significant number of objects that are subject to vandalism are integral elements of public places (benches in parks, seats in public transport, windows and walls in entrances, elevator cabins, etc. are subject to destructive impact); third, the fact that the intention to commit acts of vandalism in many cases arises suddenly, for example during a mass event, after drinking alcohol, during joint leisure activities, etc. (such forms of behaviour are typical for public places).

The specific nature of many targets (special historical, artistic, architectural, religious or other value for a significant number of people) causes the prevalence of acts of vandalism in places where such objects are compactly located: in museums, libraries, exhibition halls, and other educational, scientific and cultural institutions.

Common places of committing vandalism are cemeteries, graves, burial sites, places of worship, morgues, various religious buildings and "sacred" places. The vast majority of cases of lucrative and religious vandalism are recorded in such places. For example, valuable items, as well as elements of monuments and fences, are stolen from graves and cemeteries. Moreover, it is here that various rites and ceremonies are performed, and most acts of desecration and abuse are committed. Less common, but no less important for analysis, are places with a special status: nature reserves, memorial complexes, cultural and archaeological heritage sites, etc. The vast majority of acts of environmental vandalism are committed here.

Less common, but no less important for analysis, are places with a special status: nature reserves, memorial complexes, cultural and archaeological heritage sites, etc. The vast majority of acts of environmental vandalism are committed here.

A relatively significant number of acts of vandalism are committed in abandoned, neglected places (at stopped construction sites, in abandoned residential buildings, in the poorest residential neighbourhoods, at previously damaged and mutilated objects). To explain this trend, some scholars use the "broken windows theory", the essence of which is that vandalism is to some extent encouraged by the situation at the scene: the more disorderly and littered

the place, the more likely it is to be committed (Latysh, 2016, p. 52; Reynald, Elffers, 2009, p. 27).

4. Conclusions

Above, we have already analysed the criteria enabling to get only a general idea of the state of and trends in vandalism in the current socio-political and economic environment. Moreover, the data on which our study is based are relative, as most of them are the result of our review of the materials of criminal proceedings for vandalism, and not officially recorded statistical indicators. All of this affects the accuracy of our calculations, as well as the objectivity and reliability of our conclusions.

However, it should be noted that there are no other ways to study vandalism today: neither the National Police of Ukraine nor other law enforcement bodies or NGOs currently keep records of vandalism. Scholars and international experts in their few reports on vandalism rely only on official statistics, which do not focus on vandalism. Therefore, they take as a basis different corpus delicti, which, in their subjective opinion, are manifestations of vandalism. Obviously, under such conditions, the results obtained differ significantly, and the conclusions and generalisations based on them do not reflect the real scale and consequences of vandalism, do not allow us to trace their dynamics and make reliable forecasts.

References:

- Husak, T.P. (2015). Protydiia zlochynnym diiam, shcho vchyniautsia osobamy u skladi natovpu [Combating criminal acts committed by individuals in the crowd]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Kyiv (in Ukrainian).
- Latysh, K.V. (2016). Kryminalistychna kharakterystyka ta orhanizatsiino-taktychni osnovy rozliduvannia vandalizmu [Forensic characteristics and organisational and tactical foundations of de-icing vandalism]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. Kharkiv (in Ukrainian).
- Ofitsiynyi sait Heneralnoi prokuratury Ukrainy [Official website of the General Prosecutor's Office of Ukraine]. (2020). *gp.gov.ua*. Retrieved from https://www.gp.gov.ua/ua/stst2011.html?dir_id=104402# (in Ukrainian).
- Reynald, D., Elffers, H. (2009). The future of Newman's defensible space theory and the routine activities of place. *European Journal of Criminology*, 6 (1), 25–46 (in English).

Андрій Доброскок,

кандидат юридичних наук, директор, Юридичний ліцей імені Ярослава Кондратьєва Національної академії внутрішніх справ, Солом'янська площа, 1, Київ, Україна, індекс 03035, dobroskokandrii@ukr.net

ORCID: orcid.org/0000-0002-7047-8566

КРИТЕРІЙ СТАНУ ТА ТЕНДЕНЦІЙ ПОШИРЕННЯ ВАНДАЛІЗМУ В СУЧАСНИХ УМОВАХ

Анотація. Мета. Метою статті є дослідження стану і тенденцій вандалізму в Україні на основі відповідних критеріїв. **Результати.** Тлумачення змісту вандалізму і, як наслідок, вживання цього поняття для офіційного пояснення діянь, пов'язаних із деструктивною насильницькою руйнівною поведінкою, на сьогодні суттєво розширилося та сягнуло за межі кримінально-правового визначення. Значна частина актів вандалістичної поведінки через незначну суспільну небезпеку залишається без

належної уваги з боку правоохоронних органів, оскільки підстав для їх кваліфікації за відповідними статтями КК України часто не досить, а КУпАП взагалі не містить спеціальних норм, які б дозволяли вжити відповідних заходів реагування. У зв'язку з цим актуальним видається дослідження стану і тенденцій вандалізму в Україні на основі відповідних критеріїв. Встановлено, що стан і тенденції вандалізму в Україні найбільш доцільно визначати через характеристику кількісних і якісних показників поширення злочинів вандалізму спрямованості. Обґрунтовано, що основними кількісними показниками вандалізму слід вважати: 1) місце вандалізму в загальній структурі злочинності; 2) кількість злочинів вандалізму спрямованості, у яких особам вручено повідомлення про підозру; 3) кількість проваджень у справах про злочини вандалізму спрямованості, які були направлені до суду з обвинувальним актом; 4) рівень поширеності окремих видів злочинів вандалізму спрямованості. Основними якісними показниками вандалізму визнано такі як: 1) географія вандалізму; 2) час учинення вандалізму; 3) спосіб учинення вандалізму; 4) засоби та знаряддя вчинення вандалізму; 5) місце вчинення вандалізму. **Висновки.** Поширеними місцями вчинення вандалізму є кладовища, могили, місця захоронення, культові будинки, приміщення моргів, різноманітні релігійні споруди та «сакральні» місця. У таких місцях фіксують більшість випадків корисливого та релігійного вандалізму. Зокрема, з могил і кладовищ викрадають цінні речі, а також елементи пам'ятників та огорож. Також саме тут проводяться різноманітні обряди та церемонії, вчиняється більшість актів наруги й осквернення. Менш поширеними, але не менш важливими для аналізу, є місця зі спеціальним статусом: заповідники, меморіальні комплекси, об'єкти культурної та археологічної спадщини тощо. Тут вчиняється більшість актів екологічного вандалізму.

Ключові слова: різновиди вандалізму, наруга над могилою, місце поховання, злочин, рівень злочинності.

The article was submitted 20.07.2022

The article was revised 09.08.2022

The article was accepted 30.08.2022