

Personality of criminal

Abstract: It is analyzed the provisions said by the scientists in different historical epochs, main idea of which is that considerable part of criminals are carriers of distinctive type and the task of scientific research is to discover specific, inherent to criminals external signs, who are distinguished from law-abiding citizens with high level of impulsiveness and aggressiveness.

Each person is an individual and possesses unique combination of particularities of character and mental make-up.

There is no existed such signs, which might be join all criminals in certain group and to create a special “type” of personality. One should refuse from notion of “identity of criminal” and use a notion “persons who committed crime”.

Keywords: personality of criminal; “inborn criminal”; “criminal type”; mental disorder; type of personality; “person committed crime”.

Independently on external factors a guilty of any crime is always a separate individual. Therefore, it is impossible not to draw attention a position of identity of criminal in crime. Jurisprudents-classics were based and are based on the fact that criminals, besides of obvious and particular features (age, state of inebriation, illnesses and others), are the same man like other ones. But, it is completely obviously that such approach does not give an opportunity to move criminal law to actually scientific way in researching of reasons of criminal behaviour of man.

♦ **Rahimov Ilham Mammadhasan oglu** – Doctor of Juridical Sciences, Professor, Honoured Jurist of Azerbaijan Republic (Azerbaijan). E-mail: mopi_sid@yahoo.com

“And in this juridical lock of criminal law’s dogma with medieval legends and traditions, in world closely cork up itself from any contact with life, became scientists of a new trend... they said to dogmatists that they had forgotten about alive man, and being broken a common algebraic formula of criminal’s notion, showed that there was no one criminal, and many ones – and congenital, and occasional, and killers, and thieves, and they have nothing common between themselves, and there is inadmissibly to join them in one common notion norms’ offenders”, - noted S.K Gogel.

Beginning of studying of criminal’s identity was mainly started by researches of some English prison doctors and other specialists. Question was: whether one should look at criminal like had been looked at Ancient Greece and Roma, - like at slaves, creature of especial, other breed?

May it be any committed crime a mad or savage? And may it be, he is degenerate, as believed E. Ferri? Or, is he an epileptic, on expression of Ch. Lombroso? May it be a criminal has specific psychology? We should note that just in result of development of psychiatric doctrine, which have impacted sufficient influence in correctness of designing of human behaviour, became it possible to study an identity of a person committing criminal deed and his/her particularities. So, for example, B. Morits basing on 22 cases of surveys presupposed that brain of a criminal is specific, excursive from normal brain, person¹. One year later he said that “natural deficiency, or main element in psychology of professional criminal is ‘neurasthenia’, or nervous exhaustion, nervous weakness in physical, moral and intellectual relations, moreover a weakness is inborn or obtained in early childhood” [4]. Finally, he came to conclusion that professional, unchangeable criminal is an actual derivation from generic notion of “homo”.

¹ See: Report on Congress in Antwerp in B 1885.

As it noted, familiarization with facts came of P. Despine to assertion that serious criminals have no moral sense, which says to man what is a kind and evil, prompting accusation of criminal desires and causing consequent of pangs of conscience.

Anthropologists, being studied about 2000 individuals in prisons and madhouses, had noted that they could distinguish on bodily features of inborn killer from other criminals. Ch. Lombroso, one of the bright representatives of this direction, developed this idea of F.I. Gall concerning to the fact that most part are bearers of specific external appearance and the task of scientific research is concluded just in disclosure specific, i.e. inherent extremely to criminals, external features.

Idea about that criminal man, especially in cases of more expressed criminal type, is a savage coming in our civilization, had been expressed before Lombroso, in particular Despine. But, just Lombroso used first a notion of “inborn criminal”, who, according to his opinion, is a result painful disorder and atavism. Inborn criminal is “a savage, and in addition, illness man”. An opportunity of matching of these two judgements on criminal Lombroso sees in theory of delaying in development of some organs, and mainly, in development of badly feeding mental centres. From one side, this does from these organs “places of less resistance”, i.e. predisposes them to various disorders, and from other side – turns them to a type of lower development. He even asserted as if secretions of organism of inborn criminal are other than to occasional criminal and common law-abiding people, ostensibly unlike them inborn criminal secretes less urea and more phosphates [2, p. 66].

Mass of particularities was found by Lombroso, first of all, in skull of inborn criminals and almost in each bone of a skull, and in its general designing and outline. So, for example, criminals, especially thieves, are prevailed small skulls; the skulls of bigger volumes are met not often. Not only skulls but also ears, noses etc. were the objects of careful special research of Lombroso.

Considering collected by Lombroso data for establishing of especial “type”, L.P. Manuvrie insists on that on their bases one may assert only one: criminals have more deviations than so named honest people. He pointed out also on wrongfulness of Lombroso’s technique, consisting in that for formation of a “type” he had joined in one whole the signs, which were available to completely different criminals.

In reality, there is no common type of ugly or “pathological” man. There are various types of ugliness. These are fair notes made by Professor Manuvrie on an issue on existence of especial anatomic-physiological “criminal type”.

In the Fourth Criminal anthropological congress Professor Ferri, a colleague of Lombroso, made a report on “criminal temperament”, in which he had tried from notion of “criminal man”, before used by followers of Lombroso, with his specific and “criminal type”, and phenomena of criminality are come to actual its source – to phenomena of psychological degeneracy.

Persons, committing crime, S.V. Poznyshev also related to certain “type”. He wrote: “Criminal type is not a simple sum of known mental features of identity of person, and known make-up of personality, known combination his/her mental features, creating, so to say, deviation of this person in side of crime, which induces his/her search directly an occasion to commit crime or not to dismiss such occasion as soon as it presented, or at least insufficiently to be resisted to known sensible inclination to temptation of this occasion” [3, p. 31].

Modern scientists-jurisprudents “allow themselves to speak about identity of criminal like on separate, independent social and psychological type” [1, p. 12], though and correct that a notion of “identity of criminal” is conditional terminological indication. “it would be more rightful to use word combination ‘identity of man (individual)’ committing crime” [1, p. 12].

What is the difference between identity of criminal and common people, on opinion of these authors? Yu.M. Antonyan and V.E. Eminov answer: “Comparative psychological studying of identity of big groups of criminals and

law-abiding people has shown that the first are distinguished from second higher level of impulsiveness, i.e. inclination to act on first inducement, and aggressiveness, which are combined with high sensibility and vulnerability in interpersonal relationships” [1, p. 9].

The authors perceive in criminal “genetically founded features and inclinations” [1, p. 10]. There is a chapter “Personality” in psychology. What does it mean? It means that a term “personality” is so complex for determination and having so wider sphere of usage that one may write as much as wish, not bearing any responsibility for the definition. Today, we may enumerate few dozens and more definitions of this term:

- *theory of types* (theory of Hippocrates about four main temperaments: choleric, melancholic, sanguine and phlegmatic);

- *theory of features* (personality of man presents a combination of features or characteristic ways of behaviour, thought, senses, reaction etc.).

There are also psycho-dynamic and psycho-analytic theories (Freud, Jung, Fromm, and Horn). Personality is characterized in them through notion of integration. What definition will be correctly a personality of criminal related to?

As we said above, anthropologists often spoke about “criminal type” like on known “external” type, i.e. like about combination of certain external signs, on which criminals are distinguished from other people and are able to serve for their classification and identification, like about anatomic-physiological and anthropological type. Thus, external signs of a “type” have a leading and critical significance. Therefore, those, who standby on point of view of “criminal type,” concentrate their attention mostly to human appearance. Unlikely, anybody believes today that criminal might be distinguished from law-abiding man on external signs.

Criminal is not especial type with specific external features. This is absolutely normal in physical relation man. May it be criminals have a specific psychology? But science of psychology did not come to such conclusion. In essence,

psychology of killer is psychology of any man, who can also under appropriate living circumstances become a killer. Criminal like all people possesses with sum of individual features. Everybody has known physical and mental features forming his/her physical and mental constitution, and both this and other are formed by part of inborn, and part of features received. Therefore, unlikely there has a sense to distinguish the persons who committed crimes, into special category, especial “type” and to consider them as special persons in negative meaning.

Notion of “personality of criminal” causes also negative attitude to people. In addition, whether we relate the notion “personality of criminal” to a man, who committed crime on negligence?

Thus, a personality is a stable system of world outlook, psychological and behavioural signs characterizing a man. Can an especial system of these signs be determined to criminals? Today, science does not give affirmative answer at this question.

Type of personality is an abstract model personal signs, which are inherent to certain assembly of people. There are people with brightly expressed particularities, deviating from typical for the socio-cultural system of characters, structures and levels of personality’s development.

But, it does not speak about the fact that they constitute a special type. The fact only emphasizes a low level development of these people on any reasons. For example, an individual, who has lived whole his life in mountains, and later came to civilized Europe. Certainly this man will be clearly distinguished with his behaviour and communication among other people. But, this does not mean that he/she can commit crime and become criminal.

Everybody is an individuality, who has unique collection of particularities of character and mental state, which distinguish one person from other one. This is also related to criminal. But there are no features, which might be joined all criminal into any group and create an especial “type” of personality. Therefore, we

believe that one should be refused from notion “personality of criminal” and to use a notion “persons committed crime”.

References

1. Antonyan Yu.M., Eminov V.E. Lichnost' prestupnika. Kriminologo-psikhologicheskoe issledovanie [Identity of criminal. Criminological and psychological research]. Moscow, 2010, 368 p.
2. Lombroso Ch. Noveyshie uspekhi nauki o prestupnike [Newest successes of science about criminal]. S. Petersburg, 1892, 168 p.
3. Poznyshev S.V. Kriminal'naya psikhologiya. Prestupnyie tipy [Criminal psychology. Criminal types]. Moscow, 2007, 320 p.
4. Cazette de Tribunaux. 1852.