

Fighting against corruption in modern Russia: problems and prospects

Luchando contra la corrupción en la Rusia moderna: problemas y perspectivas
Combate À Corrupção Na Rússia Moderna: Problemas E Perspectivas

Recibido: 20 de abril de 2018. Aceptado: 10 de mayo de 2018

Written by:

S. A. Vorontsov⁷⁵

A. Yu. Mamychev⁷⁶

A. V. Ponedelkov⁷⁷

Valentin G. Medvedev⁴

R. G. Magomedkhanov⁵

Abstract

The authors analyze the problems and perspectives of fighting against corruption in modern Russia based on the materials of a sociological survey conducted in November-December 2017 by the Laboratory of Problems of Improving the Efficiency of State and Municipal Management in the South-Russian Institute of Management (the branch of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration) in 15 regions of the Russian Federation within preparation for the Round Table with an international participation "Problems of fighting against corruption in the state and municipal service and ways to solve them in modern Russia" (16-17 February, 2018, Rostov-on-Don).

In the paper there are analyzed the assessments of experts on the content of corruption in Russia, its level; there are also identified threats to security formed by corruption manifestations. The authors clarify the main reasons for bribery of state and municipal employees, determine the areas affected by corruption to the greatest extent; examine the role of the Federal Law of the Russian Federation "On Fighting against

Resumen

Los autores analizan los problemas y perspectivas de la lucha contra la corrupción en la Rusia moderna sobre la base de los materiales de una encuesta sociológica realizada en noviembre-diciembre de 2017 por el Laboratorio de Problemas de Mejora de la Eficiencia de la Administración Estatal y Municipal en el Instituto de Administración del Sur de Rusia (la rama de la Academia Presidencial Rusa de Economía Nacional y Administración Pública) en 15 regiones de la Federación Rusa en preparación para la Mesa Redonda con una participación internacional "Problemas de lucha contra la corrupción en el servicio estatal y municipal y formas de resolverlos en Rusia moderna" (16-17 febrero, 2018, Rostov-on-Don).

En el documento se analizan las evaluaciones de expertos sobre el contenido de la corrupción en Rusia, su nivel; también se identifican amenazas a la seguridad formadas por manifestaciones de corrupción. Los autores aclaran las principales razones del soborno de los empleados estatales y municipales, determinan las áreas afectadas por la corrupción en la mayor medida; examinar el

⁷⁵ Doctor of Juridical Science, Professor. Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation, E-mail: raven_serg@mail.ru

⁷⁶ Doctor of Political Sciences, Candidate of Legal Sciences. Vladivostok State University of Economics and Service. E-mail: mamychev@yandex.ru

⁷⁷ Doctor of Political Sciences, Professor. Honored Worker of Science of the Russian Federation. Russian Academy of National Economy and Public Administration under the President of the Russian Federation. E-mail: ponedelkov@uriu.ranepa.ru

⁴ Doctor of Juridical Science, Head of the Department of Theory and History of State and Law. Togliatti State University. E-mail: ip@tltu.ru

⁵ Candidate of Juridical Science, Associate Professor. Taganrog Institute named after A. P. Chekhov (branch), Federal State Budgetary Educational Institution of Higher Education "Rostov State Economical University (Rostov Institute of national economy)". E-mail: ragim01@rambler.ru

corruption" in the implementation of anti-corruption measures, assess the effectiveness of the ban on employees to receive gifts in connection with their official position; examine the opinion of experts on the advisability of adding greater punitive measures or mitigation of punishment for bribery.

At the end of the paper, directions for improving anti-corruption activities are formulated. The authors of the paper concluded that the increase in the effectiveness of anti-corruption activities depends on the depth of corruption nature research and the forms of corruption manifestation in contemporary Russian society. In the current situation, along with the repressive method of suppression of corruption manifestations, the strategic direction of combating corruption should be to identify and eliminate the causes and factors that form corruption risks.

Keywords: corruption, bribery, spheres of corruption, objects of influence, level of corruption, anti-corruption education.

papel de la Ley Federal de la Federación de Rusia "sobre la lucha contra la corrupción" en la aplicación de medidas contra la corrupción, evaluar la eficacia de la prohibición de que los empleados reciban obsequios en relación con su posición oficial; examine la opinión de los expertos sobre la conveniencia de agregar medidas punitivas más importantes o la mitigación del castigo por soborno.

Al final del documento, se formulan instrucciones para mejorar las actividades anticorrupción. Los autores del documento concluyeron que el aumento en la efectividad de las actividades anticorrupción depende de la profundidad de la investigación de la naturaleza de la corrupción y las formas de manifestación de corrupción en la sociedad rusa contemporánea. En la situación actual, junto con el método represivo de represión de las manifestaciones de corrupción, la dirección estratégica para combatir la corrupción debe ser identificar y eliminar las causas y los factores que forman los riesgos de corrupción.

Palabras clave: Corrupción, soborno, esferas de corrupción, objetos de influencia, nivel de corrupción, educación anticorrupción.

Resumo

Os autores analisam os problemas e perspectivas da luta contra a corrupção na Rússia moderna, com base em materiais de uma pesquisa sociológica realizada em novembro-dezembro 2017 pela Melhoria da Eficiência Problemas Laboratório da Administração Estatal e Municipal no Instituto de Administração no sul da Rússia (o ramo da Academia Presidencial Russa de Economia Nacional e da Administração Pública) em 15 regiões da Federação Russa em preparação para a Mesa Redonda com a participação internacional "Problemas de anti-corrupção estado e de serviços municipais e as formas de resolvê-los na Rússia moderna" (16-17 fevereiro de 2018, Rostov-on-Don).

As avaliações de especialistas documento sobre o conteúdo da corrupção na Rússia, analisa seu nível; Ameaças de segurança formadas por manifestações de corrupção também são identificadas. Os autores esclarecem as principais razões de suborno de funcionários estaduais e municipais, determinar as áreas afetadas pela corrupção em toda a extensão; examinar o papel da Lei Federal da Federação Russa "na luta contra a corrupção" na implementação de medidas anti-corrupção, avaliar a eficácia da proibição de que os funcionários recebam presentes em conexão com a sua posição oficial; examinar a opinião de especialistas sobre a possibilidade de adicionar mais importantes medidas punitivas ou mitigar a punição para o suborno.

No final do documento, as instruções são formulados para aumentar as atividades anti-corrupção. Os autores do documento concluiu que o aumento da eficácia das atividades anti-corrupção depende da profundidade de investigação da natureza da corrupção e formas de manifestação da corrupção na sociedade russa contemporânea. Na situação atual, juntamente com o método represivo da repressão de manifestações de corrupção, direcionamento estratégico para combater a corrupção deve ser identificar e eliminar as causas e os fatores são os riscos de corrupção.

Palavras-chave: Corrupção, suborno, corrupção esferas, objetos de influência, nível de corrupção, educação anti-corrupção.

Introduction

In the modern period, the problems of fighting against corruption have firmly established themselves among the topical problems not only of the third world countries, but also of the most economically developed countries. Since 2008 in the Russian Federation systematic work has been carried out to identify, prevent and suppress corruption manifestations, and to create in the society an aversion to corrupt behavior through consistent anti-corruption education.

In order to study public opinion on the nature and content of corruption, and the areas of effective counteraction to this phenomenon in the state and municipal service, in November-December 2017 the Laboratory of Problems of Improving the Efficiency of State and Municipal Management of the South-Russian Institute of Management (the branch of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration) has conducted in the territory of a number subjects of the Russian Federation (Rostov, Moscow, Arkhangelsk, Kurgan, Chelyabinsk, Yaroslavl regions, Krasnodar, Primorsky and Stavropol Territory, the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania, Bashkortostan, Karelia) a sociological survey of experts (1005 people from among the representatives of state authorities and local self-government, the judiciary and law enforcement bodies, from the sphere of science and education, members of political parties and public organizations, journalists) [Problems]; some results of the survey are given below.

Opinions of experts on the content of corruption in Russia

According to experts, corruption as a phenomenon of Russian reality characterizes, first of all, with the *receipt or giving bribes to officials*. So, from 90% to 55% of experts in the Moscow, Rostov and Kurgan regions, the Krasnodar and Stavropol Territories, the Republic of Bashkortostan, Komi, North Ossetia-Alania, and the Chechen Republic believe that this is the case.

Of course, the characterization of the corruption content as bribery does not cover the variety of forms in which it can manifest itself at the present

time. Therefore, in Arkhangelsk, Yaroslavl and Chelyabinsk regions, and in Primorsky Territory most experts see the essence of corruption in the *use of official position for personal purposes*. This characteristic of corruption firmly occupies the second rank position in the assessments of experts who have placed "*receiving or giving a bribe to an official*" on the first position.

Practically in all 15 federal subjects, experts placed such characteristics of corruption as "*misappropriation of public resources for personal purposes*", "*use of state or municipal funds for personal purposes*", "*illegal distribution of public resources*" on the third position.

The scatter of experts' opinions on such a characteristic of corruption as "*giving gifts to officials for making a "necessary decision"*": from 50.0% in the Stavropol Territory, 37.5% in the republics of Bashkortostan and Komi, 35.4% in the Kurgan region, 29.2% in the Rostov region, up to 12.7% in the Moscow region and 4.1% in the Chechen Republic.

Experts noted that the key problem of modern Russia is insufficient effectiveness of the state and municipal management system caused by a decrease in the professional level of officials and their corruption. The latter circumstance formed the conditions for penetration of a significant number of low competence persons in the authorities, and introduction by them of illegal mechanisms of activity into the elite layer (Sharkov).

Thus, by experts, the contents of corruption is associated primarily with the offenses of *officials* which include persons performing permanent or temporary functions of a representative of authority in the state government, a local government, state and municipal authorities, state corporations, state-owned companies, state and municipal unitary enterprises, joint-stock companies, the controlling interest of which belongs to the Russian Federation, the federal subjects of the Russian Federation or municipal entities, as well as in the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, other troops and military formations of the Russian Federation. Such an understanding of the essence of

corruption by experts coincides with its textbook definition given by the well-known criminologist A. I. Dolgova who has defined corruption as "a social phenomenon characterized by a bribery, i.e. vendibility of state or other employees, and the self-serving use of official powers, associated authority and opportunities for them in personal or narrowly grouped, or corporate interests on this basis" [Criminology, p.501]. At the same time, some components of the content of corruption may have their own characteristics, depending on the socio-economic situation in the subject of the federation, in which this phenomenon is investigated.

Opinions of experts on threats to security, which are formed by corruption manifestations.

Analysis of the materials of the sociological survey of experts in the Krasnodar, Primorsky and Stavropol Territories, the Rostov and Yaroslavl regions, and the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania shows that they see the main fear of corruption for Russian society and the state as a *threat to the national security of a state* which vulnerability is substantially increased due to possible bribery of Russian civil servants from representatives of other states, to work in their interests.

In this context, national security refers to conditions of protection of the individual, society and the state from internal and external threats, upon which implementation of the constitutional rights and freedoms of citizens of the Russian Federation, decent quality and standard of living, sovereignty, independence, state and territorial integrity, and stable socio-economic development of the Russian Federation are ensured. Ensuring the national security involves not only identifying, preventing and eliminating threats to security, but also counteracting their sources [Vorontsov, p.24].

According to experts from the Arkhangelsk region and the Chechen Republic, the main threat of corruption is *destruction of the concepts of morality, honesty and justice*.

Experts from the Moscow and Chelyabinsk regions believe that corruption deprives of meaning the state institutions, replacing by themselves the public administrative and legal procedures.

Experts from the Rostov region, Primorsky and Stavropol Territories see at the second ranking position such threat of corruption that it *spreads the illegal world view in society: once the laws are not binding for the corrupted elite, it means that they generally can not be respected*. Experts from the Republic of Karelia, Bashkortostan and Komi singled out this threat of corruption as the main one.

Experts from the Arkhangelsk, Kurgan, Moscow and Rostov regions, Krasnodar, Stavropol and Primorsky Territories, the republics of Bashkortostan and Komi believe that the strategic danger of corruption lies in the fact that it *destroys social justice and reduces the level of political loyalty of citizens to the state and its political leaders*.

Opinions of experts on the level of corruption in the Russian Federation.

In the Arkhangelsk and Rostov regions, and in the Chechen Republic experts estimated the real level of corruption as *notable, but in recent years it has significantly decreased*.

In other subjects involved in the survey, experts assessed the level and prevalence of corruption in state structures as *very high*. This is the opinion of 85.4% of experts in the Chelyabinsk region, 79.8% of experts in the Krasnodar Territory, 72.9% of experts in the Yaroslavl region, 70.8% of experts in the Stavropol Territory, 68.8% of experts in the Kurgan region, 68.6% of experts in the republics of Bashkortostan and Komi, 60.4% in the Republic of Karelia.

At the same time, 12.1% of experts from the Moscow region, 20.6% from the Chechen Republic, 4.2% from the Primorsky Territory, 2.1% from the Krasnodar Territory noted that *corruption has been virtually eradicated and only a few special cases of bribery occur*.

Experts' assessments allow us to speak about a certain decrease in the level of corruption, which is a consequence of the complex of measures on combating corruption implemented in the country. The effectiveness of this process is directly dependent on how accurately the causes that contribute to the reproduction of corrupt manifestations will be identified and eliminated.

Opinions of experts on the main reasons for bribery in officials.

Experts from the Moscow and Kurgan regions, the Krasnodar Territory, the Karelia Republics and North Ossetia-Alania specified the *lack of moral signs and decency among officials* as the main reason for bribery among officials of state structures.

Experts from the Rostov, Chelyabinsk and Yaroslavl regions, the republics of Bashkortostan and Komi see the main reason for bribery among government officials in the *patronage of corrupted officials by higher officials*.

Experts from the Arkhangelsk region and the Stavropol and Primorsky Territories, the Chechen Republic pointed to *imperfection of the legislative base, the "vagueness" of the basic concepts, and insufficiently severe punishment for bribery*.

The second ranking position is occupied with *low salaries of officials*. Then follows the *inefficient implementation of anti-corruption legislation*.

As follows from the above, the reasons reproducing corruption manifestations can not be eliminated by repressive means or localized exclusively in the process of anti-corruption education of state and municipal employees. They require making significant adjustments to the organization of education and upbringing of youth in schools and higher educational institutions, improving the social and economic situation in the country, including raising wages.

Opinions of experts on areas affected by corruption to the greatest extent.

Law enforcement agencies were indicated at the first ranking position by experts from the Rostov and Kurgan region, the republics of Bashkortostan and Komi, and Stavropol Territory.

Experts from the Moscow, Chelyabinsk and Yaroslavl regions, the Krasnodar and Primorsky Territories, the Republics of Karelia and North Ossetia-Alania, singled out *state bodies*.

According to experts, corruption is the most developed in the *sphere of business and entrepreneurship* in the Arkhangelsk region and in the Chechen Republic.

The above assessments of experts differ from the statements of the leaders of law enforcement agencies of Russia that among the spheres which are the most susceptible to corruption encroachments are education, health care, science and culture [Chapter]. These differences can be explained by the fact that the law enforcement bodies allocate "areas affected by corruption" based on the results they obtained during the operational-search activity, preliminary investigation and trial conducted in the areas of law enforcement activities specified in the National Anti-Corruption Plan. No one in the country knows in what proportion the data obtained by law enforcement agencies on the identified corruption manifestations in these areas are related with a real level of corruption in other areas. Experts also assess this problem on the basis of the socio-economic and criminogenic situation that has developed in a specific federal subject.

Opinions of experts on compliance with the main provisions of the Federal Law "On Combating Corruption".

In response to this question, experts point out in the vast majority of subjects studied that *most of the provisions of the Federal Law "On Combating Corruption" are observed*.

The exception is the Moscow region where only 8.2% of experts adhere to this opinion, 24.3% believe that the *provisions of this law are practically not observed*, and 37.0% believe that the *provisions of the law are absolutely not observed*. In the Stavropol Territory, 45.8% of experts noted that the provisions of the Federal Law "On Fighting against corruption" are *practically not being implemented*.

It is alarming that a sufficiently significant part of experts is not familiar with the text of the law. Thus, among the experts of the Moscow region they make 26.1%, Krasnodar Region - 26%, Stavropol Territory - 22.0%, the Republic of Karelia - 20.8%, Bashkortostan and Komi - 18.7%. This information may indicate the need to intensify the anti-corruption education of state and municipal employees in these regions of the Russian Federation.

Opinions of experts on implementation of control over expenditures of officials of federal (municipal) authorities.

In the opinion of experts from the Krasnodar Territory and the Chechen Republic, the control over compliance of expenditures born by officials of federal authorities with their incomes is *fully realized*. They hold a similar opinion with regard to monitoring compliance of expenditures born by officials of the regional municipalities with their incomes.

Experts from the Arkhangelsk, Kurgan, Rostov, Chelyabinsk and Yaroslavl regions, the Primorsky and Stavropol Territories, the Republics of Karelia, Bashkortostan and Komi believe that *control over the compliance of federal government officials with their incomes is carried out, but officials have the opportunity to conceal a part of their income*. They hold a similar opinion regarding implementation of control over compliance of expenditures born by officials of the municipal authorities of their region with their incomes.

The data of experts of the Moscow region are alarming: 43.3% of them believe that there is no control over the compliance of federal officials' expenditures with their incomes. They adhere to the same opinion with regard to the control over compliance of expenditures born by officials of the municipal authorities of the region with their incomes (49.7%). It was difficult to answer for 11.5% and 17.5% of experts, respectively.

Opinions of experts on the effectiveness of the ban on employees to accept presents.

Attempts by authorities to prohibit employees from accepting presents repeatedly took place in Russian history. Thus, a tsar Ivan the Terrible explained the introduction of oprichnina terror by the desire to destroy the corrupted officials "so that new rulers to whom he gave a power, would hold a court according to his law codes, without tributes, gifts and donations", [Russians, p.49]. In 1832, during the reign of Emperor Nicholas I, a decree was issued "On prohibition to the commanding persons to accept the offerings from society", which required officials to limit themselves only to state salaries.

An important decree was passed by the Senate in 1812 during the reign of Alexander I [On the prohibition] "On the prohibition of bringing presents to the Heads of the Provincial and other officials".

It seems that all these decrees had no serious consequences for the tradition of giving presents to leaders remained to this day. Today, the norms of the Federal Law No.119-FZ dated 31 July, 1995, "On the Principles of the Public Service of the Russian Federation", the Federal Law No. 79-FZ dated 27.07.2004 "On the Civil Service of the Russian Federation", the Federal Law No.25-FZ dated 02.03.2007 "On the municipal service in the Russian Federation", and Article 575 of the Civil Code of the Russian Federation, and others, are aimed at its eradication. Let's consider how, according to experts, these documents are being implemented.

Most experts from the Arkhangelsk, Kurgan, Moscow, Rostov, Chelyabinsk and Yaroslavl regions, Krasnodar, Primorsky and Stavropol Territories, the republics of Karelia, Bashkortostan, Komi, and North Ossetia-Alania believe that the *introduction of this ban did not affect the level of corruption in the country*.

Experts of the Chechen Republic believe that the introduction of the ban *significantly reduced the opportunities for bribes by officials*.

The experts expressed their unanimity indicating that *the prohibition in question prevents only bribes in especially large amounts* as a second ranking position.

The experts pointed out (as their special opinion) on that the ban on accepting presents for their employees did not play a special role, as officials stopped taking presents at their duty station and transferred the process to office cars, cafes, restaurants and the place of residence.

It should be noted that according to the materials of this and other opinion polls, experts assess the efforts of the state and society to combat corruption, establish various kinds of prohibitions, introduce codes of ethics into practice, and so on. (Elitogenesis).

Opinion of experts on the resonant detention of officials who took bribes in a particularly large amount.

Among the resonant criminal cases that have been implemented in the Russian Federation in recent years, there are cases involving ministers Anatoly Serdyukov and Alexei Ulyukayev, governors Leonid Korotkov, Vyacheslav Dudka, Alexander Tishanin, Vasily Yurchenko, Nikolai

Demin, Vyacheslav Geiser, Vladimir Torlopov, and others.

Answering the question about the connection of resonant detentions of high-ranking officials with the anti-corruption policy of the state, experts from the Arkhangelsk, Kurgan, Moscow, Rostov, Chelyabinsk and Yaroslavl regions, Krasnodar, Primorsky and Stavropol Territories, the republics of Bashkortostan, Karelia, Komi and North Ossetia-Alania pointed that, in their opinion, the *majority of detentions were of a "demonstrational nature" to create the appearance of the fight against corruption.*

Experts of the Chechen Republic have not doubts that *all resonant detentions are the result of fighting corruption in the country.* The same answer corresponds to the second rank for all the above experts' assessments.

Approximately 10% of experts believe that *those officials were detained who did not deduct a percent, or interests, of the amounts received as a bribe to the top management.* In the Krasnodar Territory, this figure achieves 41.6%.

Thus, the widely known mindset of the President of Russia V. V. Putin that "corruption must be uprooted without looking at faces and posts", is being realized to a certain extent [Putin].

Opinion of the experts about the necessity of adding greater punitive measures or mitigation of punishment for bribery.

Crimes of a corruption nature are characterized by increased public danger, as they infringe upon the foundations of the state system, violate the activities of public authority and administration that are regulated by law and comply with the interests of social development; they also violate constitutional rights and legitimate interests of citizens and organizations. In recent years in the Russian Federation the responsibility for corruption offenses has been consistently increased. Thus, the Federal Law No.324-FZ dated 03.07.2016 has amended seven articles of the Criminal Code pertaining to corruption-related crimes: 104.1 (Confiscation of property); 184 (Infringement on the result of an official sports competition or entertainment commercial competition); 204 (Commercial bribery); 290 (Getting a bribe); 291 (giving bribes); 291.1 (Mediation in bribery); 304 (Provoking bribery or commercial bribery), and

three new articles were introduced: 204.1 (Mediation in commercial bribery); 204.2 (Minor commercial bribery); 291.2 (Minor bribery) of the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation.

Nevertheless, the problem of bribery remains very relevant, as before.

The experts participating in the sociological survey were asked to express an opinion on the sufficiency and fairness of the punishment specified in the legislation of the Russian Federation for taking bribes.

Experts from the Moscow and Yaroslavl regions, the Primorsky and Stavropol Territories, the republics of North Ossetia-Alania, Bashkortostan and Komi are convinced of the need to *add greater punitive measures for bribery than it is specified in the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation.*

Experts from the Arkhangelsk, Kurgan, Rostov, Chelyabinsk regions, the Krasnodar Territory, the Republic of Karelia and the Chechen Republic believe that the punishment specified in the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation is in *full conformity with the nature of the act.* At the same time, the task of making a punishment for taking bribes stiffer than it is specified in the Criminal Code of the Russian Federation occupies the second ranking position for those experts.

The opinion that a *punishment for taking bribes is too stiff and unfair* was supported by 2 to 10% of experts that participated in the poll in the federal subjects.

Opinions of experts about the need to stiffen a punishment for bribery depending on the level of an official's position.

In one of his speeches, Russian President Vladimir Putin said that corruption in the sphere of ensuring national security is a high treason. The Vice Prime Minister of the Russian Federation, Dmitry Rogozin, said he believes corruption in the defense sector is a grave crime against the country's defense. The deputy of the State Duma of the Russian Federation, a member of the committee for security and anti-corruption Nikolai Kovalev proposed to qualify bribes of high-ranking officials, including governors, as well as investigators, prosecutors and judges, who, incidentally, take an oath of allegiance to the Fatherland, as a treason [Bribe].

Considering the foregoing, the experts were asked to answer the question: Is it necessary to determine the degree of punishment for bribery for officials depending on the level of the position they occupy?

Experts from the Arkhangelsk, Kurgan, Rostov, Chelyabinsk and Yaroslavl regions, Krasnodar, Stavropol and Primorsky Territories, the Republics of Bashkortostan and Komi believe that *officials of a higher rank should be punished for bribery stiffer than ordinary employees*.

Experts in the Moscow region, the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania and the Chechen Republic are convinced that *punishment for taking bribes should be the same for all officials regardless of their rank*.

In the Republic of Karelia, the opinions of experts are divided equally between the above positions.

Experts' opinions on the role of mass media in fighting against corruption.

The issue of the role of the mass media in fighting against corruption is very relevant, because the press, television, radio, and online publications form in the minds of the population an idea of the level of corruption in the country, the causes and factors that contribute to its reproduction, its driving forces, the scale of damage to an individual, society and state. Analysis of the materials of the sociological survey shows that there are serious problems with the transmission of anti-corruption information to its potential consumer.

According to experts, in none of the subjects involved in the poll, with the exception of the Chechen Republic, the *federal media does not cover the results of the fight against corruption in full*.

Experts in the Arkhangelsk, Kurgan, Moscow, Rostov, Chelyabinsk and Yaroslavl regions, the Krasnodar, Primorsky and Stavropol Territories, the republics of Bashkortostan, Karelia, Komi, and North Ossetia-Alania are convinced that *federal mass media provide information only on the most resonant detentions*.

It is alarming that in a number of subjects the percentage of experts who expressed the opinion that *the results of fight against corruption are almost not covered, or are not covered in federal media*: the Moscow Region (30%), the Arkhangelsk Region (25.1%), the Primorsky

Territory (21%), the Stavropol Territory (27.1%).

As for regional media, the experts expressed similar assessments. Only experts from the Chechen Republic claim that the *regional media cover the results of the fight against corruption in full measure* (49.9%), while 35.1% hold the opinion that only large-scale detentions are covered. The experts of the Komi Republic also hold a similar opinion: 43.8% and 41.6%, respectively.

There is also a high percentage of experts who expressed the opinion that *the results of the fight against corruption are almost not covered, or are not covered in their regional media*: the Moscow region (27.6%), the Rostov region (24.6%), the Arkhangelsk region (33.4%), the Kurgan Region (31.2%), the Republic of North Ossetia-Alania (33.4%), and the Stavropol Territory (37.6%).

As their special opinion, experts pointed out the lack of summary information on the high-profile bribe-takers' resonance detentions, what gives rise to the view that, as in the case of Serdyukov, Vasilieva and others, they managed to avoid severe punishment. Experts drew attention to the fact that in the central and regional media there are no materials on the so-called *journalistic investigations*, which in past years have shown the importance of mass media as the "fourth" power.

Factors hampering anti-corruption, specified by experts.

Experts attributed the following factors to those which reduce effectiveness of fighting against corruption in the Russian Federation:

- high corruption of authorities, which is the basis of unwillingness to fight corruption;
- lack of effective state personnel policy and modern mechanisms of elite formation;
- the confidence of high-ranking corrupted officials in their subterfuge;
- the absence of a criminal-legal institution for the full confiscation of the corruptor's property, including those registered to relatives;
- high level of corruption in law enforcement agencies and judiciary;
- low level of legal culture of the population, legal nihilism of a part of society;

- internal consent of a part of the population to solve arising problems by corruptive methods, giving the chance to save time and means.

Conclusions and offers.

- **Determine the system of indicators of the level of corruption.** According to the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia, the number of areas, which are "the most vulnerable to criminal attacks", that is, those areas where anti-corruption measures and technologies should apply as a matter of priority, include public procurement, education, health, science and culture [Interior Minister].

It should be noted that the data provided by the Ministry of Internal Affairs of Russia characterize objectively not the existing spheres which are "most susceptible to criminal encroachment", but those areas where law enforcement bodies managed to obtain concrete results in the fight against manifestations of corruption. No one in the country knows what is the proportion of data on revealing the corruption manifestations obtained in these areas, to actual levels of corruption in other areas; the reason is that the level of corruption in the country is predetermined by operational search activity in spheres or contingents allocated by the country's political leadership. Thus, in what spheres the next anti-corruption blow will be struck, depends not only on the objective prerequisites of the social being and the emerging criminal situation, but also on the spheres and social groups specified in the National Anti-Corruption Plan for the relevant period.

The conclusion is justifiable that law enforcement officers, like the representatives of the scientific community, have a very contradictory view which has not been confirmed by objective materials on the structure of corruption, and how it is distributed in different spheres and contingents. When assessing the statistical indicators of anti-corruption based on the results of the law enforcement system activity, it can not be asserted that these indicators are objectively related to the change in the actual level of corruption in the country.

It seems that the main task of the scientific community today is to provide practical assistance to law enforcement bodies in establishing the basic patterns and indicators of corruption.

- **Correct the ratio between repressive and preventive measures in the fight against corruption.** Today, the repressive aspect realized in the fight against corruption by the system of law enforcement bodies, is prominently highlighted. The desire of these bodies to obtain significant formal indicators of anti-corruption activity forms the impression of a high level of corruption in the country or a region. There is no doubt that corruption manifestations must be suppressed in accordance with the current legislation. Thus, a repressive method is necessary as a way to ensure the inevitability of punishment, but this is not enough, because the struggle is carried out not with the causes and factors that generate corruption, but with corrupted officials, which is not the same thing.

Undoubtedly, anti-corruption education plays an important role in combating corruption. However, upbringing and enlightenment is a very long-term process, the results of which will be manifested gradually, for a long time, because human nature has not been changed in any short time by anyone in the history of mankind.

Man is a being with reason. And in a situation where there is a choice, man chooses the least expensive and most profitable path for him/herself. And life shows, that no matter how much we would tell a person that it's bad to give and take bribes: if a situation arises where it is possible quickly and cost-effectively achieve a benefit, neither ethical norms nor laws do not work regardless of a title or rank. For people give and take bribes from considerations of survival, comfort and prestige.

It should be taken into account that most of the bribes are given by people to solve an issue. Therefore, a state should create conditions for solving those problems that are traditionally resolved through bribery. It is necessary to apply to this process the technologies that separate a potential briber from a bribe-taker. So, all over the world there is widely used principle of "single window" which allows to separate the consumer of services and its executors. Introduction of electronic technologies of state services under public control has already partially changed the field of corruption risks. There are a lot of examples of this: an electronic queue for registration in a kindergarten, obtaining documents on land and property issues,

obtaining a passport, a rating system in higher education institutions, etc. It is necessary to further expand the network of such services, increase "transparency" of activities of public authorities and local self-government.

- Improvement of the forms and methods of anti-corruption education. More than half of experts pointed to the need to increase the effectiveness of anti-corruption education aimed at assimilating the foundations of a culture of anti-corruption behavior as a key place in the system of measures to fight corruption. In the opinion of experts, courses of anti-corruption measures should be taught at higher educational institutions and additional education faculties within the framework of the state order for professional retraining, upgrading of qualifications and training of civil servants aimed at forming of intolerance in society to corrupt behavior, to attract state and municipal employees, as well as citizens, to participate more actively in the fight against corruption. This aspect correlates with the world experience of fighting corruption, because connecting the society to fighting against corruption will contribute to overall systemic transformation and minimization of corruption.

Reference

- Bribe as a betrayal of the Motherland: bureaucratic officials are offered to equate to traitors. [Digital source]. Access mode: <https://pasm.ru/archive/132673/>
- Corruption caused damage to the RF by 130 billion rubles in 2.5 years. [Digital source]. Access mode : <https://www.gazeta.ru/social/2017/08/09/10825598.shtml>
- Criminology: A Textbook for Law Schools / Under the General Ed. of A. I. Dolgova. M., 1997. Ivanov P.I., Shegabudinov R.A. Economic and corruption crime and its latency as an object of criminological research. [Digital source]. The access mode: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/ekonomicheskaya-i-korruptsionnaya-prestupnost-i-ee-latentnost-kak-obekt-kriminologicheskogo-izucheniya>
- Letters missive of Veliky Novgorod and Pskov. Ed. by S. N. Valok. M. -L., 1949. P.145. No.88.
- On the prohibition to bring presents to the Governors and other officials: Decree of the Russian Senate dated 10 March, 1812 // PSZ. - V.32. - No.25028
- Ponedelkov A.V., Starostin A.M. 2017. Expert dimension of the modern Russian elite representation. - *Communicology*. № 1.
- Ponedelkov A.V., Starostin A.M., Yalansky A.P. 2016. *Elites and strategies* for the development of modern Russia. Information and analytical materials for the II All-Russia Elitology Congress. Rostov-on-Don. : Publishing house of the South-Russian Institute of Management (the branch of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration).
- Problems of fighting against corruption in the state and municipal service and ways of their solution in modern Russia. Lokota O.V., Shutov A. Yu. (group head), Zolochevskaya E. Yu., Ponedelkov A. V. (deputy head), Vorontsov S. A. (deputy head) and others. Information and analytical materials of the Round table with international participation. - Rostov-on-Don: Publishing House of the South-Russian Institute of Management (the branch of the Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration), 2018. - 128 p.
- Putin on the corruption of officials: we will root out this infection. [Digital source]. Access mode : <https://ria.ru/politics/20131114/976920692.html>
- Russian tsars. 1547 - 1917. Rostov on Don., 1997. Sharkov F.I., Ponedelkov A.V., Vorontsov S.A. On the Problems of the Contemporary Russian Political Elite and Possible Directions of their Resolution // Bulletin of the Peoples' Friendship University of Russia. Series : Sociology. 2017. V.17. № 4. Pp.524-541.
- The head of the Ministry of Internal Affairs named the five most corrupted spheres in Russia. RIA News. [Digital source]. Access mode : <https://ria.ru/society/20161005/1478557987.html>
- The Prosecutor General's Office assessed the damage from corruption in Russia in 2016 at 78 billion rubles. [Digital source]. Access mode: https://www.dp.ru/a/2017/04/25/Genprokuratura_ocenila_ushh
- Vorontsov S., Mamychev A., Ponedelkov A., Yanguzin A. and Vildanov H. Elitogenesis in the Political Processes of Modern Russia, Based on Sociological (Field) Research // Man in Indian. 2017. Vol. 97. № 23. P. 273 – 284.
- Vorontsov S.A, Lokota O.V., Ponedelkov A.V. BASICS OF NATIONAL SECURITY OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION. Textbook / Rostov-on-Don, 2017.