

Social Control of Deviant Behavior in the Context of Rights and Freedoms of Man



Picture: www.pixelio.de
(Photographer: V. Villanueva)

Tatjana Shipunova, St. Petersburg (Russia)

T. Gobbs, an English philosopher, thinking about the problem of sociogenesis, had formulated a question: ‘How can a society exist if dog eats dog?’ He presumed that in an evolutionary process people had lost a programmed natural prohibition on killing representatives of their own kind (as opposed to animals). So, killing is a natural characteristic of human. That is why a society can exist only under a tight control of human behavior.

This theme has got a wide development in social-philosophical and sociological proceedings. Here we can name O. Kont, H. Spencer, W. Sumner, G. Tarde, E. Durkheim, E. Ross, R. Park, M. Weber, P. Sorokin, T. Parsons and others. Social philosophers sorted out basic institutions of social control that are responsible for human integration into society. First of all, they are: family, religion and a state. To the basic means of social control were related folk customs, traditions, manners, laws, social regulations. And amongst the maintenance mechanisms of social order were specially marked out *imitation* in a socialization process; *obedience* in two forms – personally-inofficial (based on consent and carried out as an inside control) and impersonally-official (by means of outer control); *reactions on stable forms* of social behavior (punishment or award) (1).

In the development of social control of deviant behavior that has been practiced in all Western countries we can sort out three periods.

The first period – until the end of XVIII century: The control had a repressive character. Measures of punishment were aimed at the human body (death penalty, mutilation, monstrous anguishes) and through this at external behavior. In this period there was no clear separation of control into formal and informal.

The second period – from the end of XVIII century: Ideas had particularly strengthened during the first decades of the XIX century. The human personality became the subject of control, his internal condition, “soul”. During several decades many countries refused to use corporal punishments. The meaning of formal institutions (schools (control over children), factories (control over workers), psychiatric clinics (control over mentally ill), army (control over military men)) that controlled humans’ behavior was understood. The origin of prisons dates from this period (the end of the XVIII century). Despite the fact that, with the imposition of prisons, the ideal aim of transition from repressive control to deterrence control was not reached, closed institutions remained legitimate and even strengthened. It led to unwarranted widening and toughening of formal control, and, on the other hand, to the decrease of efficiency.

The third period has begun approximately since 1950s. Social, economical and cultural changes became its prerequisites: economical and social expansion of youth (liberation from conservatism), reduction of the role of family and church (as socialization institutions), increasing level of consumption with growing demands in the material sphere, broadening of possibilities for creative self-realization not only in a labour sphere, but also in leisure, too. This washed out the standards and stereotypes of behavior, strengthening internal control and weakening of the external one. Another important prerequisite was the declining belief in the ability of criminal law to secure the decrease of criminality – “crisis of punishment” (2).

In this phase offers of using alternative methods of punishment appeared (probation, intensive supervision, electronic oversight, community works, conciliation, conditional early discharge, tax, etc.), and also different patterns of *social control* started to be suggested. Social control

became understood as a mechanism of establishing the social order, the mechanism that ensured the aspiration of the system (whole society and/or social groups) for self-preservation and functioning. It acts constantly and appears as a totality of technologies, means and methods of influence of all society and/or a social group upon undesirable forms, kinds of behavior and activity with a purpose of their total elimination or minimization of damage caused by their existence, bringing to the condition, that would afford them to exist without destroying the social order.

On the assumption of this, *functions of social control* are:

1. Correction by means of awards and punishments (in Russian conditions it is rarely employed),
2. Maintenance of conditions for the stability of the social system (of society),
3. Preservation of an adaptive flexibility of the system by means of inclusion of some kinds of alternative behavior and activity into legitimate social practice,
4. Integration of members of the society by the use of resocialization, readaptation, rehabilitation, treatment.

Punitive control (founded on realization of correcting function by means of punishment) is based on sorting out and on the consolidation of prohibitive and binding norms in law. In a process of codification of these norms in law we can see two regularities:

1. Assessing the level of dangerousness of this or that kind of behavior and/or activity resp. legislative issues not from damage or utility of an action for definite individuals but from the level of conjectural damage for society and state. It should be noted that with absence of civil service and mechanisms of social control over the state's activity there appears a tendency to assessing damage/utility of an action in the first place for the state as a bureaucratic machinery, that tries to hold the power using all its efforts;
2. In most cases (not including acts in political sphere) authorities are not interested in particular negative activities of people. The legislator pays attention only to arisen massive (mass) forms of deviation, yet again including not all of the deviations, but only those, which (from the authority's point of view) may threaten the stability of the state's existence and the existence of society ruled by it.

Though the legislator's assessments may be not adequate (wrong) and enter the contradiction with the assessments of other social subject's importance of actions. In medias res, exactly the *differences in rating* of the importance of these or those actions lie in the basis of the beginnings of different deviantological paradigms and all discussions about deviant phenomena.

It is clear that divergences of opinion in assessments of actions made by representatives of different social groups may be essential. These differences are conditioned by various experiences and, correspondingly, various definitions of the vital situation. Different determinations of situations and their assessments (discourses) may in some parts cross with each other, creating possibilities for shaping tolerance in society or intervals of norm operation, establishing measures of punishment and development of steps by controlling instances.

Divergences of opinion in assessments have particular consequences for the society's life. So, if the social importance of an action is adequately reflected in total public opinion, but inadequately in law, then social-inadequately low norms emerge. And here official instances inevitably clash with *mass* inobservance of established directions, because "imposed on norms are associated in an individual's mind with an external enemy, that causes hatred,

animosity, while 'homemade' norms stimulate voluntary obeying to their directions, solidarity, absence of violence" (3).

The confrontation of assessments of the social importance of actions elapses difficultly. This process is connected with political and economical concerns of different social groups, which undertake all possible means (lobbying, bribing, blackmailing, corrupting and contract murders of officials, who apply to the creation of regulatory acts), to assign legislatively these concerns as law and order. This is how laws, which conflict with common sense, bring damage to society, but maintained by ruling top-down, are born. And this way, at the same time new kinds of "crimes" and other "deviations" are also born, the quantity of imprisoned people grows, the interference of law in the natural process of society's development expands, inadequate lay policy forms, and methods of social control over deviant behavior change.

In terms of efficiency of social control over deviant behavior we should recognize the functions of the maintenance of conditions for a stable social system (society), the preservation of an adaptive flexibility of the system by means of including some kinds of alternative behavior and action in legitimate social practice, the integration of the members of society. The realization of these functions proposes the establishment of the priority of preventive control, which is targeted, from the one side, at creating conditions for human's integration into society, and from the other side – at the protection of human rights to determine to live one's life oneself and to carry responsibility for one's own choice, in compliance with the principle of democratic society "everything that is not prohibited is allowed".

The ideological and connecting basis for the realization of these functions could become the conception of social justice. Humanistic ideas which maintain people's aspiration for a happy life on Earth, for freedom, have been born in democracy and liberalism. And the formula for justice in democratic relations had always required for an accurate definition. Modern democrats focus definitions of social justice, which were introduced by K. Popper and J. Rawls.

Karl Popper in his book "Open Society and its Enemies" gives a widespread understanding of justice: "... a) an equal distribution of civil duty's burden (those restrictions of freedom, which are necessary in a public life); b) equality of citizens in the eye of law, surely on conditions that c) laws are not prejudiced towards or against definite citizens, groups or classes; d) fair trial and e) an equal distribution of privileges (not only burdens) which may signify a membership in a definite state for citizens" (4).

Another definition is given by J. Rawls. He argues that justice principles for the basic structure of a society are objects of an original agreement. On the basis of this statement he had sorted out two aspects of justice:

1. Justice as an ideal social order (theory of strict agreement is in line with it);
2. A real society's condition, where there is injustice with which the society must somehow get on. But how should we treat injustice? The theory of partial agreement can be the answer. It includes two principles of justice: a) everyone has an equal right for freedom, compatible in a fundamental way with the same freedom of others; b) economical and social inequality (for example, authority and wealth) is fair only if it brings common utility and compensates the losses of the most unprotected members of society. Furthermore, social and economical inequality must presuppose: a) the highest utility for those who are in disadvantaged places and b) opened possibilities and equality of conditions for all in the same positions. The theory of partial agreement constantly demands the renewal of justice, searching of its new forms and formulas (for example by means of "forced measures") (5).

Without entering the contradiction with supposed definitions of social justice, we can give its integrative definition: it is a measure of social utility (social adequacy) of laws and other normative prescriptions (formal and informal), which establishes and maintains (on the basis on an agreement) a special kind of vital activity of people, organizations, physical and judicial persons, that favours the society's survival and development, and also ensures the integration and worthy existence of all members of a society.

Socially fair institutions, forms of government, norms and laws are those, which on the basis of an agreement between subjects of social interactions create and support bases of worthy life of people in society where the requital principle on merits is proclaimed, i.e. there is aspiration to provide everyone *individual justice* in his relations with the state and social institutions. In the given *tool* definition of social justice offers foreseeable reference points (or the purposes) – the establishment of such an order of ability to live for people and the organizations which promotes survival and development of society; the maintenance of integration and a worthy existence of members of society, and also the means of their achievement – utility measure, i.e. social adequacy of social norms. Here the definition «*worthy existence*» is a generalization of all those blessings which are proclaimed as those of modern society: a measure of freedom, equality, social security, an educational level, inclusiveness in social networks, wide opportunities of a choice of legal kinds of activity etc.

Social justice infringement (social injustice) leads to the occurrence of various forms of protest, including deviant ways. The protest against injustice can be passive (short circuit in itself, alienation and leaving from the reality in fantastic dreams, in various kinds of mysticism, drunkenness and alcoholism, narcotism, virtual reality of the Internet etc.) or active (vandalism, hooliganism, thefts, robberies, murders, “shadow” enterprise activity etc.). Together they also form the uniform case of deviation.

Criteria of levels of justice/injustice and, accordingly, social adequacy/inadequacy of a system of standard instructions are: high level of infringement of norms (official and informal); narrowing of “a field of possibilities» for legal activity; low level of tolerance; protest reactions in the form of strikes or other forms of expression of disagreement; subjective feeling of citizens of injustice; low level of trust to official social institutions; indifference or abhorrence to the actions of the state; political apathy; conflicts between social groups; social exception of the social groups, etc. These phenomena are an actualization of the citizens' feelings of the injustice. This feeling appears, when people in social interactions constantly face socially-inadequate norms interfering their high-grade participation in life of society, or the absence of socially-adequate norms, capable to raise their integration in the social space and, therefore, to make life more productive, i.e. allowing most effectively (with smaller expenses and qualitatively) to satisfy requirements and to realize the potential. Social justice immanently includes also justice in relation to the person. Considering it, some researchers consider as indicators of measurement of social justice «the fact of presence of the legislation of human rights and citizen rights» (6). It is necessary to notice, that the simple presence of a legislation of human rights is insufficient. It is necessary to consider also all totality of legal maintenance of the legislation of human rights as blessing and as an indisputable display of justice in modern society.

The observance of human rights, however, is not a unique criterion of the estimation of justice in society. Here are also such indicators, as the level of quality of life, and also the development of human potential. These indicators are being discussed and worked out, which shows their utility and availability for measurement of level of social justice.

In the most general meaning the *standard of living* is understood as a level of satisfaction of material requirements of people in a quantitative expression when the available level is

compared with a standard set or being counted. And the *quality of life* – the level of satisfaction with non-material requirements, reflecting the value judgment of social and cultural comfort (8, c. 100). Thus, elements of the quality of life in each state are separated depending on ideological and cultural orientations. The European economic commission of the United Nations systematized a set of social indicators, having emphasized eight groups: health; quality of a workplace; purchase of the goods and household services; possibility for spending free time; feeling of social confidence; chances of development of the person; quality of environment; possibilities of participation in public life (in the same place). The generalized indicators of the quality of life of people, represented in the international statistical data, are averaged and they can not always be used for practical needs of an increase of the level and quality of a life of members of a concrete society or its subsystems. Therefore it is necessary to form more operational rating scales of all elements of quality of life with the account social-cultural features of each concrete society which would give the chance to track dynamics of development of justice in attitude to the separate person in concrete society.

As one more criterion of a level of social justice in society is the index of development of human potential (IDHP), which can be considered as an integrated indicator of the development of the person. Among the leading indicators defining an index of development of human potential it emphasizes three: expected life expectancy; an educational level; real per capita gross internal product (gross national product). Taken together they reflect three main qualities: a healthy life, knowledge, a worthy human level. Representations of developers of the theory of development of human potential about a fair social system are harmoniously combined with the understanding of social justice meaning at an individual level the protection of rights and freedom of the person. Especially it concerns representations of integration, development and public blessing including also an indicator of adaptive flexibility of social system, supported mainly by the development of human potential.

Among the lacks of IDHP, first of all, are to be named the following: giving the exaggerated value of correlation between incomes of the population and well-being (health, life expectancy, education); difficulty of discovering qualitative parameters of well-being, the omissions connected with consideration of a social inequality and absence of differentiation on socially-age groups (7). Taking into account our theme, to lacks it is possible to add also the following: In IDHP only minimum parameters of level of social justice/injustice in society are fixed. But indicators of possibilities (for example, of level of income and education) are essentially differed within the limits of each society depending on the social status of people.

The social differentiation causes the presence of a big interval in possibilities in which representatives of different classes and social groups take a corresponding place. From the point of view of practical advantage for the increase of the level of social justice, it should, firstly, regularly count the IDHP of different classes and social groups (as well as indicators IDHP of different regions within one society), secondly, to develop a more differentiated rating scale of *quality* of already available indicators, and also those characteristics of human needs which yet do not get a tool reflection in the concept of development of human potential. Such specifications are necessary, because an overall objective of this concept is the establishment of social justice on the basis of «the thought over and real system of measures which is based on more fair distribution of industrial actives and incomes, focused on development of abilities and satisfaction of needs of person, his as much as possible active participation in economic, political and cultural life» (8). Some steps to this direction are already undertaken. So, an inequality of income is being tried to be considered at the calculation of IDHP «adjusted for distribution» or with other amendments. And a correction taking into account the problem of an inequality of sexes is suggested to be carried out by the means of IDGF – «an index of development taking into account the gender factor» (9).

When the level of income, the possibilities of satisfaction of needs (primary and secondary) of the largest part of population ceases to correspond to representations of worthy life (cultural caused or built on social comparison with rich people), an actualization of the protest giving a large increase of different kinds of deviation begins. It is necessary to notice, that even in a more or less fairly organized society such protest based on social comparison, will always exist, as it is basically impossible to establish equality of all and about all. However it is possible to assume that it will have, most likely, the character of violence not against others, but against oneself as an expression of dissatisfaction by the abilities, talents, the competitiveness, not allowing to receive more an appreciation, wide recognition and to occupy a higher social status, or as the expression of the protest against safe, but too predicted and measured daily occurrence. Probably, a high level of suicides in some safe Scandinavian countries, for example in Sweden and Finland, or in the small countries of Europe – in Switzerland and Denmark, can be explained partly by that.

In existing explanatory concepts deviant behavior and deviation in general are considered through a prism of various social processes and the phenomena (anomie, stigmatizing, subcultural differentiation, conflicts, easing of social communications and control etc.). However, all of them inherently reflect this or that display of social injustice and correspond with a concept of «social injustice» as a separate and general, or as a part and whole. (It is necessary to consider also that the arisen kinds of deviation influence the further level of social injustice). We will show it in examples.

In **rational-educational models** of the formation of the person the formation of the criminal is caused by an existing unfair inequality in getting education and the means of providing a worthy existence. If to speak about modern society «worthy existence» – it is not the simple possibility of satisfaction of the most necessary requirements, but it is satisfaction at such a level which corresponds to the quality standards accepted in the given society at the given stage of its development. Such worthy existence directly depends on the received education and the social status corresponding to this education. Besides, numerous research shows that the educational level influences the various aspects of ability to live of people, for example, the state of health, political activity, tobacco consumption, perception of classical music, speed of distribution of the information, upbringing of children, catering services, health protection of members of a family and education of children. For example, «with the growth of an educational level of mother decrease also children's death rate as irrespective of income level in a family quality of care of children and their food» becomes better (10).

There is also an inverse relationship in this kind of model. So, the connection between an educational level and some kinds of criminality is being established. The main kinds of crimes against the person (murder and attempt at murders, deliberate causing of heavy harm to health, rapes and attempts at rapes, robberies, robberies, thefts) are connected to people having a low educational level, not having a constant source of income.

As the evidence of education and not learning fundamental ethical standards lead to low level and the most refined and cynical physical violence, numerous facts of unmotivated cruelty of teenage criminal groupings, growth of extremism among youth, violence in colonies for minors are also connected with it. There is data that the most severe kinds of violence (beating, rape, mockery), made sometimes with no reasons and with a refined sadism, occur in correctional facilities for minor criminals institutions, and transfer to «an adult zone» of many minor prisoners is regarded as a blessing. Apparently, an explanation for this is not only social and economic trouble of Russian children (a low standard of living, absence of attention from outside parents, high level of violence in a family etc.), a high level of aggression and violence in the Russian society, but also the not full-value educational systems and formations, a low standard of living of many families, their social disorder and absence of prospects in life. These factors cannot promote a formation of empathy and moral maturing of

the person. And if the person does not have moral internal control in extreme conditions it is said that he or she will inevitably show all wild instincts (11).

Social injustice in the sphere of education lies in the fact that society cannot provide a *high-quality* education for all citizens that would allow them to be competitive on the labour-market. This is caused by many problems of objective and subjective causes. As objective causes there should be labeled firstly great economical costs for schools, equipment, high pays for teachers and so on, and also the inability of some people to receive modern education in the full amount. Subjective causes are the unavailability and unwillingness of society to invest money in the education of those who cannot pay for this education by themselves.

From time to time in different countries there are attempts being undertaken to solve this problem. The conversation is lead towards the special social programs, in example, the Program of preschool education of Perry town in USA. The main aim of it was to lower the risk of unlawful behavior. In the group were gathered children at the age of three from families with low socio-economic status for the period of two years. Almost half of these families were composed from one-parent families, and almost all of the parents had a low coefficient of intellectual development, a low educational level, poor employment sheets and lived in overpopulated dwellings. The program of preschool education included the drawing of the children into the planning of the work in group for the purpose of the improvement of their intellectual and social development. Over the years it was found out that children who took part in the program of preschool education (in comparison with the control group) were better in school, as a rule they finished school and got a job. The level of teenager pregnancy was considerably lower (almost twice), and the level of arrests was lower by 40 percent. The analysis of financial costs of the project of Perry showed that it cost about 5000 dollars for one child in a year. Despite the great costs the program fully covers the expenses in the future. The USA special committee on matters of children, youth and family has calculated that there is an income of 4,75 dollars for every dollar invested in the programs of preschool education, which is a result of economy on the organization of special education, social assistance and combating crime (12). Despite the high effectiveness and recoument in the future, these programs are probably the exception.

Uneducated or poorly educated people are imprisoned because of crimes more often than highly educated (it should be considered that in Russia high education diploma does not always correspond to the high level and quality of education). The reason for that could be on the one hand side that they get judged or imprisoned more often because of an unjust judicial system or on the other hand side – in an anomie explanation – because they are rather poor, belong to the lower stratum of society, so more often and acute feel their different displays of social injustice and accordingly more often protest against it. For people who haven't got sufficient education, on the one hand it is much harder to fight such vices as restraints, envy, aggression, injustice and so on, and thus deviance seems more often successful.

In the *ratio-ethic model* the forming of the personality of a criminal and deviant person in whole is conditioned by such cases of injustice as deprivation of favourable development environment (?), the establishment of unequal possibilities to become familiar with cultural values, the deprivation of parents attention and absence of good human relationships in the closest surroundings.

Social injustice consists of absence or underdevelopment of a legislative basis (the totality of laws with according mechanisms of their realization, social projects and programs), that leads to react adequately to the changing situation and to protect the rights of children and teenagers, creating conditions for their integration in a legitimate social space. Talking about Russia, the situation on these issues became critical. Scientists created a method, which could objectively estimate the effectiveness of the whole totality or certain legislative acts, aimed on

a family's social protection. Researches took place according to this method to estimate the families' social protection according to the law (proper documents) performed nowadays in Russia (49 documents totally).

The estimation was adjusted to the following indicators:

1. the reflection in the act of the life cycle of the development of the subject of the legislative act: in terms of family it means the ability of usage of the acts on all or only on some phases of family existence, in the most crisis periods of its development
2. targeting of legislative act: means indication in document the family or certain family categories, upon which its act is spread
3. absence of objective obstacles for the document's realization
4. absence of unconformity with other legislative acts
5. presence of elements, which initiate participation of non-government organizations in law's realization
6. the presence in the act of sanctions for non-compliance or impede of its compliance;
7. the ability of the legislative act to provide satisfaction of material and spiritual needs of family members. The following needs were considered: material supply of vital functions and support of efficiency of adults and physical development of children; accommodation; medical service; education; self-actualization; legal protection.

The not very comforting results were obtained after carrying out the analysis: a) legislation foresees one or another protection level only for some categories of families; b) only for 30% of families that are definitely in need of social protection any legislative acts work; c) the Russian legislative system poorly foresees the social protection of the families that are in need of preventive social protection; d) the majority of families belong to the type of poorly and/or satisfactorily social protected on legislative basis.

The other shortcomings of the legislative system that is aimed at the social protection of population, are the abundance of declarative clauses and the absence of the mechanisms of its realization; the non-compliance of laws; the absence of a non-contradictory legislative system itself, connecting the legislative acts regulating financial, tax, economic, legal decisions and so on (13).

When there is no organized mechanism for the regulation of activities of people and social systems by the creation of a system of socially adequate norms in the society, it pays for this in the growth of number of crimes and other types of deviant behavior. So, from the end of 1980s the noticeable growth of number of crimes is registered in Russia. Against the background of an increase of the number of crimes in general the number of crimes among juveniles rises steadily. There are the rejuvenation and the rise of the number of grave crimes, the number of drug addicts is more than 6 million, the number of prostitutes composes 2% of the population.

And here are interesting facts given by foreign researchers and showing the connection between socialization in amoral environment with different displays of deviant behavior:

- about 65% of the children treated severely by family have a breach of behavior (39% in control group); these breaches often reveal as problems at school and also problems of integration to social environment
- emotional violence or sexual assault leads to refusal to eat (21% of questioned adults, subjected to these forms of violence in childhood, in control group – 8%), damaging themselves (34% and 1% in control group, respectively), theft (26% and 6% in control group);

- among the adults subjected to cruel treatment in childhood smoked 62% (16% – in control group), took alcoholic drinks 22% (5% – in control group), took drugs 18% (3% – in control group), attempted suicide – 16% (2% – in control group), had difficulties with sex 60% (15% – in control group);
- women subjected to sexual abuse in childhood later far more often become victims of new sexual assaults and start to engage in prostitution (14).

According to the *anthropologic-biological model* social injustice in the case of criminal identity becomes apparent in unequal ability of getting medical service for the treatment of some mental diseases (heightened excitability, depressions, impulsivity of actions, distrustfulness, heightened aggression and so on), that could be fully or partly cured. In addition, social injustice can show when the matter is that there is an undeveloped system of health service, an exposure of population to different epidemic diseases, the population's lack of knowledge on matters of health support and so on.

Let's cite some data characterizing the activity of the system of public health services and the state of health of Russian citizens:

- In the Russian Federation, in comparison with developed west-European countries, the indicator of maternal mortality is 5-10 times higher (50,2 for 100.000 newborn). The main causes in the structure of infant mortality are those related to maternal health. The number of children who died exceeded the number of the newborn by 1,6 times. The mortality of 1 year infants in Russia is 2-4 times higher than in other economically developed countries.
- The rise of the level of general morbidity is permanently seen.
- 400 thousand people get malignant diseases every year, 3.000 of them are children, and about 300 thousand people die from cancer.
- The situation with syphilis is close to epidemic. In the end of 90s the number of people fell ill risen by 77 times in comparison with 80s (10% of them are children under 14).
- Children's psychosomatic diseases become more and more widely-spread. So, 40% of children in Saint-Petersburg have somatogenic psychic disorders; 20% – different somato-vegetative symptomatology, mainly of psychogenic origin; 10% of them are children with psychosomatic disorders, 14% are children of risk groups as they were in unfavorable family conditions or were inadequately grown-up. While studying data in one of St. Petersburg's districts it was known that 16% children have a high level of affective intensity; 31% – middle level; 22% – low level. Basing on this data it can be concluded that children of this district have a high level of anxiety which means a liability to neurotic and psychosomatic disorders.
- In 1989 in the Russian Federation for the first time the attempt was undertaken to set the diagnosis of psychosomatic disorders among children under 15. Nowadays 8 million children get ill annually. Studying the teenage population (more than 5 thousand) showed clinical displays of dystonia (15).

A question can arise: "How are different population diseases and deviant behavior correlated with each other?"

1. Some mercenary crimes are committed to get money for a close acquaintance's operation, like in case of cancer or chronic diseases, especially if children have it.
2. For instance, a higher level of anxiety can lead to spontaneous aggressive and/or violent behavior displays.

3. Experts in narcomania point out that more often drug addicts are people whose course of life was accompanied with the following occurrences: mother's pregnancy pathology (toxins, infections etc.); complicated birth; frequent, hard, chronic diseases in childhood; psychic diseases, psychical problems of one of the close relatives, etc. (16)
4. Many violent crimes are committed by people, suffering from different types of mental diseases, which (given the normal functioning of public health services) could have been revealed and cured on the early stages.

“Normal functioning” of public health services means servicing as a system to people, creating the totality of such socially adequate regulations, which could help all members of the society to get qualified help right in time. Moreover, “normal functioning” means the creation of real protective mechanisms from negligent medics and the possibility of their punishment for unsatisfactory work.

From the above we can draw the following conclusion: without canceling the work with people with deviant behavior, it should be paid special attention to the reforming of social institutions, called to provide citizen's rights in education (schools, universities, mass media), medical services, social protection and support and by that also to prevent deviant behavior. In Russia these institutions (mostly state) became dysfunctional subsystems, producing services that influence the forming of citizens morally, educationally and physically. Not in the last place the result of their activity is the decrease of quality of life of the young generation, a decrease of the level of morality and responsibility, leading towards the growth of different forms and types of deviant behavior. I'd like to underline that mostly guilty are not certain teachers, medical and social workers, but the ideological concept and organization of these institutions, that are characterized with the following features: a high level of bureaucracy and tough administrative hierarchy; creating people needing social help in future; guided to only informing people about establishing some standards instead of submitting support in complex situations or conflicts and helping with ways to solve it; based mostly on compulsion instead of voluntariness; in case of fault it uses punishment, provoking the fixation of stigma; through selection mechanisms the current power system is supported; human values are being frustrated. So, the whole system seems to be irrational and dysfunctional, because it basically increases the displaying of social injustice.

Annotations

- (1) For further information see: Gilinsky Y. Deviantology: sociology of criminality, narcotism, prostitution, suicides and other deviations. 2nd publication, corrected and added – SPb.: Publishing house of R. Aslanov 'juridical center press', 2007. P. 419-425.
- (2) Christie N. Limits to Pain /translated from English – M. : Progress, 1985.
- (3) Oleynik A. N. Prison Subculture in Russia: from daily life to state authority. – M., 2001. P. 24-25.
- (4) Cited from: Gelich O. Ya. Justice and management //Management and marketing in social sphere: tutorial. – SPb.: “Knizhny Dom”, 2003. P. 123.
- (5) Rawls J. Theory of Justice. – Novosibirsk, 1995. P. 19-29.
- (6) Trotskovskaya V. A. Justice – as a value-standard basis of social interaction. //Actual problems of sociology, psychology and social work. – Barnaul, 1999. P.64.
- (7) Human development: new measurement of social and economic progress. – M., 2000. P. 103-106.
- (8) Human development: new measurement of social and economic progress. – M., 2000. P. 50.
- (9) Human development: new measurement of social and economic progress. – M., 2000. P. 31.

(10) Human development: new measurement of social and economic progress. – M., 2000. P. 277-278.

(11) See in more details: Abramkin V. F. Seachers of exit. Criminality, the criminal policy, jails in the post-Soviet territory. – M., 1996.

(12) Graham John, Bennett Trevor. Crime Prevention Strategies in Europe and North America. – Helsinki, 1995, P. 9-10.

(13) See for ex.: Social policy and social work in changing Russia. – Moscow, 2002. P. 183; Theory of social work /red. by Cholostova E. I. – Moscow, 1998. P. 229-236.

(14) Kindermisshandlung. Erkennen und Helfen. Hg. Kinderschutz-Zentrum. – Berlin, Berlin 2000. P. 76-77.

(15) Boyko V.V., Oganessian K.M., Kopytenkova O.I. Socially protected and not protected families in changing Russia. – SPb., 1999. P. 13-14.

(16) See for ex. Actual problems of organization of medical psycho social help to the juveniles, abusing psycho active substances, in the conditions of big city. – SPb., 2003. P. 14-24.

Tatjana Shipunova works as a professor at the Department of Social Work at the Faculty of Sociology at St.Petersburg State University (Russia).

Picture: www.pixelio.de (Photographer: Valentina Villanueva)

Tags: [democracy](#), [education](#), [human rights](#), [prevention](#), [rights](#), [Russia](#), [social policy](#)