

Development of Theories of Criminology in the Process of Industrialization

Dr. Mohammad Ashori¹ and Farhad Mierzaei²

¹Full Professor, Department of Criminal Law & Criminology, College of law and Political Science, Tehran Science and Research Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran.

²PhD of Criminal Law and Criminology, Department of Criminal Law & Criminology, College of law and Political Science, science and research branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

Received: Nov. 2014 & Published: Jan. 2015

Abstract: The societies that have experienced industrialization have spent several steps since the beginning of the process of industrialization namely the early Industrial Revolution to the present that each of these stages has left the various impacts on such the communities that has been affected by the process; These changes are leading to the formation of the major theories in criminology from its beginnings to the present; The common feature of these theories is this factor that all of them have evolved in the context of industrial and postindustrial societies and the other factor is that they are looking for the underlying causes of crime within the society; This paper focuses on the examine of the formation of them in the industrialization of process by categorizing these theories In three intervals proportional to the growth and development of capitalist society.

Keywords: industrialization, crime, capitalism, theories of criminology

1. Introduction

Civilization and industrialization create communities that have the different and sometimes contradictory cultures together; the older patterns of values changed and some of them had lost their efficiency; in the field of criminology, globalization has changed the landscape of transnational crime by catalyzing processes of industrialization, development and urbanization, among others; Industrialization in Europe and America was a factor for the emergence of important theories about the impact of industrialization on the emergence specific crimes or the development of the crimes; The result of all this analysis focuses mainly on the analysis of social organization to than the individual. This paper focuses on examine of the formation of them in the industrialization of process by categorizing these theories in three intervals proportional to the growth and development of capitalist society (Vold, George. 1958). The classifications are as follows:

The first category is the early creation of criminology until 1950, the second category is

from 1950 to 1980 and the third category is from 1980.

1.1. Theories before 1950:

Among the various theories that have investigated on the topic of industrialization and its impact on society and crime we can refer to the four major theories: Positivism theory, Emile Durkheim's social stigma, *Robert Merton's* structural strain theory and *Cohen's* Crime *Opportunity theory*.

1.2. Positivism

The primary idea behind positivist criminology is that criminals are born as such and not made into criminals; in other words, it is the nature of the person, not nurture that results in criminal propensities. Moreover, the positive criminologist does not usually examine the role of free will in criminal activity. In the early 1800s, public executions used to be commonplace. The idea was that society would be afraid of the public punishment that came with wrongdoing and adjust their actions, Positivist theories have been criticized for failing to discover the causes of crime and to develop effective strategies for controlling

crime. Positivist theories discount the role of free will; instead it takes into account factors such as genetic transmission, personality, learning and moral development (Williams III, F. P., & McShane, M. D. (1999). The sociological perspective is also taken into account. Emphasis is placed on anomie (a lack of moral standards in society) and strain resulting from poverty imposed by a rigid class structure. Strategies to reduce crime would involve treatment at an individual level or intervene at a social level. The mentioned perspectives have formed in the nineteenth century, namely the strengthening period and further consolidation of the capitalist system and the capitalist mode of production in Europe (Taylor, Ian R. et al.1988). This time is a period that the world is witness to major changes in technology and methods of ((mass production)) instead of the dominant mode of agricultural production and commercial transactions; accordingly, the criminal theories of the first half of the twentieth century could not rely on the ancient dogma about depravity of the inherent; Therefore tendency to the natural science of research methods became common in the criminal science so far according to Kenney, senior author of criminal law, the development of Criminology revealed "unexpected complications" issues related to the crime; The nineteenth century in Europe was the period of the new thinking about the human of nature and throughout society, the effective factors in the formation of the positivist perspective in the field of criminology can be attributed with the two correlated change in this situation that happened on the end of the nineteenth century: The first transformation, the formation of a set of empirical researches that have attempted to provide the biological explanations of criminal attitudes((bio Positivism) and second transformation; the other fields of this research that was located to focus a set of psychological factors associated with crime; the formation and development of biological, psychological and social positivism perspective was the fundamental shift in the path of the classical tradition; The view that largely defined the crime as a phenomenon based on the individual case. In general, the views of the classical school

of positivism are located often in the conflict with each other.

1.3. Emile Durkheim's social stigma (Anomie):

This theory has been initially proposed by Emile Durkheim is based on the assumption that the problems can be found in the modern industrialized societies, previously there have not been and the society has been fully balanced. The actions and reactions were performed according to the values and consensus; the general consensus and social harmony have been transformed due to social changes caused by industrialization and forcibly, has created the new actions and conditions. So, that does not have the efficiency another longstanding practice nowadays. Durkheim divides the society into the two basic categories: Mechanical or primary communes and organic or modern. In the mechanical kind, there is the similar principle, Such as hunting tribes and pastoralist which all of them are doing just one job and its function of the Societies is promoting equality in the society (Siegel, L. J. (2001).

For Durkheim, anomie arises more generally from a mismatch between personal or group standards and wider social standards, or from the lack of a social ethic, which produces moral deregulation and an absence of legitimate aspirations, Therefore, the murder compared with the other crimes, did not consider crime a major in these communities and the parties accord to the amount of the victim's blood. The law of this society has punitive the mode; the purpose of the punishment is merely the satisfaction of the collective spirit in the society; the second kind is called the organic society that There is a division of labor within and their existential origin established by the differences in roles and social status; In the societies, depend all the members to each other due to the expansion and specialization of activities, However, Durkheim implies that there is some kind of division of labor in the primitive societies But the elementary division could lead to a loosening of Social Solidarity (Hirschi, T. (1969); in the society, All the elements are mundane. Stigma may also be described as a label that associates a person to a set of unwanted characteristics that form a stereotype.

It is also affixed. Once people identify and label your differences others will assume that is just how things are and the person will remain stigmatized until the stigmatizing attribute is undetected. A considerable amount of generalization is required to create groups, meaning that you put someone in a general group regardless of how well they actually fit into that group. However, the attributes that society selects differ according to time and place. What is considered out of place in one society could be the norm in another. When society categorizes individuals into certain groups the labeled person is subjected to status loss and discrimination. Society will start to form expectations about those groups once the cultural stereotype is secured. So, by the creation of the kind of societies placed the reconstructive law in front of the punitive law; to interpret of Durkheim, from the division of labor is extracted the rules that dictate the nature of the relationships and certain of roles but a violation of these rules leads only to the restorative measures and did not seek judgment. In the book of ((the social division of labor)), Durkheim explained the process of social change that was shaped with industrial development; the Most of communities are described in the book mechanically and the modern societies such as the organic but any society is not completely organic or mechanical according to Durkheim, industrialization has caused to get out of the human emotions from the restraints or conditions, However, the primitive societies were mainly taught through religion to control their desires and wishes. The modern industrial communities have away people from each other and have weakened the social ties thereby increasing complexity and division of labor people; In his opinion, people in these communities are at risk of anomie that He explained about it in the book of "suicide". Durkheim's use of the term anomie was about a phenomenon of industrialization—mass-regimentation that could not adapt due to its own inertia—its resistance to change, which causes disruptive cycles of collective behavior e.g. economics, due to the necessity of a prolonged buildup of sufficient force or momentum to overcome the inertia (Arthur, J. A. (1991); In Durkheim's view, traditional religions often

provided the basis for the shared values which the anomic individual lacks. Furthermore, he argued that the division of labor that had been prevalent in economic life since the Industrial Revolution led individuals to pursue egoistic ends rather than seeking the good of a larger community. Robert King Merton also adopted the idea of anomie to develop strain theory, defining it as the discrepancy between common social goals and the legitimate means to attain those goals. In other words, an individual suffering from anomie would strive to attain the common goals of a specific society yet would not be able to reach these goals legitimately because of the structural limitations in society. As a result, the individual would exhibit deviant behavior. From the perspective of Durkheim in Modern Society, severe punishments such as public executions and deportations replaced by penalties including imprisonment; as it becomes loose the religious foundations and public conscience in the pre- modern the society, Humanistic understanding of social interaction and interdependence makes it easier to identify crime as an act that occurs between individuals. Most theories of law and society are based on the assumption that the criminal executive guarantees directly related to by the complexity of community and the economic development (Marco Orru. (1983).

1.4. Robert Merton's structural strain theory:

Merton's theory like the other theories of the pressure has created within the developments of industrial community; therefore, like the theories, is seeking to answer the question of how to define the incidence of crime in the era of economic growth and prosperity; except that Durkheim described in the relation to the anomie at the macro level. But Merton believed in the level of the Individual; In other words, the first is looking for the question of the why of this process and second, to seek how of it; According to the American sociologist, in the every social group on the one hand, There are legitimate purposes and consistent within the values that the community offers to its members; On the other hand, the tools and legitimate capabilities provides to achieve this goal for them (Featherstone, R. & Deflem, M. (2003); Actually, to achieve the proposed objectives,

there are ways which at the same their effectiveness with known values are not consistent with in the law. Merton changes the concept slightly, to refer to a situation in which there is an apparent lack of fit between the culture's norms about what constitutes success in life (goals) and the culture's norms about the appropriate ways to achieve those goals (means). In fact, Merton is seen as a polar example of a society in which success goals (often defined primarily in monetary terms) are emphasized to everyone in the culture, and people are criticized as being quitters if they scale back their goals. His attempt to determine the prevalence of crime began to rely on the concept that the occurrence of the phenomenon is related with the ability of the community in the strengthening of the norms that regulate the behavior of people. Thus, he claims that can be explained the crime to help assess the relationship between two variables defined major cultural goals and institutionalized means in achieving those goals. In his view, by considering such cultural patterns, we are faced with five types of reactions: Conformism, Innovation, Practice-oriented, Defection and Rebellion; regarding the cause of the crime should be considered the phenomenon due to the rupture of social or societal processes. That is indicative of the social pressure within the community. The main focus of the analysis in the theory focuses on the pressures is associated with the ((structural opportunity)) and ((cultural processes)). The dominant idea is on the theory that the cause of crime can be searched in the inadequate of the tools and opportunities to achieve certain objectives; these lacks of tools are comparable with other tools that are available with other community members.

1.5. Cohen's Crime Opportunity theory:

Albert Cohen offered different versions of theory pressure in the famous research of the "Delinquent Boys," which was published in the 1955. The main idea of the foundation of These approach is the theory of pressure that in the different social situations, the individual how are associated with those who are involved in the perception of culturally acceptable and unacceptable behaviors into two categories; Cohen As well as Merton focuses on the industrial working class of delinquency but it also refers to the fact that the large part of such

behavior is very meaningful and not related to obtain money or goods; Cohen's main argument is that have been dominated by the middle class values and norms that they operate within the educational system and the mass media- in the American society; The working class boys that he calls them as ((corner boys)) do not have the tools to compete with the middle class boys that he calls them as ((College Boys)); Generally it can be said that the both Cohen and Merton, consider criminal behavior as a product of pressure which is derived from the inherent inequality of opportunity as the Industrial Society (Akers, R. (2000).

1.6. Theories 1950-1980:

The public opinion from 1960 is concerned about the phenomenon of fear of crime; On the one hand, the rapid growth of serious crimes was important and on the other hand, the current inability to rein the problem of crime in the criminal justice. That protest and insurgency of the prisoners of America, Italy and France occurred in the 1970. The cause of such events should search in the imbalance of economic development and transformation arising from inadequate prison conditions; since the start of this decade, criminologists and mainly North American criminologists influenced by the Marxist perspectives expanded the scope of his critical studies to the social reaction against crime and how to apply for it, the penal police, justice, prisons and even legislative institutions. A part of the motivation for forming such famous perspectives of criminology such as the *Labeling theory* can be seen behind in the changes that occurred in the advanced capitalist society, especially the United States of America during the 60s and 70s; in the Great Britain during the 1950s and 1960s that Garland called it the later such as an ideological framework punishment, During the 1960s in the UK, there was consensus on many of the issues partly, Amendment theory and the welfare of citizens; Namely the idea that should spend more money to provide for the welfare of the people fighting the underlying causes of crime

1.7. Marxist criminology:

Marxism offered one of the most famous theories of social oppression; Marxist criminology is one of the schools of criminology

that adopts a predefined political philosophy. Its function is similar to that of the functionalist school which concentrates stability and continuity producing factors in society. Marxist criminology is much influenced by the teaching of Karl Marx that law is the mechanism by which the ruling class keeps all the other classes in a deprived position. Marxist criminology focuses on the reason for the change of things, identifying the disruptive forces in industrialized societies, and describing how society is fractioned by power, wealth, prestige, and the perceptions of the world; Marxist theory argues that can be understood historically by focusing on different ways of production. This viewpoint also considers each mode of production involves different aspects such as the forces of production (tools and techniques), relationships of production (relations between lord and vassal, or capitalist and proletariat), the Social institutions (monarchy, parliamentary democracy) Accordingly, Marxist theorists argue that can be observed a transformation of the mode of production along with the motion of the Landholders in the capitalist system, Until the flourishing of the radical Criminology In the 1960s and 1970s was carried out the systematic attention to the crime or the criminal justice mainly by Marxists and others (leftist) the Marx and Engels have explained lower than in relation to the crime and more efforts have to Reconstructing their theories based on the collection of scattered remarks of Marx's early works such as "The Capital" which is a detailed historical analysis of the emergence of factory legislation in England in the early of the nineteenth century; Despite the fact that Marx had a few studies about crime and punishment, His a few works, especially in the case of execution, is an inspiration of the huge volume of Marxist criminology literature; Marxism provides a systematic theoretical basis upon which to interrogate social structural arrangements, and the hypothesis that economic power translates into political power substantially accounts for the general is empowerment of the majority who live in the modern state and the limitations of political discourse. Hence, whether directly or indirectly, it informs much of the research into social phenomena not only in criminology, but also in

semiotics and the other disciplines which explore the structural relationships of power, knowledge, meaning, and positional interests within society. The early origins of the perspective of criminology should be sought in the early twentieth century. Crime is not just economically important; is also a major political issue. It forms the main part of the work of the Home Office, one of the three leading offices of government in Britain, and occupies a similar position elsewhere. It is a major theme of the mass media: one would expect a typical news broadcast to include discussion of crime at some point. Similarly it forms a major part of television drama, and the workings of the police and the criminal justice system are an important theme in documentaries

The Marxist writers, in the first decade of this century discussed about the situation in which of them, the Crime considered a consequence of the hasty social and economic conditions of capitalism; Richard Quinny, the author of American Marxist, Stated the traditional Marxist stance such as, the crime is essentially the result of material and moral contradictions of capitalism. ((Elliot Courier)) identified the seven elements of the market society or capitalist societies that these elements can cause serious violent crimes

as the combination; these elements include:

1. The gradual loss of living status
2. The increasing intensity of the economic inequality and the material deprivations
3. The loss of support and public services, especially for families and children
4. The reduction informal and collaborative of networks, mutual support, monitoring and surveillance
5. Extension of materialism and cruelty
6. The irregular marketing of technology of violence
7. The weakening of the social and political alternatives that prohibits people from solves problems as collectively.

The criminology initially noticed to the crime of the authorities in the structure of the capitalist system and emphasize on it widely; from the viewpoint of perspective, the authorities - In contrast people without power that have been developed in the capitalism, are committing crimes which arises from the structure of power

and capitalism; the mentioned of the perspective recognizes the faces of the authorities: First, this group will adjust the rules in the collective interests and second In the event that violate or distort the rules and regulations in practice; They have power and more possibilities to defend themselves, The authorities can influence, The nature and social reaction against crime that appears to be harmful such as socially; In contrast, The image has presented from the people without of power in the society by Marxist criminology, have the following characteristics: First, the needs of economic and social alienation that these parties have to commit a crime and Second, the main target of law enforcement and criminal justice officials are inclusive the category.

1.8. The radical criminology

The radical criminology is based on the principle that crime arises from authoritarian governments and the judicial mechanism acts mostly towards the people toiling classes. Among The radical criminologists, William Adriaan Bongers, initially attempted to offer a systematic analysis of crime; He was a leader of the radical criminology, but usually had been considered by the subsequent radical criminologists and therefore could not be introduced as a pioneer of political economy and crime control; He argued that the criminal thought can be the product of two factors: ((First, That requirements imposed on the different sections of the working class)) and Second, avarice, That in his vision is the foundation for competitiveness in capitalism; In his opinion, crime and capitalism related to the three fundamental manner to another.

1. The development of criminal law linked, to a magnification property right; hence, according to the bunkers, the history of stealing is the history of private property; In other words, criminal law has been established for the protection the property and ownership from burglars

2. The crime caused by the imposed misery conditions of the working class with the emergence of industrial capitalism

3. The economic logic of capitalism creates the endless greed that expands the crime

This is also an era in which the previous models of social change and resistance—notably

Marxism/Leninism and the vanguard party, national liberation, and social democracy—have been discredited and/or discarded. New generations of people, with no particular prejudices, biases, or commitments toward the radical political models of the past and their associated claims on the rightness (and righteousness) have become politicized on new terms and from new beginnings. This poses both great possibilities and great perils. On the one hand, there is the danger of starting over from scratch—of needlessly making the same mistakes that experience might avoid, of reinventing the wheel (as a flat tire), of pursuing false leads and getting caught in dead ends (reformism and adventurism, statism and electoralism, guerrilla moralism and vanguardism). It is now absolutely essential, as a matter of struggles for justice and against repression and criminalization, that criminologists take a firm and open stand against criminal justice policies and practices that serve capital at the expense of the working class and oppressed. A radical criminology must act in solidarity with those individuals and groups targeted by the institutions of the state. This perspective criminology in the recent decades has been seen in various apparently more such as Left Realism; the Left Realism emerged from Critical criminology taking issue with "the two major socialist currents in criminology since the war: reformism and left idealism", criticizing 'the moral panics of the mass media or the blatant denial of left idealism; Left Realism set down a marker in the United Kingdom with the work of Lea and Young (1984) as representative of a group of academics: Richard Kinsey, John Lea, Roger Matthews, Geoff Pearson, and Jock Young. The group saw themselves as facing up to the challenge thrown down by Ian Taylor in *Law and Order: Arguments for Socialism for the left to take crime seriously*.

1.9. The theories of 1980 onwards:

The dawn of the 1970s was associated with the severe economic crisis especially the crisis caused by rising oil prices, Increase of unemployment, the rise of liberal movements, independence, political and social demands; In the 1980s there was a significant social change in the world in terms of demographic; The population growth affected on the Criminal

Justice with the continuous increase in the rate of expansion of the city and urbanization; Because the city and urban development is dependent on increasing demand from organizations of crime prevention and criminal justice; In this case, not only change the number of crimes But also will transform The their nature. Zach Young, in an article entitled "Ten Tips on realism" describes the main problems of the criminal justice system as: ((In the last quarter of the twentieth century we have witnessed a significant increase in criminology discussions. The main problem was the continuous rise in crime in many industrialized countries)) that despite the rise in of living standards has doubled growth; in these years there was a crisis in the etiology and punishments; For this reason, all modern theories of criminology, such as the control theory, the right realism, managerial criminology and the left realism focused on to assess the social and political structures of social etiology; Thus, some studies on the causes of crime are known unacceptable

1.10. The Criminology of risk

Since the beginning 1980s onward, the Prevention of crime that will rely on the individual and his environment gradually replaced by the management and risk control. The judicial procedures have changed in order to supervise the groups and the population which in terms of commit crimes or recidivism are evaluated adventurous and on the verge the risk crime. The management control and supervision is the function of dangerous delinquents, this management approach to crime, raised in the society where there are sociologists like Ulrich Beck that called it as ((the risk of society)). He writes: Risk and responsibility are intrinsically related to each other; as the venture, the trust and risk and safety (safety and insurance) related together. Do we live in the context of 'organized irresponsibility? Some believe that the risks involved in the control; equally that risk is greater, will require to control further; However, the concept of ((the society in the global risk)) concerned the attention to the control the risks. In the risk society, Most of the damage Introduced as a crime. So that the

dominant culture of the society is a culture of fear. The security with fear, anxiety, marketing and entrepreneurship creates a powerful combination. The combination that the industrialization of society of central interest to establish and reinforce of it and today in the criminology literature refers as ((fear of capitalism)); The two oldest proponents of risk society are Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens; Both authors refer to a concept of manufactured Uncertainty_Where everyone is forced to live the unknown risks and incomputable; These risks further have been created by progress of science and technology and it is difficult to assess; According to Beck, the 'risk of society has passed the two stages. First, the new industrial risks created regularly_due to the establishment of military-industrial Company since the 1950s; in the second stage _ the beginning of the 1970 decade_ has changed the qualitative Status and has criticized the industrial society as a risk society; Thus, the socio-economic risks that are related to globalization of the economy also increases to the industrial risk; This community creates the risks by the social - economic decision in terms of social relations (O'Grady, W. (2011). The first of it is the poverty, the unfavorable of life conditions, the loosening of social relations, insecurity. Furthermore, the risk and insecurity is reagent an economic opportunity for a set of private security companies. This has led to the commoditization of security; Thus, The social, industrial and the economic hazards are shown in the natural communities; in such situations (the industrial, social and the economic risks), the penal system and the social policies of some European countries and North America have changed in the new culture of crime control In contemporary societies and They used the industrial progress and achievements for crime control and Risk Management; This community considers imprisonment and the control of offenders as the solution of elimination of risk that they do it through tools such as prisons, electronic surveillance, etc. This policy was associated with the use of the maximum of convictions and more than the minimum convictions that they were proposed in the America. In the discourse of modern

penal law; the prison rather than reform criminals or dangerous people and returned again to the society—considered as the fundamental solution to in the ((storage)) of the superfluous people. Imprisonment, however, only poorly reflects these limits or fulfills these functions. Preventive imprisonment is used as anticipated punishment, before the trial has been held, and is not really related to the need to assure legal procedures. Punishment through imprisonment does not always reflect the seriousness of the crime and there is no evidence of its ability to express or reinforce law's authority. In both cases, moreover, the rule is that the people who are imprisoned are those with less economic and social resources. The new penologists are focusing more on the potential offenders to offenders; the people are considered as members of a group or class of risk and not as a separately case (Gilinskiy, Y. 2001). The risk consist the main concept of modern penology that has unequally distributed among the delinquents, thus, in the mentioned approach, the mental element of the offense is partially replaced to risk of crime and the recidivism; From this perspective, the risk cannot be diagnosed on the basis of personal knowledge and the demands of clinical criminologists, social workers and ... But also in the all stages of decide of the criminal process is used to the experimental methods, the statistical and the clinical trial statisticians, and the possibilities of modern technology information system; the use of the concept risk in the criminal justice, left a considerable impact: First, the punishment rarely based on the concept of crime and the more attention to the future issues of crime; This leads to government intervention But the amount and the nature of the intervention will depend more to the future actions and the dangerous nature of it. Second, although the risk may be accounted for much of human behavior, but in the field of criminal justice, the assessment of human behavior interferes to personal liberties; third, the concept of risk is very uncertain; fourth, the risk is a masculine concept therefore, when used for the women, is thought to lead to the tolerance but not this way. Postmodernism is a bit like criminology

in that it too is best described as an area, a loose collection of themes, rather than as in itself a coherent philosophy. To attempt a description of postmodernism in the latter sense would be to fall precisely into the trap of attempting to articulate it as a grand narrative, or global world view, when one of its main thrusts is precisely the denial of the possibility of such standpoints. The themes that seem to me to be important and which I shall discuss in this paper are fourfold; he final problematic of criminology is the control of crime. Here a critical acceptance of some of the themes of postmodern sociology may seem useful. The postmodern stress on the fragmentation of older centralizing structures of modernity seems to accord with the increasing stress during the last decade on the role of informal preventative processes of crime control. Of course, as every criminologist knows that the informal processes of the family, community school and work are the most important front line mechanisms of crime control. But in modern society these are always to be evaluated and regulated from the standpoint of the grand narratives of justice. During the post war period both the welfare state and the criminal justice system intervened in these informal mechanisms through a variety of social rights to welfare and education, parental and children's rights etc. Criminal justice and welfare institutions, police and social work, with their discourses of treatment, care and surveillance seemed to many commentators in the 1970's and 80's to be penetrating into these areas and 'blurring the boundaries' between formal institutional structures and informal community based forms of social control to the detriment of the latter (Cohen 1985). The hypothesis of an incorporation of informal mechanisms as adjuncts to a repressive criminal justice system was a theme attractive to the left; it is clear that a postmodern perspective, with its stress on fragmentation and difference as the salient characteristic of modern society leads in a contrary direction. If post modernization has any meaning then it lies in the hypothesis that decentralized informal mechanisms come to dominate and partially replace formal centralized institutions and their accompanying discourses or grand

narratives and at the same time that formal criminal justice institutions operate in increasingly informal ways. The most obvious example of such processes is the growth of private decentralized crime prevention not only at the micro level in the control of entry to particular streets, 'public' places, housing or shopping complexes but also in the macro design of cities, the zoning of neighborhoods the segregation of rich and poor populations etc. Such a system has, it can be argued, begun to emerge partly as a result of the privatization of public space or the growth of 'mass private property' (Shearing and Stenning 1987) epitomized by the shopping mall surveyed by private security agencies, video cameras etc. In a postmodern world such decentralized privatized forms of crime control are decreasingly ancillary to an increasingly a replacement for the system of formal controls. The important 'postmodern' characteristics of such a system of informal controls are, firstly, that it pre-empts and avoids discourses of rights and due process through the generalized segregation of populations, decentralized and non-focused coercion. Control lies decreasingly in the threat of the detection of and punishment for, the violation of generally agreed norms and increase in the general controls on entry to certain areas applied to population categories. As Mike Davis (1990), in his remarkable study of Los Angeles observes, the decline of an apartheid sanctioned by explicit, reactionary politically centralized laws in South Africa is met by the increase in a form of apartheid - between the ghetto and the white suburb - organized through the decentralized and impartial mechanisms of private property and the regulation of space in the cities of the free world. Secondly the decline of free public space involves the decline of the notions of the public sphere and the free citizen. The postmodern celebration of 'difference' replaces that of inclusion in the grand narratives of citizenship, though, as we have seen, such a notion fails to grasp the power implications where the blacks in the ghetto and the whites in the protected central city and the segregated and secured suburbs are all, equally, manifestations of difference. Finally, and

crucially for a postmodern perspective, the accountability and control of such systems are decreasingly related to generalized discourses of democracy or generalized legal rights and increasingly to decentralized groups of 'consumers' and 'customers'. The proliferation of crime prevention serves as a metaphor for postmodern crime control.

The other side of the coin meanwhile is that the formal agencies of social control - the police, courts etc., act in increasingly informal ways. While remaining in theory governed by formal rules and procedures corresponding to the grand narratives of justice and rights the informal aspects of the work of such agencies comes to predominate. Again, criminology has always been aware of the role of informal norms governing the work of criminal justice institutions, and indeed, that such bodies would not be able to function at all without such informal procedures. But as with the role of non criminal justice institutions in the control of crime, such informal procedures were seen as subordinated in the last analysis to generalized discourses of both justice and rights and of technical efficiency. One of the aims of radical criminologist such as Left Realism was to bring such informal processes, together with norms of technical efficiency, under the overall surveillance of democratic discourses of public needs

2. Feminist criminology

The Industrial Revolution led to the first change in the status of women to stimulate the incentive of egalitarianism on the opportunities and resolve the legal barriers about the activities outside the home for women; the rise of the feminist Criminology requires knowledge of industrial developments and the evolution of the capitalist society undoubtedly and the creation of the women's movement and the continuation of it in the capitalist society.

2.1. The effect of the capitalist system on the status of women

The industrial revolution replaced the factory system Instead of domestic production of the system. By transfer work from home to factory, was separated work of the home and this separation has led to profound impact on

women's sexuality; Meanwhile, the women were away from the public sphere and emphasized on the women's roles as wives and mothers; the development of capitalism required the use of cheap labor that would have been denied women as half of the labor force and this is not compatible with the structure and needs of capitalism; For this reason, the capitalism select another way; The reliance of capitalism on the force of the car that was replaced by the force of men Led the attention of the capitalist system to women (Carrington, K. 1998).

2.2. The rise of feminism and Criminology of it

Engels considers the cause of the historical and global failure due to the economic factors during the process of the evolution of human societies especially the replacement of the agricultural economy and farming instead of hunting economy (Risman, B. (2004). However, In the Western world consider the 1630 as the exact history of the beginning of feminism that was written the first works in protest to the women's status. The feminism criminology Began the its growth from the late 1960's and at the end of the second stage of the feminism movement; this growth continued until the 1970s; this movement was claiming that history states that the women were exposed to the male oppression as the social group for the long term; the new movement was called as the first wave That were observed in the late 1950's in the form of women's suffrage movement. The second wave was being named the Feminist; the emergence of the second wave was accompanied by the formation of a kind of the social dynamic movement In the 70's; the first subject was the structural oppression of women and the other was the abuse of her that comes with it (Oakley, Ann (1998). The feminism criminology has been progressing on the risk approaches and in addition, has created new strategic principles for identifying risk factors; as deemed to be increase the rate of women prisoners In terms of feminist as ((Equality in revenge)); Today, the concept of risk also raised the same attitude again; On the basis of it, the women should be studied and evaluated in the risk assessment on the basis of their gender while that Has been established The new penal policy according to the delinquency of men with the argument that the delinquency

of men is the major problem of the society. In the third stage of the movement that is doing the combined and ancillary of activities while maintaining the original activity and can be searched its examples in the pacifist feminist and Eco-Feminism and especially in the latter case. The worldview of men is the dominance over all things and such nature, Woman and nature are equal in modern project which the principle is the domination of nature; the both are tools that used and controlled. This group of the feminist movement believes that the women damaged further than men from the environmental pollution and this is confirmed by increase of the rates of the specific cancers in the women while women have been excluded from the scope of the environmental management

3. Conclusion

The industrialization process that began with the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century in Europe led to the change in the production and livelihood of people in the human societies the revolution that led to the human progress towards nature and its dominance, it was the beginning of the new approach to the problems of human society; Although the new approach began with the Industrial Revolution but after the arrival of humans to the post-industrial era was undergoing many changes, many of the social change, change of values, the cultural system, etc. have been developed by the emergence of the industry and its evolution or in other words, are owing to the development of technology, So that has affected the industry, culture and the social framework and overall the value system of a society and even in the world, because the phenomenon of crime and the reaction against it is Influenced by The social factors, Therefore in the interaction of industrialization that is a social phenomenon is associated with changes. The classical theories of criminology had a closely connection with the early history of the industrialization process, the doctrine of positivism is a milestone of this reflection due to the spread of Factory system and economic problems arising From economic development, So it is also during the course of evolution of criminology can not be studied the theories such as anomie Durkheim, Merton of structural pressure, feminism, Marxist Criminology, criminology of risk and such as it

regardless of industrial process. These theories also has formed in the economic – social situation of industrial societies and searched the reason of the occurrence of a crime in such communities (Vold, G. B., et al. (2002). The emergence and dynamics of these theories is indicative of the continuing impact of the industrialization process in the penal system and the development of criminology, alongside these dynamics, the other critical factor of the influence of these theories is the logical and continuous of relationship and interaction of the political economy of countries and its impact on the evolution of criminology unfortunately, it does not matter, Although the history of the relationship between criminology and political economy is related to the emergence of criminology and even before it, However, the more research has been done in this field in the past half century that indicates there is constant and interactive relationship between the economic structure of society and its system of crime and punishment and can not be evaluated the criminal phenomenon regardless of the economic system of communities.

References

1. Akers, R. (2000). *Criminological Theories: Introduction, Evaluation, and Application*. Los Angeles: Roxbury.
2. Arthur, J. A. (1991). Socioeconomic predictors of crime in rural Georgia. *Criminal Justice Review*, 16(1). Retrieved April 24, 2007, from Sage Criminology database.
3. Carrington, K. 1998. "Postmodernism and Feminist Criminologies: Fragmenting the Criminological Subject." In *The New Criminology Revisited*. P. Walton, & J. Young, (eds.). London: Macmillan.
4. Featherstone, R. & Deflem, M. (2003). "Anomie and Strain: Context and Consequences of Merton's Two Theories." *Sociological Inquiry* 73(4):471-489.
5. Gilinskiy, Y. 2001. "Concept of Criminality in Contemporary Criminology" In *Papers of St. Petersburg's Juridical Institute of the General Prosecutor's Office of Russian Federation*. No 3. 74-79,3. Retrieved October 18, 2007.
6. Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of Delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
7. Marco Orru. (1983). "The Ethics of Anomie: Jean Marie Guyau and Émile Durkheim", *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp. 499–518.
8. O'Grady, W. (2011). *Classical Sociological Explanations of Crime*. In *Crime in Canadian Context*. Canada: Oxford University Press.
9. Oakley, Ann (1998). "Science, gender, and women's liberation: An argument against postmodernism". *Women's Studies International Forum*, 21(2), 133–146.
10. Risman, B. (2004). Gender as a social structure: Theory wrestling with activism. *Gender & Society*, 18(4), 429-450.
11. Siegel, L. J. (2001). *Criminology: Theories, Patterns, and Typologies* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
12. Taylor, Ian R., Paul Walton., and Jock Young. 1988. *The New Criminology: For a Social Theory of Deviance (International Library of Sociology)*. Routledge.
13. Vold, G. B., Bernard, T. J., & Snipes, J. B. (2002). *Theoretical Criminology* (5th ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
14. Vold, George. 1958. *Theoretical Criminology*. New York: Oxford University Press.
15. Williams III, F. P., & McShane, M. D. (1999). *Criminological Theory* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.