

The Indigenization of Criminology in Iran: Barriers and Requirements

Mehran Sohrabi Asmaroud^{1*}

Ali Najafi Tavana² 

Abstract

The indigenization of criminology is easy and unavoidable. The main issue of the present study is the question of whether indigenization of criminology is possible in Iran or not? The primary hypothesis was based on the possibility of indigenization of criminology in Iran but the analytical inquiry by considering the requirements and barriers to indigenization, using a descriptive-analytical research method based on a critical approach, showed the dominance of barriers over the requirements and the refusal of indigenization of criminology. Based on the findings of the article, some of the most important challenges are: 1- Three ontological, epistemological and methodological challenges. 2- Incorrect confrontation with the new humanities sciences and the new man as its child. 3- Lack of formation of the "society of criminology" in Iran and lack of consistency of its main components such as academic man, academic identity, discipline independence and lack of democratization of the space for growth and prosperity of science. 4- Absence of social context, criminology and the man of criminology in criminological explanations. The present paper discusses the possibility of future criminology indigenization, while pointing to the role of facilitators (requirements), proposes some strategies to pass the harmless challenges of indigenization.

Keywords: *Indigenization of Criminology, Barriers of Criminology, Requirements of Criminology, Sociology of Knowledge, Philosophy of Science.*

1. Introduction

Indigenization of Criminology is an easy yet difficult task. The current paper is an exploration for identifying the obstacles and exigencies, and evaluating arguments of two dominant discourses in this area, that is the Exigency

*1. PhD Candidate in criminal law and criminology, Islamic Azad University Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran (Corresponding Author: Sohrabi2040@yahoo.com)

2. Assistant Professor, Islamic Azad University Central Tehran Branch, Tehran, Iran

Discourse and the Refrainment Discourse, and in the final analysis, answering the issue of possibility or impossibility of the indigenization of criminology in Iran. Regarding this, a wide spectrum of opinions, presumptions and approaches of the supporters and opponents of indigenization of criminology has been analytically probed, and on the other side, the approaches and discourses of those believing in the possibility and impossibility of indigenization of criminology in Iran have been put to the test of analyses and examination. The present research believes that production of science, in the general meaning, and indigenization of criminology, in the particular meaning of the word, is a mental, cognitive, and epistemological effort and indigenization of criminology means internalization of crime control in the social context using Iranian wisdom. This research , while correctly and efficiently assessing needs for addressing the issue of indigenization and having deep scientific belief that solving domestic issues takes domestic theories and approaches and given the fundamental necessities governing indigenization and analysis of domestic and external examples of miscalculated, slogan-like and instructed indigenization and while adopting scientific realism regarding the basics and sources of indigenous knowledge, has tried to present an honest and trustworthy narrative of the thoughts of supporters of the Exigency discourse, as well as tried to win them over in the documentation of the main question of “ why we are in need of indigenization of criminology?

2. Methodology

The present paper has used a Qualitative and Descriptive-Analytical method, with a Theoretical – Critical approach. Considering the nature of the subject researched, the Theoretical – Critical approach gives the researcher the possibility to consider the arguments of supporters and opponents, and provide an epistemological occasion for identifying the obstacles and exigencies, and finally possibility or impossibility of producing domestic endogenous and exogenous theories of criminology.

3. Results and discussion

The paper has analyzed and examined the opinions of the supporters and opponents of indigenization of criminology in Iran for proving or rejecting the raised theory (Possibility of Indigenization of Criminology), and in the battles of opinions, the authors themselves have not appeared as passive observers and mere narrators of competing arguments, but when appropriate, have provided scientific analyses, evaluations, criticisms and examinations of both pro and against arguments. The major arguments of the supporters of indigenization of criminology have been for scientific qualification of the domestic sources for the possibility of indigenization of criminology in Iran, and due to this, the Exigency Discourse has deemed itself needless of translation of basic sources of

western criminology and refrained from imitating the theories of criminologists of pioneering countries in the Western Criminology area, and has stressed the adequacy of the domestic knowledge sources, and in contrast, the opponents of indigenization, while warning the supporters to avoid superficial, popular, pseudo-scientific and reductionist interpretations of compressed indigenization, have considered the area of science production and indigenization of criminology as the major manifestation of original thought.

The supporters and opponents of indigenization of criminology in Iran seem to be subordinate to various paradigms, and this has heightened the arguments between them, and left the possibility of scientific evaluation and final assessment faced with obstacles, though in the final analysis, the arguments of the Refrainment Discourse have had more prominence and weight, making the believability of the arguments of this approach easier.

4. Conclusion

The present research, following profoundly discussing and delving into the basics and domestic sources of indigenization of criminology and with attention to the necessities governing them, have concluded that: 1) Indigenization of Criminology is a cognitive and epistemological issue, and in fact, a clear example of production of science, and the research tries not to fall into the trap of science-worshipping, scientific racism and scientific sectarianism. 2) The Iranian science system has never been effectively and correctly faced with the manifestations of the Modernity such as the new science, enlightenment, Renaissance, modern Humanities and modern mankind as its children, as well as the university and its main vocation (production of science), and still is acquiring, adopting and translating it, and in this capacity too, is suffering from the three challenges of ontology, epistemology, and methodology. 3) Finally, by analyzing the domestic epistemological sources on one side, and considering the rivaling arguments and the data from the Refrainment Discourse and research from the authors, on the other side, and by virtue of the dual models of Indigenization of Criminology (endogenous and exogenous), the Indigenization of Criminology will be impossible until next notice, but only by removing the existing challenges and barriers, there can be talk of Indigenization of Criminology by adopting the endogenous illuminating model in future.

Selection of References

- Arcand, S. Brillon, Y. (1973), **Comparative criminology**: Africa. *Acta criminological*, vol 6, Number 7, pp. 199-217.
- Ashouri, Dariush (1989), "Theory of Westoxication and the Crisis of Thought in Iran", **Iran Nameh Pub**, No. 27, pp. 460-454. [In Persian]

- Carrington, K. (2017), “Asian criminology and southern Epistemologies”, **comparative criminology and criminal justice Research**, school of social sciences. Monash university, Clayton, Vic Australia.
- Ghanieirad, M.A. (2010), “Independent Social Sciences/ Multiple Deuteronomy and Objectivity (A Look at the Opinions of Sayed Hussein and Sayyid Farid al-Attas)”, in: **Indigenous Science, World Scientific: Possibility or Refusal?** First Edition, Tehran: Jihad Pubs University. [In Persian]
- Hill, S. (1995), “Globalization or Indigenization: New Alignments Between knowledge and culture”, knowledge and policy: **The International Journal of knowledge transfer and utilization**, vol 8, number 2, pp. 88-112.
- Laufer S, William, Adler Freda (2017), **Advances in criminological theory**, Temple University, u. s. a, Routledge publication, Landon and Network.
- Laufers, William, Adler Freda (2017), “The challenges of Advances in criminological theory”, advances in **criminological theory**, Routledge publication, London and Network, vol 1.
- Mccord, Joan (2017), “Theory, pseudo theory, and Metatheory”, **advances in criminological theory, Willian S. Laufer and in Freda Adler**, Routledge publication, London and Network, vol 1.
- Messner, F. Steven (2017), “when west Meets East: Generalizing Theory and Expanding the conceptual Todkit of criminology”, **comparative criminology in Asia**, Springer series on Asian criminology and sciences, Monash university, clayton, VIC Australia.
- Phi, Brian (2010), **The Modern Philosophy of Social Sciences with a Multicultural Perspective**, translated by Khashayar Deihimi, fourth edition, Tehran: New Plan Pub [In Persian].

Citation:

Sohrabi Asmaroud, M. and Najafi Tavana, A. (2022). “The indigenization of criminology in Iran: barriers and equirements”, **Criminal Law Research**, 13(25), pp. 123-150. DOI:10.22124/jol.2022.19390.2122

Copyright:

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to *Criminal Law Research*. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided that the original work is properly cited.

