



PROJECT MUSE®

Hybridity in the Canadian Craft of Criminology

John Braithwaite

Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Volume 56,
No. 4, July/juillet 2014, pp. 399-416 (Article)

Published by University of Toronto Press
DOI: [10.1353/ccj.2014.0033](https://doi.org/10.1353/ccj.2014.0033)



➔ For additional information about this article

<http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/ccj/summary/v056/56.4.braithwaite.html>

Hybridity in the Canadian Craft of Criminology

John Braithwaite*

Le Canada est un contributeur distinct et important aux études criminologiques. Comme c'est le cas pour de nombreux autres domaines, il tire profit de sa proximité avec les leaders américains en la matière et de sa capacité à s'en éloigner. Cet éloignement est nécessaire, car la criminologie fait partie d'une structure disciplinaire pathologique de la recherche en sciences sociales, laquelle fut développée aux États-Unis et en Europe. Bien que la criminologie au Canada soit plus hybride que la plupart des autres pays, elle demeure moins ouverte aux idées venues des pays orientaux et méridionaux du globe. Une partie importante de cette hybridité que le Canada englobe plus que les autres sociétés occidentales est la sagesse de ses Autochtones. La justice réparatrice, le maintien privé de l'ordre, la criminalité d'entreprise et la lutte contre la criminalité sont utilisés pour illustrer les forces de l'hybridité canadienne. Il s'agit de conversations canadiennes dans lesquelles Carol LaPrairie a participé de manière évocatrice.

Mots clés : criminologie canadienne, justice réparatrice, maintien de l'ordre

Canada is a distinctive and rich contributor to criminological thought. As in many things, it benefits both from its proximity to powerhouses of the discipline in the United States and from distancing itself from them. Distancing is needed because criminology is enmeshed within a pathological disciplinary structure of social science research invented in the United States and Europe. Canada embraces more hybridity than most national criminologies, though it still falls short in its openness to insights from the South and East of the globe. An important part of the hybridity it does embrace in greater measure than other western societies is wisdom from its Indigenous peoples. Restorative justice, private policing, corporate crime, and crime-war are used to illustrate strengths of Canadian hybridity. These are Canadian conversations in which Carol LaPrairie engaged evocatively.

Keywords: Canadian criminology, restorative justice, policing

*Please direct correspondence to John Braithwaite, Regulatory Institutions Network, Australian National University, Canberra 0200, Australia; John.Braithwaite@anu.edu.au

Canada in the context of contemporary crises

Before exploring some distinctive virtues of Canadian criminology, it is important to note that these are located within deeper global structures that are less virtuous and are riven with crisis. These are structures of global injustice and of a structuring of the social sciences that leaves them ill-equipped to contribute to solving the crises that face us. Canada is a highly integrated piece of global capitalism that, in some respects, is a globally average kind of place. It can seem to have an exceptionally low homicide rate compared to the United States, and its homicide rate is, indeed, well below the world average per capita rate ([United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime 2013](#)). Yet in most years there are around 50 countries with a homicide rate as low as or lower than Canada's. The exceptionalism rests with the US rather than Canada. Canada seems to have a very low imprisonment rate compared to its great neighbour. But the US has the highest rate in the world; 80 countries have lower rates per capita than Canada ([International Centre for Prison Statistics 2013](#)). Like almost everywhere in the world, global capitalism, with state collaboration, is sharply driving up levels of inequality in Canada. Indigenous peoples feel this most intensively, with one of the consequences being that already catastrophically high Indigenous imprisonment rates in Canada are heading higher.

Canadians sometimes take comfort in their welfare state because they see poor and not-so-poor US citizens routinely travelling across their border to purchase medicines they cannot afford in their own country. Yet Canada is no welfare state leader globally, including on pharmaceuticals. There was once a time when Canada would compulsorily license medicines necessary to save the lives of poor Canadians who could not afford them. Like most countries, it has, in recent decades, bowed to US and EU business pressure to desist from compulsory licensing of medicines.

Pharmaceuticals is as good a topic as any to illustrate the failure of the social sciences, and specifically criminology, to tackle the problems that matter most. Many more lives are lost every year in the world as a result of poor people being unable to afford medicines than are lost because of street crime. Most of these deaths are caused by monopolies that are legal, but whose monopolistic practices, in the opinion of many of us, should be treated as criminal.

It is important to note that a significant minority of the deaths of the poor are caused by *illegal* monopolies (Braithwaite 1984; [Dukes, Braithwaite, and Maloney 2014](#)). Increasingly, when the poor do get access to drugs, they are cheap, often dangerous, counterfeits—sometimes purchased on the Internet and dispatched through the black market and much more often purchased on the street without a prescription. One estimate is 700,000 lives lost globally each year to counterfeit medicines (Harris, Stevens, and Morris 2009), a number that is huge compared to homicides known to the police globally. The scale of the counterfeiting problem seems to have more than doubled so far this century, while it continues to fail to register as a topic of great interest in criminology journals ([Dukes et al. 2014](#)).

But this kind of fraud does not kill anywhere near the millions of poor people killed each year by legal drug monopolies. The European Union estimates that adverse reactions to pharmaceuticals kill nearly 200,000 Europeans each year (Archibald, Coleman, and Foster 2011), more than eight times the EU homicides (23,000) in 2010. Gotzsche estimated that the US company Merck was responsible for 120,000 deaths worldwide by 2004, through thrombosis caused by Vioxx, which was misleadingly evaluated by the company. Merck pleaded guilty in 2012 to criminal charges for its promotion and marketing of Vioxx, paying a \$950 million civil and criminal settlement (Gotsche 2013: 160–61). By 2007, Gotzsche (2013: 230–32) estimated, the Eli Lilly corporation's top seller, Zyprexa, had killed 200,000 worldwide, partly on the back of illegal marketing for numerous unapproved uses, including Alzheimer's, depression, and dementia, for which the company forfeited a sum of \$1.4 billion in civil and criminal penalties. These deaths, caused by US companies and associated, in each case, with a single product, compare with 14,827 murders and manslaughters known to the FBI in the United States during 2012. Blatant fraud, while it is a substantial part of the problem, bears less of the responsibility for such deaths than gaming the law. Studies that suggested that a product like Lilly's Zyprexa was dangerous were suppressed, but one encouraging study, according to its Cochrane review of 2005, was published 142 times in papers and conference abstracts (Gotsche 2013: 231). In this respect, criminology journals do not seem so bad!

Why is corporate crime as absent from the pages of the *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* as it is from all the world's leading criminology journals? It is not for a want of influential and highly respected criminologists systematically drawing attention to the issue

in their publications. No criminologist has had more influence on the discipline than Edwin Sutherland (1949). In 1949, he was the first to make the point that white-collar crime accounts for greater losses of property and lives than street crime. Many of the brightest and best of the next generation of criminologists – Donald Cressey, Gilbert Geis, Marshall Clinard, and others – alongside consumer advocates like Ralph Nader, have also repeated this message. A number of the most senior living criminologists have also done so. Why is an issue so forcefully articulated by so many respected leaders of the discipline so assiduously ignored in its journals and by its mainstream, including the critical and radical criminological mainstays?

For this author, the answer seems clearly grounded in a wider crisis of all the social sciences (Braithwaite 2011). It is a crisis of being bound to a dysfunctional disciplinary structure that is excessively tied to *categories of institutions* as objects of study, rather than being organized around theory.¹ Economics studies economic institutions; political science, political institutions; sociology, social institutions²; law, legal institutions; criminology, criminal justice institutions . . . for the most part. If the police do not investigate fraud in the safety testing of drugs or drug cartels, if prisons do not house pharmaceutical executives, then criminology shows limited interest. My argument has been that the social sciences are deep into a dark period of their history. A drastic remedy is needed – the creative destruction (Schumpeter 1962) of these institutionally grounded disciplines.

To dig themselves out of the hole, illustrated here with drug crime, the social sciences must make a move akin to that made by the biological sciences. The biological science disciplines in the mid-twentieth century were also organized around categories of objects: botany focused on plants; zoology, animals; entomology, insects; anatomy, bits of one species; microbiology, microbes. Now these disciplines have been transcended by organization around powerful theories – evolutionary biology, across all categories of living things, is organized around evolutionary theory; ecology around ecological theory; the new molecular biology around a micro-macro science of DNA. This shift from organization around categories of objects to organization around theory and discovery has lifted the biological sciences into a stellar era of break-throughs, during the past half century. Meanwhile, the social sciences, still organized in category-of-object disciplines, descend deeper into mediocrity.

The fact that some of the social sciences are organized around more abstract objects, like space (geography), time (history), thought (philosophy), language (linguistics), even gender identities (feminism), changes little; emergent theory and discovery still drives the structure of knowledge and discipline creation less than the object does (or institutions associated with it). This is not to deny that geography departments inspire the refinement of great theory and new methodologies of mapping, such as GPS. It is just to raise this author's conjecture that more exciting discoveries might come from social science research groups clustered around micro-macro theories of the social and cognitive across space-time (Jared [Diamond's \(1999\)](#) theories of geography-history-demography-anthropology being an example). The reasons for this are not utterly dissimilar to the reasons the physical sciences have made more progress with theories of space-time than with purely spatial astronomies of the universe. Refining telescopes or mapping is a good reason, but not a good enough reason, to organize research groups into astronomy or geography departments, in a world where mathematics may be methodologically more important to both. Likewise, methodologies for understanding the (rather low) correlations among police-, court-, victim-, and self-reports of crime are a limited justification for organizing research groups into criminology departments. This is especially so when disciplines become methodological conspiracies that downplay the methodological limitations of their dominant methods.

What does all of this have to do with the distinctiveness of Canadian criminology? Well, I see a bit more hybridity of institutional and methodological preoccupation in Canadian criminology than in most of the world. The ethnographic study of corporate crime illustrates this well. This topic has been somewhat less neglected in Canada than elsewhere. Colin Goff, of the University of Winnipeg, worked with Gilbert Geis to reveal the full, partially suppressed text of [Sutherland's \(1983\)](#) work in *White-Collar Crime: The Uncut Version*. This remains the most important book on the subject, more so in its uncut incarnation. Goff's PhD supervisor, Charles Reasons, was enlivening this field ahead of him, along with Harry Glasbeek and others. A younger Canadian generation of corporate lawyers has also been enlivening the field, such as [Cristie Ford](#), with her rich research on the new governance and the limits of corporate integrity agreements, as an outcome of corporate crime cases ([Ford and Hess 2011](#)). [Laureen Snider](#), of Queen's University, was the third recipient of the Gilbert Geis award of the American Society of Criminology, receiving it only

after Geis himself and Marshall Clinard. Her corporate crime scholarship has been consistently powerful. A significant number of other Canadian names could be mentioned; apologies to them. In addition, some leaders of the field, like Frank Pearce, were attracted to move to Canada.³

State–academy–civil-society hybridity

The world has learnt from experience across a variety of international organizations that Canadians contribute analytic competence at an unusually high level. Many of my experiences at organizations like the UN and OECD were about the governance of crime, but also about a much broader terrain of regulation and governance. One of the first Canadians to impress was John Braithwaite, who headed Corrections Canada. I paid his annual membership of the American Society of Criminology for years! I met John Braithwaite when I served as rapporteur for a meeting of the Asia-Pacific Conference of Correctional Administrators, in Bangkok. Braithwaite was adept at making connections between correctional innovation and theory and research from the academy.

In many ways, of course, Canadian justice administrators fall down as doers, notwithstanding their comparative analytic sophistication. Yet corrections is an area where, across the 33 years since I first met John Braithwaite, I saw much innovation in doing that was ahead of my own country – in prison education and vocational training, in the circles of support and accountability led by the chaplaincy service of Corrections Canada (Braithwaite 2002: 75–76), and in a visit to the Okimaw Ohci Healing Lodge for serious female Indigenous offenders in Saskatchewan. In spite of this kind of innovation, as in my own country, Aboriginal over-representation in the prison population continues to get worse rather than better (Office of the Correctional Investigator 2012). Innovation takes persistence, in the *longue durée* of justice systems, and Canada has not been so strong in this persistence.

During the decades since I first met John Braithwaite, I have come to appreciate that one reason Canadian public servants are analytically special is that they draw on bridge people who are analytically special. These are Canadians who glide between the worlds of public policy, academia, and civil society. Carol LaPrairie was one of them. She would think the words in this essay about the Canadian state somewhat romantic. Nor was Carol misty-eyed about theory and research from

the academy, which she thought, nevertheless, had genuine value; for example, in the case of restorative justice. She was not a romantic about the sphere of civil society where she became an unusually sophisticated specialist: the justice institutions of Canadian Aboriginal peoples.

This non-Canadian is a romantic about Carol and about the bridging role she played so well. Benoit Dupont's (2006) work on nodal governance of security in Quebec showed that the key nodes who bridge large bureaucracies, like police departments, to other large organizations are surprisingly often a single individual. Carol LaPrairie was one of those singular nodes. Just as important as the way bridging social capital enriches the public sphere is the way it enriches the intellectual life of universities. Carol was a Canadian government official at the time she visited the Australian National University (ANU) with Philip Stenning, two decades ago. She is the only international visitor I can remember who went out with me on fieldwork, in Adelaide and more remote parts of South Australia, observing restorative justice conferences. She was a "fieldworkaholic" with an incisive observational mind. Following in the wake of Carol, we had visits by senior officers of the RCMP, a delegation of First Nations elders, and a justice minister of British Columbia who later became its premier, among others who were interested in engaging with the research we were doing on restorative justice at ANU. This enriched ANU more than it enriched them.

From Ontario and Quebec to Alberta

Visiting the University of Toronto in the 1980s and 1990s, one found Carol LaPrairie was a small part of the large complex of bridging social capital among different Canadian institutions that created a special excellence about that place. Carol was not in the Centre of Criminology (now the Centre for Criminology and Sociolegal Studies) of the University of Toronto, but she was of it. She was part of its constellation of conversations and a particularly important element of its linkages to learning lessons from Indigenous Canada. During the 1980s and 1990s, I was quite a traveller among the best criminology programs. I felt that the University of Toronto nexus, partly because it was more than just its inmates—connecting clusters of interesting folk from many parts of Ontario and beyond—was the most intellectually interesting node of criminological thinking in the world. I am no judge of whether it still is, as I spend more time visiting war-torn societies than criminology departments during the present century.

What was special about the University of Toronto was the quality of the conversation. One example was the invention of private policing as a field at the University of Toronto in the 1980s, particularly through the agency of Clifford Shearing and Philip Stenning (1987), but also involving many others. This was a brilliant break-out from the institutional shackles of prisons-police-courts that enfeeble criminology. These were scholars who did more to improve the work of other scholars than they did to advance their own. Of course, their largest single contribution was through their own writings and lectures, but the bigger, aggregate contribution was in improving the contributions of a hundred others through the exceptional quality of strategic conversations about their research. We all learnt to think more in terms of public police as the actors who provide security as we move from one bubble of private security to another. We land at the airport under airport security; arrive to work at a university under university security; go to a shopping mall under mall security; watch a sporting event under the surveillance of stadium security. Only as we move from one bubble of private security to another is it the public police who have front-line responsibility for our security. It motivated a new form of theoretical organization around nodal governance (e.g., Wood and Shearing 2007) that mobilized many brilliant young Canadian scholars, such as Jennifer Wood and Benoit Dupont. Before Dupont became one of those bridging between continental and new-world metropolises, between social science and computer science, on the networked governance of the Internet, Jean-Paul Brodeur (2010), leading the University of Montreal's International Centre for Comparative Criminology, completed a foundational body of work there on *The Policing Web*.

In the chemistry that leavens the kind of intellectual loaves we saw baked at the University of Toronto during Carol LaPrairie's time in that city (and commuting from Ottawa), the bridging capital of the likes of Carol was yeast. There were other fine conversations in the social psychological, micro-macro tradition of Anthony Doob, who was one great leader of that Toronto criminology department. So many of us were shaped by conversations about the work of that group on how and why ordinary citizens become less punitive when they get closer to the context and the lived experience of a given crime (Doob and Roberts 1983; 1988). Rosemary Gartner's work with Dane Archer (Archer and Gartner 1984) on how war increases post-war homicide still profoundly influences the writing of many of us on the theory of crime-war today.

The most prominent scholar of crime-war and criminologist of genocide is John Hagan ([Hagan and Rymond-Richmond 2008](#)). He was in the Sociology Department of the University of Toronto. There was a kind of competitive tension between that group and the Centre of Criminology. Excellence blossomed on both sides of that little divide. Perhaps John Hagan's finest accomplishment was *Mean Streets*, written with Bill McCarthy, who did a Toronto PhD ([Hagan and McCarthy 1997](#)) on how (among other insights) homeless children on the streets of Toronto and Vancouver had what they described as "street families." We restorative justice scholars absorbed, from this work, the need to learn how to work with street families as social support units in processes of transformative justice. [Hagan and McCarthy \(1997: 191-7\)](#) also tested Lawrence [Sherman's \(1993\)](#) defiance theory against the prediction that children who have been humiliated, have been treated unfairly, and have had bonds severed by virtue of being victims of sexual abuse or physical violence will have their criminal behaviour amplified by traditional criminal justice processing more than offenders who have not been abused (with bruising or bleeding). Their data supported the defiance theory prediction.

One of my early experiences in Canada was as a guest of the warm hospitality of Jim and Bunny Hackler, when I gave the Nettler Lecture at the University of Alberta thirty years ago. Jim and Bunny, as denizens of criminology conferences, were intellectually engaging and rather like Carol and Philip, epitomizing the social glue and hospitality that make communities of scholarship communities, rather than just aggregations of people with a shared interest. Jim Hackler has a great cosmopolitan and comparative criminological imagination. Gwynne Nettler was John Hagan's PhD supervisor. As a student, I had a grudging admiration for the incisiveness and empirical edge of Nettler's work, particularly his sweeping book *Explaining Crime* ([Nettler 1984](#)). It was grudging because I had a very different explanatory and political take on the importance of inequality as an explanation of crime.

From British Columbia to Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and Labrador

One of the Canadian PhD students whom Carol LaPrairie engaged during her time at ANU was Brenda Morrison. Today, Brenda leads the inspiring work of the Centre for Restorative Justice at Simon Fraser University. Brenda has done path-breaking work on restorative

approaches to the smart regulation of school bullying (Morrison 2007). This work matters in terms of the institutional critique of criminology because it is possible that what schools do matters more than what prisons–police–courts do for patterns of crime, including corporate crime. This is because, as Morrison’s work explains, school bullies are more likely to become the organizational bullies of corporations and coercive state organizations that commit crimes (up to genocide).

For a restorative justice scholar, the most distinctive of the many urban nodes of criminological community in Canada is, perhaps, Nova Scotia. The distinctive holism of the Nova Scotia approach to restorative justice has blossomed in recent decades. Learning from First Nations traditions is an important part of that holism, fostered by the Nova Scotia Restorative Justice Community University Research Alliance (NSRJ-CURA). This community university research alliance has been a special program of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council. It has promoted a most encouraging kind of transformation of the dysfunctional criminal justice system that we see everywhere in the world. There was a time when it could be argued that New Zealand and my own country were the most innovative places in the world on restorative justice practice and research. Today, that country is surely Canada, a return of leadership to the place where the first of the post-1970 wave of restorative justice innovation occurred (in Kitchener, Ontario). NSRJ-CURA and its networks became part of this global Canadian leadership by provincial collaboration between the major stakeholders in the Nova Scotia Restorative Justice Program and scholars from five universities. The Alliance forged local, regional, national, and international partnerships across multiple disciplines and sectors.

NSRJ-CURA involves 17 different research projects focusing on the theoretical and practical issues that arise with the development and application of restorative justice. The 17 research fronts reflected five overarching themes: (1) translation of principles into practice, (2) community, (3) diversity and equity, (4) gender, and (5) conceptualizing and measuring success. The initiatives were diverse, including a play, David Craig’s *Tough Case* (2011), that was artistically brilliant and deeply engaging to audiences, including school children. It toured province-wide and beyond. NSRJ-CURA projects tackled problems such as senior safety and elder abuse, trauma-informed justice for intimate violence, and rights protection within restorative justice; they explored African communities’ experiences with restorative justice

and engaged the African community in discussions about the use of research to support and encourage development of *ceasefire* models ([Kennedy 1997; 2009](#)) for Nova Scotia, in a more restorative way. They considered the implications of relational theory ([Llewellyn 2011](#)) for the governance of restorative justice and, more broadly, the application of an integrative conceptual framework to develop ways of extending a restorative approach to social and political institutions and goals, not just to the criminal justice system, but to the whole of government and whole of civil society.

NSRJ-CURA prioritized the building of collaborative relationships across sectors (community, university, government) and among areas of government (justice, education, community services, human rights, status of women) and disciplines (criminology, law, health, sociology, social work). These relationships and the commitment to work, and build capacity to work, in deeply collaborative ways has been central to NSRJ-CURA since its inception. All of the partners (community/university/government) have played significant leadership roles in the governance of the project, the conduct of research, the analysis of data, and the dissemination and mobilization of knowledge. Through this approach, the NSRJ-CURA strengthened the collaborative capacities that might enable impacts to be sustained.

A particularly profound influence on restorative justice thinking, within Indigenous justice and beyond, was the work of Joan Pennell and Gale Burford when they were working in Canada. [Burford and Pennell's \(1998\)](#) research on serious cases of family violence in Newfoundland and Labrador found that abuse/neglect incidents were reduced in families that went through a restorative family conferencing process compared with a matched control group of families. A halving of abuse/neglect incidents was found for 32 families, comparing the year after the conference to the year before, while incidents increased markedly for 31 control families. [Pennell and Burford's \(1997; 2000\)](#) research is also a model of sophisticated process development and process evaluation and of methodological triangulation. While 63 families might seem modest for quantitative purposes and could never loom large in a meta-analysis, the study is actually statistically persuasive in demonstrating that this was an intervention that reduced family violence. There were, in fact, 472 participants in the conferences for the 32 families, and 115 of these were interviewed to estimate levels of violence affecting different participants ([Pennell and Burford 1997; 2000](#)). Moreover, within each case, a before-and-after pattern was tested

against 31 different types of events (e.g., abuse of child, child abuses mother, attempted suicide, father keeps income from mother) where events could be relevant to more than one member of the family. Given this pattern matching of *families* × *events* × *individual family members*, it understates the statistical power of the design to say it is based on only 63 cases. As with Bonta, Rooney, and Wallace-Capretta's (1998) evaluation of the Restorative Resolutions project in Manitoba, Burford and Pennell show that a carefully designed restorative program that targets many Indigenous offenders who might otherwise be heading to prison might substantially reduce both crime and Indigenous incarceration.

Burford and Pennell (1998: 253) also reported reduced drinking problems after conferences. Also, beyond the positive effects for the direct objective of reducing violence, the evaluation found a post-test increase in family support (concrete—e.g., babysitting—and emotional) and enhanced family unity, even in circumstances where some conference plans involved separation of parents from their children. In Pennell and Burford's (1995) family violence conferences, 94% of family members were "satisfied with the way it was run," 92% felt they were "able to say what was important," and 92% "agreed with the plan decided on." A reservation from Carol LaPrairie (1995) that we must bear in mind, when drawing on these lessons, is a pattern of greater satisfaction among Aboriginal leaders and offenders than among *victims* for restorative projects in Canadian Aboriginal communities. The Newfoundland and Labrador work was also a profound influence on us at ANU because of the way it connected to the research we were doing on reintegrative shaming at that time. Pennell and Burford's (1996: 218) conferences "generated a sense of shame across the extended family for not having acted in the past to safeguard its relatives as well as a sense of shared identity because often the problems which their relatives experienced were common in their own lives." It was reintegrative shaming rather than stigma that was allowed to consolidate because the program supplied a path for extended families to seize power, put things right, and transcend shame by acknowledging it (Ahmed, H. J. Braithwaite, and V. Braithwaite 2001).

As in the Nova Scotia work of NSRJ-CURA, Burford and Pennell's network mobilized non-academic media, as exemplified in the award-winning Health Canada film *Widening the Circle: The Family Group Decision Making Experience* (Pennell, Burford, and Cahill 1998). It illustrates the concept of plurality of deliberation as a key to restorative effectiveness. We see, in the film, a social worker list, on butcher paper,

the range of options available locally for dealing with family violence. Later, the experts leave but are called in to explain some other kinds of treatment options that the family members think might help in their situation. Most importantly, the film gave direct voice to the perspectives of Indigenous people, as restorative justice advocates have done in Canada, from the Yukon to the Atlantic Provinces.

Conclusion

In the midst of this Canadian promise, however, we must be constantly on guard, in light of Carol LaPrairie's (1999) warning that, sadly, restorative justice is often "responsibilization without resources." Carol tempered my enthusiasm for the excellence of the research-driven and community-driven innovation in Canadian criminal justice with the caution that long-term commitment to resourcing of communities, and to the welfare state more broadly, ebbs and flows more radically in Canada than it does in the most progressive European polities.

This essay has illustrated the hybridity strengths of Canadian research and innovation on crime. It could have been illustrated with work from other provinces by many other Canadian criminologists. An important part of that hybridity is that much of the best work is not done by criminologists, but by social workers, psychologists, lawyers, and representatives of many other scholarly traditions, as well as by elders of Indigenous communities. It is also a researcher-practitioner-community hybridity, where the bridging social capital of the Carol LaPrairies of Canada is important. Academic excellence in the Scottish Enlightenment was fuelled by Scotland fostering strong channels of exchange with the great intellectual metropolises of that era—especially Paris and London—while also distancing itself from their orthodoxies. In a similar way, Canadian criminology benefits from its francophone channels to European sensibilities and from its proximity to the powerhouses of the discipline in the United States, without being "American" or "European." The influence from bridging to its own Indigenous communities has been helpful in that.

At the same time, Carol LaPrairie was sensitive to the fact that Canada suffers from a kind of white-settler society insularity that also afflicts my own country. Learning from the eastern and southern peripheries of the globe is not, in general, an impressive characteristic of Canadian criminology. And Canadian criminology, for all the improved hybridity illustrated herein, like all criminology, is ensnared in a prisons-

police–courts institutional trap. The Indigenous peoples that Carol LaPrairie struggled with continue to be trapped in prisons by the global and state reproduction of capitalist welfare and unemployment crises. Criminology persistently fails to dissect how to prevent this. Canadians take too much comfort from the fact that Canada’s financial institutions did not make the contribution to the 2008 global financial crisis that corporate crime in the United States and certain European banks made. Like western social science generally, Canada also fails to generate sufficient theory and research of relevance to preventing future crises that are partly crises of organizational crime.

Notes

- 1 A paradox in this may be that the *new institutionalism* has been a good turn in the social sciences. I would not want to contest this. The problem, as I see it, is scholarship organized around categories of institutions as opposed to organized around theories of institutionalism.
- 2 Sociology is something of a break-out discipline, which does limited disciplining of its inmates to stick with certain kinds of “social institutions,” although “that’s not sociology” was certainly a comment faculty members made about my work and that of others, when we were PhD students.
- 3 I was not a leader, but in 1983, I accepted a verbal job offer, following an interview at Simon Fraser because I saw Canada as a more hospitable seedbed for developing theories of just regulation. Simon Fraser, faced with budget cuts, had the wisdom to withdraw the offer before a letter was dispatched.

References

- Ahmed, E. N., Harris J. Braithwaite, and V. Braithwaite
2001 Shame Management through Reintegration. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Archer, Dane, and Rosemary Gartner
1984 Violence and Crime in Cross-National Perspective. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Archibald, Kathy, Robert Coleman, and Christopher Foster
2011 Open letter to UK Prime Minister David Cameron and Health

Secretary Andrew Lansley on safety of medicines. *Lancet* 377 (9781): 1915. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(11\)60802-7](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(11)60802-7).

Bonta, James, Jennifer Rooney, and Suzanne Wallace-Capretta

1998 *Restorative Justice: An Evaluation of the Restorative Resolutions Project*. Ottawa: Solicitor General Canada.

Braithwaite, John

1984 *Corporate Crime in the Pharmaceutical Industry*. London: Routledge.

Braithwaite, John

2002 *Restorative Justice and Responsive Regulation*. Sydney: Federation. New York: Oxford University Press.

Braithwaite, John

2011 Preface. In *What Is Criminology?* ed. M. Bosworth and C. Hoyle. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brodeur, Jean-Paul

2010 *The Policing Web*. New York: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199740598.001.0001>.

Burford, Gale and Joan Pennell

1998 *Family Group Decision Making Project: Outcome Report, Vol. 1*. St John's, NL: Family Group Decision Making Project.

Craig, David

2011 *Tough Case*. <http://davidscraig.com/tough-case/>.

Diamond, Jared

1999 *Guns, Germs and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: Norton.

Doob, Anthony and Julian Roberts

1983 *Sentencing: An Analysis of the Public's View of Sentencing—A Report to the Department of Justice, Canada*. Ottawa: Department of Justice.

Doob, Anthony and Julian Roberts

1988 *Public attitudes towards sentencing in Canada*. In *Public Attitudes to Sentencing*, ed. N. Walker and M. Hough. Aldershot, UK: Gower.

Dukes, Graham, John Braithwaite, and James Maloney

2014 *Corporate Crime, Pharmaceuticals and Public Health*. Cheltenham, UK: Elgar.

Dupont, Benoit

- 2006 Mapping security networks: From metaphorical concept to empirical model. In *Fighting Crime Together: The Challenges of Policing and Security Networks*, ed. J. Fleming and J. Wood. Sydney: UNSW Press.

Ford, Cristie and David Hess

- 2011 Corporate monitorships and new governance regulation: In theory, in practice and in context. *Law and Policy* 33 (4): 509–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9930.2011.00347.x>.

Gotzsche, Peter

- 2013 *Deadly Medicines and Organized Crime: How Big Pharma has Corrupted Healthcare*. London: Radcliffe.

Hagan, John and Bill McCarthy

- 1997 *Mean Streets: Youth Crime and Homelessness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511625497>.

Hagan, John and Wenona Rymond-Richmond

- 2008 *Darfur and the Crime of Genocide*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511804748>.

Harris, Julian, Philip Stevens, and Julian Morris

- 2009 *Keeping It Real: Combating the Use of Fake Drugs in Developing Countries*. London: International Policy Network. <http://www.africanliberty.org/pdf/Keepingitreal.pdf>.

International Centre for Prison Statistics / Essex University

- 2013 *Entire World: Prison Population Rates per 100,000 of the National Population*. London: ICPS. http://www.prisonstudies.org/info/worldbrief/wpb_stats.php?area=all&category=wb_poprate.

Kennedy, David M.

- 1997 Pulling levers: Chronic offenders, high-crime settings, and a theory of prevention. *Valparaiso University Law Review* 31 (2): 449–85.

Kennedy, David M

- 2009 *Deterrence and Crime Prevention: Reconsidering the Prospect of Sanction*. New York: Routledge.

LaPrairie, Carol

- 1995 Altering course: New directions in criminal justice and corrections – Sentencing circles and family group conferences. *Crime, Criminology and Public Policy*. Spec. Issue of Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology (December): 78–99.

LaPrairie, Carol

- 1999 Some reflections on new criminal justice policies in Canada: Restorative justice, alternative measures and conditional sentences. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology 32 (2): 139-52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/000486589903200204>.

Llewellyn, Jennifer J.

- 2011 Restorative justice: Thinking relationally about justice. In *Being Relational: Reflections on Relational Theory and Health Law*, ed. J. Downie and J. J. Llewellyn. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Morrison, Brenda

- 2007 *Restoring Safe School Communities: A Whole School Response to Bullying*. Sydney: Federation.

Nettler, Gwynne

- 1984 *Explaining Crime*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Office of the Correctional Investigator

- 2012 *Spirit Matters: Aboriginal People and the Corrections and Conditional Release Act – Final Report*. Ottawa: Office of the Correctional Investigator. <http://www.oci-bec.gc.ca/cnt/rpt/pdf/oth-aut/oth-aut20121022-eng.pdf>.

Pennell, Joan and Gale Burford

- 1995 *Family Group Decision Making: New Roles for 'Old' Partners in Resolving Family Violence. Implementation Report, vol 1*. St. John's, NL: Family Group Decision Making Project; University of Newfoundland.

Pennell, Joan and Gale Burford

- 1996 *Attending to context: Family group decision making in Canada. In Family Group Conferences: Perspectives on Policy and Practice*, ed. J. Hudson, A. Morris, G. Maxwell, and B. Galaway. Sydney: Federation; Criminal Justice.

Pennell, Joan and Gale Burford

- 1997 *Family Group Decision Making: After the Conference – Progress in Resolving Violence and Promoting Well-Being*. St. John's, NL: Family Group Decision Making Project; School of Social Work; University of Newfoundland.

Pennell, Joan and Gale Burford

- 2000 *Family group decision making: Protecting children and women. Child Welfare 79: 131-58.*

Pennell, Joan, Gale Burford, and Brian Cahill

- 1998 Widening the Circle: The Family Group Decision Making Experience [Video]. Ottawa: Health Canada. <http://www.restorativejustice.org/editions/2007/april2007/videofgdm>.

Schumpeter, Joseph A.

- 1962 Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York: Harper.

Shearing, Clifford and Philip Stenning, eds.

- 1987 Private Policing. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sherman, Lawrence

- 1993 Defiance, deterrence and irrelevance: A theory of the criminal sanction. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 30 (4): 445-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022427893030004006>.

Sutherland, Edwin H.

- 1983 White-Collar Crime: The Uncut Version. Intro. Gilbert Geis and Colin Goff. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. [Originally published 1949].

United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime

- 2013 Homicide Statistics. <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/homicide.html>.

Wood, Jennifer and Clifford Shearing

- 2007 Imagining Security. Portland, OR: Willan.