

- “Community” in Contemporary Criminal Justice’** 22(3) Journal of Law and Society 301- 325.
18. Mair, G (2011) **‘The Community Order in England and Wales: Policy and Practice’**, Probation Journal, 58(3): 215-232
19. McCulloch, T., and McNeill, F. (2007), **‘Consumer Society, Commodification, and Offender Management’** 7(3) Criminology and Criminal Justice 223-242.
20. McIvor, G. (1992). **Sentenced to serve: The operation and impact of community service by offenders.** Aldershot: Avebury
21. National Audit Office. (2008). **The supervision of community orders in England and Wales.** Retrieved from <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200708/cmselect/cmpubacc/508/508.pdf>
22. Pease, K. (1975). **Community service orders: A Home Office research unit report.** London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office
23. Pease, K. (1981). **Community service orders: A first decade of promise.** Report of Howard League for Penal Reform. London: Howard League for Penal Reform.
24. Pease, K. (1985). **Community service orders.** In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice: An annual review of the research.* Vol 6. (pp. 51-94). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
25. Pease, K., & McWilliams, W. (1980). **Community service by order.** Edinburgh: Scottish Academic Press.
26. Rogan, M. (2011). **Prison policy in Ireland: Politics, penal-welfarism and political imprisonment.** London: Taylor & Francis.
27. Willis, A. (1977). **Community service as an alternative to imprisonment: A cautionary view.** Probation Journal, 24(4), 120-126
28. Wootton, B. (1977). **Some reflections on the first five years of community service.** Probation Journal, 24(4), 110-112.
29. Young, W. (1979). **Community service orders: The development and use of a new penal measure.** London: Heinemann.
30. Zedner, L. (2004). **Criminal justice.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

References

1. A. M. Abadi , **Salman Kvnany, Context of community-based sentences, with emphasis on criminal policy approach to Iran**, prevention of crime study journal, 2010.
2. Advisory Council on the Penal System. (1970). **Non-custodial and semi-custodial penalties**. London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office.
3. Ashworth, A. (2010), **Sentencing and Criminal Justice 5th edn**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
4. Bottoms, A. (2008), **'The Community Dimension of Community Punishments'** 47(2) the Howard Journal 146-169.
5. Bottoms, A. (2017) **'Punishment in Non-Custodial Sentences: A Critical Analysis'**, Criminal Law Forum, 28:563– 587
6. Brownlee, I. (1998). **Community punishment: A critical introduction**. London: Longman Publishers.
7. Canton, R. (2007a), **'Probation and the Tragedy of Punishment'** 46(3) The Howard Journal 236-254.
8. Crawford, A. (1997), **The Local Governance of Crime: Appeals to Community and Partnership** (Oxford: Clarendon).
9. Green, S. (2014), **Crime, Community and Morality** (London: Routledge)
10. Halliday, J. (2001). **Making punishments work: Report of a review of the sentencing framework for England and Wales**. Retrieved from <http://webarchive.national.archives.gov.uk/+/http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/documents/halliday-reportsppu/chap-1-2-halliday2835.pdf?view=Binary>
11. Hayes, David John (2015) **the penal impact of community punishment in England and Wales: a conceptual and empirical study**. PhD thesis, University of Nottingham.
12. Home Office. (1957). **Alternatives to short terms of imprisonment (A report of the Advisory Council on the Treatment of Offenders)**. London: H.M. Stationery Office.
13. Home Office. (1995). **Strengthening punishment in the community: A consultataion document** Retrieved from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/272037/2780.pdf
14. Kate O'Hara, (2016) **Examining the comparative use, experience, and outcomes of community service orders as alternatives to short prison sentences in Ireland**, Ph.D. Thesis, College of Arts and Tourism School of Languages, Law and Social Sciences Dublin Institute of Technology.
15. Kilcommins, S. (2002). **The introduction of community service orders: An historical interpretation**. London: Barry Rose Law Publishers.
16. Kilcommins, S. (2014). **The introduction of community service orders: Mapping its 'conditions of possibility'**. The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice, 53(5), 487- 510. doi:10.1111/hojo.12096
17. Lacey, N., and Zedner, L. (1995), **'Locating the Appeal to**

unintentional crimes: perpetrators of unintentional crimes whose legal punishment is more than two years imprisonment under Article 68 of the new law. Another type of social punishment is the daily fine. According to Article 85 of the Islamic Penal Code 2013, "The penalty for a fine is one-eighth to one-fourth of the daily income of the convict, which is received under the supervision of the execution of the sentence.

Conclusion

The reform of community-based punishment has gone through a long and complex process of development. Community-based punishment came at a time when there was considerable pressure on prisons and the conditions of imprisonment were seriously affected. Increasing numbers, rising costs, and frustration with prison effectiveness have led to a shift in criminal direction. Overall, the historical development of criminal justice in the British criminal justice system has led to several changes in the basic goals set for the rulings of the community: from restorative to retaliation, and then (mostly) preventive. All of these approaches are apparent in the current law, which makes it difficult to predict how the law will affect offenders' experiences of community punishment. However, it can be concluded that criminal populist tendencies provide an incentive to enforce longer and more exhausting community sentences. Based on the details mentioned above, we have concluded that Iran is still far behind the UK in this regard. Since less than ten years ago, community-based punishment entered the Iranian criminal justice system. For the first time in Iran, community-based sentences were introduced in 2013, which is very ambiguous. Given the progress of the United Kingdom in this area, there is a need to amend the laws of Iran.

contains valuable propositions and regulations on community punishments, influenced by the laws of leading countries in this field. However, the bill never had a legal framework and was not considered by the legislature. Finally 3 and 4 only its contents were added with slight changes in the ninth chapter of the Islamic Penal Code 2013 (Abbas Mansori, 2010: 22).

The main feature of the Islamic penal code 2013 regarding Community-based punishment

According to article 66 of the Islamic Penal Code of 2013, "the offenders of intentional crimes whose maximum legal punishment is from 91 days to 6 months, will be punished to jail alternative punishments." Of course, the application of this article is for those offenders who do not have criminal histories or more than five years have passed from their previous criminal record.

Article 64 states "alternative punishments to imprisonment include under arrest period, free public services, daily fine penalty and deprivation from the social rights, whereas in case of the plaintiff's forgiveness and presence of abatement grounds by considering the type of crime and quality of its commission, implications caused by crime, age, skill, personality status, criminal record, the situation of the victim and other situations are determined and enforced".

This law provides two conditions for each type of crime, the first being mandatory alternative punishments in intentional crimes: If the maximum legal punishment for the crime is three months (Article 65 of the 2013 Penal Code). And if the maximum legal punishment for the crime committed is between 91 days and 6 months imprisonment and the convict has no criminal record and if so, the sentence should be more than five years. The second form is unintentional crimes: Perpetrators of unintentional crimes whose legal punishment is less than 2 years in prison. Optional alternative punishments Execution of alternative punishment to imprisonment in intentional and unintentional crimes by the courts is optional in the following cases:

In intentional crimes the court can commit the perpetrators of intentional crimes whose maximum legal punishment is 6 months to 1-year imprisonment as alternative punishments. In

requirement called the Rehabilitation Act Requirements. This was introduced for more flexibility in the types of rehabilitation partnerships that the offender can perform and the specific activities that are determined after in-depth evaluation after sentencing. The 2014 Criminal Rehabilitation Act made the most significant changes in the management and operation of community-based punishments by applying "Transforming Rehabilitation' proposals." Over the last 30 years, there have been many changes in the scope of community-based sentences in the UK. Bottoms examine these changes and the general policy trend as a move towards (i) introducing some "punitive" directives. (ii) Much greater diversity in the content of community punishments; and (iii), especially since 2005, the scope for participation in various requirements in a single order, has increased enormously (Bottoms, 2017: 570).

The development of community-based punishment in Iran

Until the early 1970s, Iran's legal system was largely unfamiliar with the concept of social punishment. In the legal texts available at this time, the vacuum of social punishments was always felt. Beginning in the 1970s, the concept of social punishment gradually entered the Iranian legal literature; it was merely influenced by the jurisprudence and practice of a small number of judges who interpreted the provisions of Article 17 of the Islamic Penal Code that rehabilitation punishments were enumerated in the branches of the juvenile court (Abbas Mansori, 2010: 21). Under Articles 22 and 728 of the Islamic Penal Code, to individualize ta'zir and deterrent punishments, this group of judges provided reactions to some juvenile delinquents under the age of 18, such as "participation in a special training course, computer training in public services.", Mosques and parks, etc. adopted.

Gradually, under the influence of this judicial procedure, as well as the more serious need for the implementation of the processes of judicial decriminalization and release from prison, several bills were prepared and submitted to the parliament by the judiciary. One of the most important of these bills is the community-based punishment Bill, which was submitted to the Islamic Consultative Assembly in 2006. The bill

are properly punished, taken more seriously by criminals, and done more for the victims" (Ministry of Justice, 2012: 4). Since the introduction of the Community Service Order, the main goal has been to increase the perceived reliability of punishment as an appropriate form of punishment. The philosophies of reparation and reintegration have not received enough attention compared to the ability to punish offenders.

The recent development of community-based punishment in England

The 2003 Criminal Justice Act seeks to increase the "validity" of community rulings and make them more attractive to judges and magistrates. He replaced these orders with a non-custodial sentence called the Community Order (CO). The validity of community sentences has been improved by further correcting and imposing new sanctions and simplifying and rationalizing "a confusing set of community-based punishments before it." (Mair, 2011: 222). The law also sought to give judges greater flexibility in shaping community sentences for offenders. The association's mandate allows convicts to choose from a wide range of requirements when sentencing an offender and, if necessary, to combine two or more requirements, depending on the nature of the offense, the need for punishment, and the underlying problems it should be considered to prevent crime.

The 2003 Criminal Justice Act also introduced a suspended sentence. The suspended sentence is imprisonment, but it is enforced in the community and allows the perpetrators to apply the requirements of the community order. The imprisonment sentence is first issued and then suspended, provided that the perpetrator meets the necessary conditions and does not commit another crime during the operational period of the embargo. If accepted, the whole punishment will be executed in society. In 2013, more changes were made to further increase community punishment. The 2013 Criminal Code and the Courts of Justice impose punishments on at least one mandatory punishment requirement when imposing a community order.

Finally, the 2014 Criminal Rehabilitation Act replaced the supervision and requirements of a specific activity that could be considered a measure of community condemnation with a new

Since the 1990s, successive governments have committed to making community punishments more demanding. Halliday's 2001 sentencing study found that community punishment was not considered "sufficient punishment" (Holliday, 2001). Based on his recommendations, and the next white paper entitled Justice for All, presented in 2002, a new social order and suspension sentence were introduced under the 2003 Criminal Justice Act. After April 2005, courts were placed in a position to design community punishments based on the seriousness of the crime and the circumstances of the offender (National Audit Office, 2008). The new directives will allow convicts to add 12 possible requirements to community punishments, including unpaid work, supervision, medical treatment, mental health treatment, travel bans, and more.

These new orders eventually replace all previous orders containing long-term suspended sentences as well as public service orders (Mair, 2011). Introducing these new community punishments to increase the punitive nature of community punishments and convicts' confidence in the use of such punishments as well as alternatives to imprisonment, however, research has shown that suspended sentences and community service orders in almost 50% of cases Used as an alternative to imprisonment (Mair, 2011). For the first time, the 2003 Criminal Justice Act made the principles of punishment law in the UK. To achieve one or more of these goals, the order of the society was needed: "Punishment of criminals; Crime reduction (including deterrence reduction); Correction and reconstruction of criminals; Protect the public; And compensate the perpetrators to those who have been harmed by their crimes "(National Audit Office, 2008: 8). However, according to Mair (2011), the instructions issued by the Penal Council have caused confusion among sentence writers about the use of these new instructions because they have not clearly stated how to use them. The recent discussion entitled: Punishment and Correction: Community Rulings The community advocates the inclusion of the element of punishment in every order of community service order to increase the valid nature of these punishments. According to the document, "this reform package assures you that the punishments of society

Pease examines the community-based sentences several times after their initial review. In short, his findings showed that the community-based punishment structure led to tariff offenders. As discussed in the next section, it was originally introduced as an alternative to short prison sentences. The community-based punishment was used as an alternative to other non-custodial sanctions. This exercise was different between the regions and courts. In violation cases, the court decision differs from the original order. Pease concluded that the design of the community sentences experienced the same fate as a suspended sentence and has not led to decarceration. He concluded that "the lack of coordination between the goal and the undesirable reality" (Pease, 1985: 52). Recently, Mair has identified that neither suspended sentence nor community-based punishment has succeeded in directing a significant number of off-prison offenders. He claims that newly unauthorized sentences are also defeated as a replacement for prison because their judiciary does not consider irreplaceable alternatives. This claim is also supported by Hough, Jacobson, and Millie (2003), which, after introducing the 1991 criminal law, supported the limitation of prison, which was an increase in the prison population.

This section shows how community-based punishment in the UK has changed in recent decades. Before 1991, community sentences and probation were two of the sentences used in the United Kingdom. In the late 1980s and 1990s, a series of white papers examining the criminal nature of community punishment was published, proposing a more flexible social order. The White Paper on Crime, Justice, and the Protection of the People, published in 1990, proposed a combined order, which was later introduced under the 1991 Criminal Justice Act, along with a new curfew order. This brought "all the orders of society in a general structure based on the principle of proportionality" (Home Office, 1995: 11). At that time, community-based and conditional sentences were still intact. However, different types of different requirements can be attached to long-term probation (Mair, 2011). The list of community-based punishment options available to the courts expanded significantly in the 1990s as a more punitive ideology of punishing criminals emerged in the community.

on the use of community service orders were vague and misleading. Other commentators argue that restricting its use to offenses punishable by imprisonment is contrary to some of the Committee's core recommendations (Brownley, 1998). The Wooton Committee recommended that community service orders be used in a wide range of cases, both instead of prison sentences or as an alternative to other non-custodial options, such as fines. Community service is considered a "criminal chameleon" that attempts to attract attention from different criminal philosophies confuse sentencers and criminal justice professionals (Willis, 1977). Given the high levels of uncertainty surrounding the purpose of community service orders, researchers began to examine the extent of its destructive ability. The 1972 Penal Code stipulated that the evaluation of six pilot projects of social service providers be performed before the national plan. However, no details are provided on how community-based punishment works. The evaluation study, completed by Ken Pease at the ministry's research unit, examined how orders were processed, the type of work available, and attitudes toward sanctions. Revocation and recidivism analysis was also completed. The report states that community-based punishment is fully used as an alternative to imprisonment in only three areas. Pease found that typically community-based punishment is only allowed when recommended by a probation officer. Offenders between the ages of 17 and 24 were more likely to be subject to community-based punishment, and between 38 and 50 percent of offenders receiving community-based punishment had the experience of imprisonment (Peace, 1975). The second evaluation, which was also completed at six pilot sites and published in 1977, found that only more than 44% of community-based offenders were re-convicted within a year, while just over 33% of Them were criminals. Recommended for public services but eventually received different disposal. Wooton claimed that the report, as the original report, was premature and was prepared "before gaining any experience in selecting the cases or types of work that provide the best prospects for success for community-based judgments" (Wooton. , 1977: 111). He also states that the study was not designed as well as justified.

conflicting services and provided resources to facilitate criminals in the community. He concludes that "community-based measures were considered as a cure for prison overcrowding diseases" (Jung, 1979: 7). However, community-based judgments are not without their "punitive bites." Such orders restricted offenders' leisure time, forced the presence of offenders and often required them to complete the physical work they needed (Zedner, 2004). Community-based punishment challenged the narrative of punishment by trying to punish, rehabilitate, and discipline. While simultaneously offering compensation to communities. However, he did not address it. Some argue that the imposition of such community-based punishments increases social control and suggests an "increasing emphasis on discipline" (Zedner, 2004: 216).

A suitable alternative to imprisonment? As mentioned above, before the introduction of community service orders, frustration with prisons was evident across the UK. (Kilcommins, 2002; Young, 1979). In 1957, a study explored alternatives to the use of short-term imprisonment. The report recommends increasing the use of financial penalties in all courts and directing the presence center for young men. There was no idea in the report that community services acted as an alternative to prison, but the authors suggested that compensation and reparations have a greater place in the penal system (Ministry, 1957). It was not until 1967 that the Penal Code introduced suspended sentences, and the 1972 Penal Code recommended the use of community service orders instead of imprisonment. The Wooton Committee recommended a maximum of 120 hours of unpaid work per order in its plan for community service orders. During the legislative process, this time was increased to 240 hours. Some commentators argue that the importance of dividing 240 by 12 may be an attempt to promote its use as a substitute for custody for twelve months or less (Pease and McWilliams, 1980). According to Mairr (2011) Deviation from prison, especially from short terms imprison, has been a major goal of criminal justice policy for the past 40 years. Therefore, the analysis of community service orders is essential as a descriptive measure. At first, Willis (1977) claimed that the Wooton Committee's recommendations

to Kilcommins, "it provided a strong incentive to repeat such practices in a non-incarcerated environment" (Kilcommins, 2014: 494). In 1968, restitution orders could be issued for theft of property-related offenses, and in 1966 the Widgery Committee was tasked with examining how "personal compensation" could play a greater role in the criminal justice system.

Kilcommins states that at the time there was "greater concern about the fragmentation of the social fabric" (Kilcommins, 2002: 393), which he attributed to a growing industrial country, and the establishment of family relationships, and Also the decline of religion. Based on these allegations, he claims that social change, as mentioned above and referred to by him as "traction factors", gave rise to community-based sentencing as a new criminal offense in the UK.

Young (1979) claims that at that time a law was passed in the British Parliament to pass the use of community-based punishments. Politicians agreed that prison was neither an effective deterrent nor a remedy. Between the late 1940s and the late 1960s, the number of offenders convicted and imprisoned across the UK increased significantly. According to Kilcommins, there was a significant increase in prison attacks, overcrowding, and the number of escapes and escape attempts at the time. The dramatic increase in the length of the sentence also exacerbated the inflation of the prison population. Kilcommins refers to these effects as "pressure factors" that act alongside cultural change and create community-based punishment as a criminal justice policy (Kate O'Hara, 2016: 43). Yang argues that the expansion of alternatives to imprisonment, such as suspended sentences, has not sufficiently reduced the prison population. Yang attributes some of the longer sentences to the extension of such non-custodial sanctions, arguing that they have been forced to use longer sentences for repeat offenders (Yang, 1979). The ineffectiveness of fines has also been cited as the cause of a wider range of non-custodial sentences across the UK (Pease, 1985).

According to Young (1979), the driving force behind the development of community-based punishment was economic pressure to reduce the high cost of imprisonment. Yang emphasizes that this increase in public spending has created

and Wales under the 1972 Criminal Justice Act. This type of punishment was recommended by a subcommittee of the Homeland Security Advisory Council, commonly referred to as the Wooton Committee (Advisory Council on Criminal Justice, 1970; Yang, 1979). In short, the Wooton Committee had the task of determining appropriate alternatives to imprisonment. The committee, which dealt mainly with minor offenders, decided to provide the courts with a wider range of non-custodial sanctions to deal with minor offenses. According to Pease, community services were attractive to the Wooton Committee because they gave "offending activity" to offenders. They recommended the introduction of community services on a trial basis and suggested conditional services and aftercare as the most appropriate for project monitoring (Pease & McWilliams, 1980). Community services, as stated in the Wooton report, seek to achieve a wide range of criminal goals. The plan was not merely a recruitment strategy, and the report was criticized for its ambiguity before and after the proposed legislation (Kate O'Hara, 2016: 42).

Yang (1979) argues that frustration with imprisonment was evident in many jurisdictions before the onset of community-based punishment. He categorizes this frustration into four general issues: "The Impact of Humanitarianism; Doubts about the Effectiveness of Prison as a Means of Treatment or Deterrence; Overcrowding; and Economic Strictness." They were considered oppressive, isolated, and ineffective, however, he attributes the development of community-based judgments to several other social changes described below.

Before the introduction of Community-based sentences, voluntarism had grown significantly in the UK. It was believed that increasing community participation encouraged social responsibility and reduced the sense of isolation and dissatisfaction experienced in the UK. The idea of compensation for criminal activity was also reinforced from the late 1950s onwards. In particular, its usefulness in dealing with antisocial behaviors among young people has been documented (Kilcommins, 2002). The growth of social service programs in closed institutions, such as borstals and prisons. According

That is why the development of community-based punishment implemented in England and its rationale is majorly focused in this section.

Before a full assessment of its use is made, the ideology and philosophy underlying the community based punishment must be discussed. According to Pease (1985), community sentences cannot be compared to other compensation systems because they do not directly compensate the victims. Pease argues that the compensation is related to the enforcement of civil society organizations, claiming that “damaging to mix the victim of crime with the symbolic victim of crime in the abstraction of society as a whole” Pease claims that the retaliatory nature of civil society organizations is how criminals retaliate to society for the harm caused by crime. Hence, he believes community service is just one variant of slavery, transportation, correctional facilities, criminal incarceration, and imprinting. He concluded that community sentences were just "a new regulation in detail" (Kilcommins, 2002: 59), but disagreed, claiming that important social changes at the time contributed to the evolution and adoption of community based punishment in the UK. He believes civil society organizations are a new type of punishment that is different from other punishments characterized by unpaid work.

After the introduction of community based sentences in England, the specific policies behind the sanctions and the goals that policymakers want to achieve remain unclear (McIvor, 1992). The development, implementation, and evaluation of the Community based punishment system has aroused considerable research interest, however, as we will see, the analysis of the use of such sanctions has caused considerable discussion and confusion (Reddy, 1991). This section describes how the community based sentence was formed, focusing on England, while trying to find out why they were introduced. It examines the evolution of politics from the beginning, its relevance as an alternative to imprisonment, and the changes in ideology and logic over the past 40 years.

Development of a penal sanction

Community-based punishment was introduced in England

of their complaints against the offender (McCulloch and McNeill 2007: 230-234). If the community is the intended 'consumer' of community punishment, then it is sensible to consider what the community wants that process to achieve, and to take this into account in the implementation of those sentences. In this sense, the community is still passive in the actual imposition of community punishment, but it is active in informing its purposes.

There are also limited grounds for understanding communities as participants in modern Anglo-Welsh community punishment. This level of involvement requires communities to be actively engaged in the process of punishment, and capable of directly influencing its impact on offenders. The community effectively becomes a resource for penal practices; something that is far more accepted in other fields of the criminal justice system, as in community policing and Neighborhood Watch schemes (Crawford 1997: 165-168). In contemporary England and Wales the community participates in community punishment in two main ways: firstly, through the community justice elements of the process; and secondly, through the dialectical infliction of shame and stigma, which is central to the operation of (retributive) community punishment. In existing England and Wales the community participates in community punishment in two main ways: firstly, through the community justice elements of the process; and secondly, through the dialectical infliction of shame and stigma, which is essential to the procedure of (retributive) community punishment (David John, 2015:13).

Historical background of Community Punishment in England

Extensive research has been mad on the history and origins of the community-based punishment. However, some types of community-based punishment were practiced in some parts of world before 1970s, but England were very first to officially recognized and establish the first community service program in their practiced criminal justice system (Kilcommins, 2002; Kilcommins, 2014). The community-based punishment model was then implemented by other European nations, after being implemented England considerable parallels can be drawn between policies introduced in these jurisdictions (Rogan, 2011).

Community Punishment another important question remains: what is a ‘community’? This is a complex issue, since the concept has been used indiscriminately and interchangeably within a number of different public policy contexts (Crawford 1997: 148). The real question (for present purposes) is what level of involvement is envisaged for the communities invoked? Generally speaking there are three levels of community involvement in community punishment, namely: as location; as beneficiary; and as participant (Green 2014: 17-28). I address each in turn. Treating ‘community’ as a three-dimensional location is a customary practice in Anglo-Welsh penal policy. The reference to ‘punishment in the community’ in penal policy has generally meant ‘punishment outdoor of prison’ (Brownlee 1998: 56; Crawford 1997: 51-52). Under such a model, communities are almost entirely passive. They serve only as the backdrop to community punishment, and have no say in how it is experienced by its subjects. This is politically eye-catching, since government agents can invoke the politically valuable concept of ‘the community’ in a rhetorical sense, whilst not having to worry too about what the invoked communities have to say about the development. However, this model is too simplistic to reflect either policy or practice. The first problem is that communities are more than spatial gatherings of individuals. Indeed, they may arise from a number of different contexts, including ‘spatial, temporal, kinship, ethnic, institutional, and many other reference points’ (Lacey and Zedner 1995: 302). Thus we may talk about ‘the deaf community’ or ‘the LGBT community’, for example (Worrall 1997: 46). Since communities do not necessarily require a spatial nexus to exist (more so in the days of online social networking than ever), a purely spatial conception of what a community is for determining its participation in community punishment would be obviously incomplete.

E-4

Moreover, it seems that communities are more significantly involved in contemporary Anglo-Welsh penal process than as mere locations. At the very least, communities are frequently seen as potential beneficiaries of community punishment: the punitive exercise is intended to advantage them, whether through the reduction of crime, reparation of the damage, or vindication

punishment as such, and about what is meant by the term itself, as a whole.

Unfortunately a literal definition of community punishment ('any punishment occurring in the community') is insufficient. There are various sanctions, including fines, bind-overs, and discharges, which take place in a community context (howsoever defined: but which are not classified as 'community punishment' under English law. Definitely, penologists speak of non-custodial sentences (Ashworth 2010: 318), or alternatives to imprisonment although it is clear that both terms are conceptually broader than 'community penalties' (Ashworth 2010: 338-353). So there must be more than a connection to community if the definition of community punishment is to fit modern practice.

The element that differentiates community punishment from other non-custodial sentences is that it involves an element of supervision (Mair, 2007). Whereas a fine does not place any (direct) oversight on the offender, community punishment involves (limited) control of the offender's physical freedom by an agent of the State. This direct supervision therefore distinguishes community punishment from other non-custodial sentences, just as its scene in the community distinguishes it from imprisonment. Moreover, it must be distinguished from the supervision of offenders who have been released from prison, which, not being directly (judicially) imposed as a response to criminal conviction, fulfils a different penal function and so ought not to be evaluated in the same breath.

Accordingly, I define community punishment as any penal process imposed as a response to criminal responsibility by a judicial authority, which does not require the offender to be (immediately) confined, but which nevertheless imposes direct supervisory control over her within her previous social context (Canton, 2007: 253).

Community punishment' Why use the phrase 'community punishment' to define this type of sentence? This particular formulation is not liked between penal scholars, who prefer other terms, including: community sentences (Ashworth 2010: 338); community sanctions and measures (Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe 1992); and community penalties (Bottoms ,2008).

Introduction

In recent years various countries around the globe have made progress in their respective criminal justice system. This progress has been made by recognizing the community power, and discovery of potential gape for working with communities and civil institutions. Identification of the community as a proper locale to control crime and for criminal justice has been done during last few decades by bringing the series of reforms. Different community programs like community policing, community corrections, community punishment, community crime prevention, community prosecution, community justice etc. have got attention and have been considered during this time period.

In the criminal justice system of England and Wales this has been the part of panel system for more than a hundred years, although not having the same name. However, the concept and ideas which are exemplified by this sort of sentence are not that much easy and demand emptying prior to any study into its effects. For that reason, the conceptual boundaries of community punishment: its definition, history and its modern form in English law are examined in this paper. This research has been divided into two parts. History of community-based sentence in England has been discussed in first part, whereas community-based punishments in Iran are discussed in second part. That is why we must answer two types of question. To address the research questions, this research is emphasis and pay attention to pertinent and important issues namely: (i) the concept and development of community-based sentences in England criminal justice systems (ii) provisions currently available related to alternatives to imprisonment in Iran and the administration thereof in practice.

E-2

Defining Community Punishment

The first stage of this analysis should be to define its subject, 'community punishment'. This label raises a number of complex issues that must be decided before a definition can be at all satisfactory, both in terms of the issues surrounding the use of 'punishment' and 'community' to identify community

فصلنامه حرفه‌ای (علمی - ترویجی) پژوهان
سال دوازدهم، شماره ۱۸ و ۱۹
تابستان و پاییز ۱۴۰۲

The development of community based punishment in England and Iran, criminal justice system

Pages (E-1)-(E-18)

Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim Shams Nateri¹
Syed Mohaddas Mahboob²
Syed Shair Abbas kazmi³

Abstract

Community based punishment is any criminal process imposed by a judicial authority in response to a criminal offense that does not require the offender to be in prison immediately, but nevertheless presupposes direct control over his or her social background. Social service programs have been established in many countries. The most extensive and studied English experience. It was adopted in 1972 following the recommendation of the Advisory Council on the Penal System. And pilot programs began in 1973 in six pilot areas. In the late 1970s, community service programs were implemented throughout the UK. This paper, while introducing and investigating the development of community based punishments in England and Iranian criminal justice system. In Iran, for the first time, the legislator introduced social punishments into the criminal system under the Islamic Penal Code of 1392 The Islamic Penal Code 2013 not only requires clear rules and regulations in this regard, but also the successful implementation of these laws requires a proper culture in society. The authors of this article try to express both systems in a comparative approach and using a descriptive and analytical method of the development of community based punishment, and to dispel the ambiguities of the Islamic Penal Code.

Keywords

community punishment, criminal justice, alternative sentences, Iran, Englan

1. Associate Professor, Department of Criminal Law and Criminology, University of Tehran, Iran

Assistant director faculty of law, university of Tehran Farabi campus
E mail address: eshams@ut.ac.ir

2. Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Criminal law and criminology, University of Tehran, Iran

Email address: mohaddas.mahoob@ut.ac.ir /mohaddas.naqvi@gmail.com

3. Lecturer, Department of Law, Mirpur University of Science and technology (Must) Mirpur, AJk

Email address: shairshahh@gmail.com