

Critical Criminology in Canada



Law and Society Series

W. WESLEY PUE, GENERAL EDITOR

The Law and Society Series explores law as a socially embedded phenomenon. It is premised on the understanding that the conventional division of law from society creates false dichotomies in thinking, scholarship, educational practice, and social life. Books in the series treat law and society as mutually constitutive and seek to bridge scholarship emerging from interdisciplinary engagement of law with disciplines such as politics, social theory, history, political economy, and gender studies.

A list of the titles in this series appears at the end of this book.

Critical Criminology in Canada

New Voices, New Directions

..... Edited by Aaron Doyle and Dawn Moore



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

© UBC Press 2011

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright (Canadian Copyright Licensing Agency), www.accesscopyright.ca.

21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 12 11 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on FSC-certified ancient-forest-free paper
(100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Critical criminology in Canada : new voices, new directions /
edited by Aaron Doyle and Dawn Moore.

(Law & society, ISSN 1496-4953)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7748-1834-6

1. Critical criminology. 2. Criminology – Study and teaching (Higher) – Canada.
3. Criminology – Canada. I. Doyle, Aaron II. Moore, Dawn, 1974- III. Series: Law and society series (Vancouver, B.C.)

HV6019.C75 2011

364.01

C2010-903473-2

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada through the Book Publishing Industry Development Program (BPIDP), and of the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Aid to Scholarly Publications Programme, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press
The University of British Columbia
2029 West Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2
604-822-5959 / Fax: 604-822-6083
www.ubcpress.ca

.....

Contents

Acknowledgments / vii

Introduction: Questions for a New Generation of Criminologists / 1

AARON DOYLE AND DAWN MOORE

Part 1: Canadian Criminology in the Twenty-First Century / 25

- 1** The Dilemmas of “Doing” Criminology in Quebec: Curse or Opportunity? / 31

BENOÎT DUPONT

- 2** Reconciling Spectres: Promises of Criminology / 55

BRYAN R. HOGEVEEN

- 3** Commodifying Canadian Criminology: Applied Criminology Programs and the Future of the Discipline / 75

LAURA HUEY

Part 2: Expanding the Criminological Focus / 99

- 4** Corporate and White-Collar Crime: The Study of Financial Wrongdoing in the Era of Neo-Liberalism / 109

JAMES W. WILLIAMS

- 5** Criminological Nightmares: A Canadian Criminology of Genocide / 136

ANDREW WOOLFORD



- 6 Power and Resistance in Community-Based Sentencing / 162**

DIANA YOUNG

- 7 Stigma and Marginality: Gendered Experiences of Families
of Male Prisoners in Canada / 183**

STACEY HANNEM

Part 3: Theory and Praxis / 219

- 8 Reimagining a Feminist Criminology / 227**

GILLIAN BALFOUR

- 9 The Promise of Critical Realism: Toward a Post-Empiricist
Criminology / 243**

GEORGE S. RIGAKOS AND JON FRAULEY

- 10 The Right to the City on Trial / 269**

LISA FREEMAN

- 11 Anarcho-Abolition: A Challenge to Conservative and Liberal
Criminology / 288**

KEVIN WALBY

List of Contributors / 308

Index / 311

..... Acknowledgments

There are a number of people and organizations who have lent support to the creation of this collection. Special thanks to the Departments of Law and of Sociology/Anthropology at Carleton and the Department of Sociology at the University of Alberta, as well as the Faculties of Arts and Social Sciences and of Public Affairs at Carleton and Arts and Social Sciences at the University of Alberta for funding to assist with the workshop that sparked this book.

We offer a very special thank you to the sorely missed Law Commission of Canada (LCC), which also provided generous funding for that workshop. The LCC was a shining light in the world of critical research on the law in Canada. We are particularly indebted to Yves le Bouthillier for his direct participation in the workshop, as well as to Gordana Krcevinac from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for her valuable assistance. Thanks to SSHRC and to the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences for their support of this book.

Akwasi Owusu-Bempeh provided indispensable assistance in organizing the workshop and putting together the manuscript. Thank you, Akwasi.

Our editor at UBC Press was Randy Schmidt. We appreciate how solidly he supported us throughout this project; without that support, it is likely this collection would never have seen completion. We owe a large debt of gratitude to Randy. Likewise, many staff at UBC from copy editors to promotions people deserve our thanks for all their hard work, in particular Ann Macklem. We also want to thank the Editorial Board of the Law and Society Series and especially Wes Pue.

Aside from the contributors, many others were directly involved in the discussions about the future of critical criminology that led to this book. At the risk of forgetting some of the participants, we would like to thank Dale Ballucci, Larry Buhagiar, Carolyn Côté-Lussier, Paul Datta, Erin Dej, Sylvie Frigon, Neil Gerlach, Michael Gulayets, Michael Handelman, Alan Hunt,



Jennifer Kilty, Maeve McMahon, Mike Mopas, Pat O’Malley, Justin Piché, and Jennifer Whitson. Again at the risk of omitting some, special thanks to Bryan Hogeweene, Joane Martel, Bob Ratner, and Andrew Woolford for their various efforts at building collaboration among Canadian critical criminologists over the years, and to Laura Huey and Paul Paré for organizing the follow-up “Bridging Divides” workshop in 2009 at the University of Western Ontario.

Kevin Haggerty was a key part of this project, co-organizing the workshop and helping with the early stages of the book manuscript until he was overtaken by his many other scholarly commitments. As always, it was a great pleasure collaborating with Kevin and this book would not have happened without him.

A special thank you to our families for offering the support and making the sacrifices that families so often do. Liz, Gen, Charlie, Carrie, and Kier, thanks for seeing us through one more time!

Over the course of putting together this collection, our community lost four members who will be greatly missed both as people and as scholars. We want to close by remembering Jean-Paul Brodeur, Richard Ericson, Robynne Neugebauer, and David Sealy.

Critical Criminology in Canada

Introduction: Questions for a New Generation of Criminologists

.....
Aaron Doyle and Dawn Moore

Criminology in Canada is bigger than ever before, but at the same time faces its most severe challenges. The contributors to this book are members of a newer generation of criminologists emerging this century who are increasingly sharing leadership (or perhaps having leadership thrust on them). Far more university students are studying criminology than ever before, yet ironically, Canada's Conservative government is dismissive of criminological expertise that does not support its law and order agenda. This reflects the broader marginalization of criminology from public policy questions globally (Garland and Sparks 2000, Haggerty 2004, Currie 2007). The Harper government's aggressive law-and-order package of bills features, for example, new mandatory minimum prison sentences for a range of crimes, extending even to possession of a small number of marijuana plants. Other measures include a major reduction in conditional sentences. These measures will cram Canadian jails and prisons even more, with a price tag in the billions of dollars (Tibbetts 2010), while Canadian crime rates have been falling since the early 1990s. The vast majority of Canadian criminologists are ignored as we point out that research shows overwhelmingly that such measures are both inhumane and counterproductive (see, for example, Tonry 2009). Meanwhile, the Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre has already been so overcrowded that inmates have been living in the showers, and triple bunking is a feature of many Canadian penal facilities. We watch the spread of security certificates and surveillance cameras, hear of a teenaged Canadian citizen imprisoned in Guantánamo with no due process protections, and read repeatedly of people dying after being tasered by Canadian police.

We criminologists proliferate, even as we struggle to define just what criminology should be. How can we overcome our own internal divisions and polarizing tendencies, for example, among English Canadian and French Canadian scholars, or among "critical" and "positivist" thinkers? We face

urgent and vital questions about what we should now research and how we should theorize it, what our duty is to our thousands of new students, and, perhaps most pressingly, what our roles should be in shaping the politics of crime, in the news, in policy talk, or in mobilizing dissent.

Our aim in this book is to give voice to some of the newer people who are now shaping Canadian critical criminology and will help shape it in the years to come. We seek to gather some of the newer voices in Canadian criminology and related disciplines, but we do not presume to be representative of, or speak on behalf of, that generation. This is simply a collection of writing by one set of interesting newer criminologists we know.

These writers will continue to help shape important theoretical and practical debates about policing, criminalization, and punishment in the years to come. The book joins other efforts to get this newer generation to think about the future of criminology, such as the 2006 special issue of the *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* on critical criminology and socio-legal studies (Woolford, Hogeveen, and Martel 2006), the 2010 special issue of the same journal entitled “Bridging Divides in Canadian Criminology” (Huey and Paré 2010), plus various ongoing efforts to organize spaces at national meetings for critical scholars working in these areas.

The editors and contributing authors have spent hours in passionate discussion in various settings about broader themes that colour this book. This introduction draws out these themes. We editors pose a set of questions that face the new generation of Canadian criminologists. Note that we define “criminologist” broadly and in an interdisciplinary way, consistent with our roots at the Centre of Criminology at the University of Toronto, rather than restricting the term to a narrower, institutionally based definition. We do not seek to protect the term so it applies only to those based in criminology departments or with criminology PhDs. Instead, we also include those in other disciplines, here notably sociology and law, who are working substantively on criminal justice issues. The perspectives captured here are wide ranging on the matter of criminology and offer assorted glimpses into some of what the future might hold for a movement whose only constant over the last thirty years has been change. The beginnings of this project were at a workshop at Carleton University entitled “The Criminological Promise.” As Bryan Hogeveen notes in Chapter 2 in his meditation on the “criminological promise,” we are still haunted by the promise of earlier generations of criminologists to control crime scientifically, a promise most of us would now disavow. But what can and should we promise instead, then? Perhaps



the most urgent recurring points in our talks, the key points in this introduction, are the need to avoid polarization and to build intellectual alliances that accommodate difference, and the need to turn our critical scholarship more often into meaningful practice beyond the campus.

In the first section of this introduction, we consider the future of “critical criminology” and what that term means and could mean. In the second section, we look at how geographical and institutional locations shape Canadian criminologies. In the third section, we briefly identify some of the other key theoretical and substantive issues crosscutting contemporary critical research. In the fourth section, we highlight some of the advances and continued struggles of feminist criminology, and emphasize its continued importance for the discipline. In the fifth section, we talk about the challenges facing criminologists as teachers at a time that has seen massive expansion of undergraduate criminology programs. In the sixth and final section, we address the role of criminologists in questions of politics and criminal justice policy.

What Is the Future of Critical Criminology?

What Does Critical Criminology Mean? What Should It Mean?

One key question we considered in the discussions around this book is what the future holds for “critical criminology” and, indeed, what exactly “critical criminology” should mean. What has resulted, as is often the case when a lot of useful dialogue occurs, is a series of partial answers and further questions.

To begin with, we define criminology broadly as academic study of “crime” and social and governmental reactions to it. Depending on how it is defined, some see critical criminology globally as something whose moment quickly passed in the 1960s and 1970s, a product of radical times that came and went. Others see it differently, for example, Jock Young, one of the founders of the critical criminology movement with the landmark neo-Marxist book *The New Criminology* (Taylor, Walton, and Young 1973) and someone who remains one of the most avid, acute, and prolific contributors decades later. Young (2002, 259-60) sees the movement blossoming far beyond its neo-Marxist origins and writes: “Critical criminology is flourishing ... Critical criminology has been at the cutting edge of the discipline and is international in its scope ... think of the burgeoning literature on governmentality ... on masculinities ... or the extraordinary flourishing of cultural criminology ... and feminist criminology.” Some reject the term “critical criminology” as too much associated with the original neo-Marxist tradition. Others use the term, like Young, in a more inclusive way that incorporates a broad rainbow of

academics who research, question, and challenge current criminal justice institutions and practices, including not only neo-Marxists but also feminists, Foucauldians, legal geographers, anarchists, and numerous others who generally resist classification.

Younger twenty-first-century criminologists live in the aftermath of grand intellectual revolutions. For many who came later, the original neo-Marxist form of the critical criminological project lost its shine, and they sought to move criminological inquiry beyond what they saw as structural determinism into a realm that focused more on varicoloured power relations and on the gendered and racist aspects of crime control, as well as on complex matrices of governance. The optimism of the heyday of neo-Marxism, the vigour and moral certainties of second wave feminism, and the sheer intellectual vibrancy of postmodernism are all, to some extent, part of history now.

Critical criminology remains fundamentally concerned with researching and theorizing power relations in crime and criminalization, power relations that lead to social injustice. Critical criminology also arguably implies a commitment to put theory into practice. Yet, the dimensions of these power relations, how they are theorized, and what putting theory into practice actually means are all ongoing topics of furiously animated exchange among critical criminologists. Even so, all that talk should occur with the sense that there is a common project that holds a very valuable heterogeneity. It can be argued that the term “critical criminologies” more accurately captures this radical heterogeneity (Sumner 2004). Like Woolford, Hogeveen, and Martel (2006), we thus want to celebrate “plurality and irreducible diversity” in our work. Another way to characterize a critical criminological orientation is that it tries to be actively self-conscious of its own margins and exclusions, continually trying to interrogate silences, omissions, and exclusions both from its research and theoretical approaches and from its politics and policy agendas. Although critical criminologists might be drawn toward such a common identity out of a sense of solidarity, we also see that categories constrain and foreclose possibilities. We are also conscious of the problems of organizing such a collective identity. Our senior colleagues recount that earlier efforts to recognize and develop critical criminology in Canada were sometimes painfully divisive and we are aware of this past.

One way we who contributed to this book have jokingly described our commonality is by saying that we are all people who might wander around the poster session at the American Society of Criminology (ASC) meetings and be horrified by much of what we see. (We are not denying there are also

many excellent papers at the ASC meetings, especially in the critical criminology section. We will continue to go there!)

Critical criminology has defined itself to a large degree by what it is not, situating itself against what it sees as the mainstream criminological enterprise. Indeed, all of us in this book have been influenced by Michel Foucault and a range of other key thinkers who problematized the discipline of criminology itself, who portrayed criminology (other than the criminology they did, of course) as fundamental to the apparatus of repression and punishment (Foucault 1977), and pushed to dismantle what they saw as "managerialist" criminology. Where do we now sit, then, in relation to criminology altogether? Is the mainstream criminological project fatally problematic? What of value might be salvaged from it?

There is clearly a conscious rejection among critical criminologists of managerialist criminology, leaving the more difficult question of what exactly constitutes managerialist criminology in the Canadian context. How should critical criminologists engage with a rather large group of broadly liberal Canadian criminologists who certainly do not fit neatly into the reductive dichotomy of critical and managerialist camps? How, then, do we relate to the many criminologists out there who may not talk about Foucault, and may do quantitative research, but who share many of the same fundamental criticisms that we have of the criminal justice system as very often harmful and counterproductive and unjust, and whose research, teaching, and work beyond the university tries to make things better? A lot of those so-called mainstream or positivist people are just as concerned as we are about issues such as overcrowded jails and prisons and about the futility of long sentences. They are arguably sometimes more engaged and effective advocates than many people who identify as "critical." Yet, critical criminologists sometimes end up set apart from these other critics, at a time when it might be much more productive to ally ourselves with them strategically on pressing criminological issues over social justice concerns we share.

This observed split between critical and liberal mainstream criminologies fits with a broader view that academia is inherently polarizing and tends strongly to drive wedges between positions that are not that far apart, so that people who really have a lot in common end up instead fighting about relatively small differences. Rather than Kuhnian paradigm shifts, as academic knowledge evolves, there is instead a continuous fracturing of positions that are not very far removed from one another, leading to a process of more and more fragmentation. This is an argument that Andrew Abbott (2001) makes

in his book *Chaos of Disciplines*. Heterogeneity is very healthy, as long as we listen to each other instead of shouting each other down.

Does the term “critical,” then, perpetuate an outsider status in the discipline? Does it promote polarized relations with others with whom critical criminologists have a fair bit in common and need more than ever as strategic allies? Here in Canada, are critical criminologists really outsiders anymore? Is the problem the supposed marginalization of critical criminology in academia from mainstream criminology, or is the problem the marginalization of criminology in general from a role shaping criminal justice practice (Garland and Sparks 2000; Garland 2001; Haggerty 2004)? One advantage of recent calls for a “public criminology” (Chancer and McLaughlin 2007; Currie 2007) is that they may push criminologists beyond debating such internal differences and toward finding common progressive goals in the world of criminal justice politics beyond the university.

Locating Criminology in Canada

Defining critical criminology in Canada is bound up with questions of geographical and institutional location. National identities remain key in criminology. We live in an increasingly globalized world, but the nation-state remains central in some of our research questions, for example, around national penal cultures (O’Malley 1999; Pratt et al. 2005). The nation-state is also central in understanding and defining trajectories in criminology itself. Global criminology continues to be dominated by academics from the North and West, especially the United States and Britain, in a way that is problematic. Also, critical criminology has taken somewhat different pathways, in the United States, say, versus in Britain. Previously, we used the example of being appalled by much of mainstream American criminology. Martel, Hogeveen, and Woolford (2006) give extensive evidence of the marginalization of critical criminology but focus narrowly on the American context. It might be argued that the critical criminology section of the ASC, as strongly institutionalized as it is, has a tendency to reproduce the separation of critical from mainstream criminology in the United States. There is an open question about the pros and cons of setting up a similar formal institutional structure for critical criminologists in Canada; some argue that it is healthier not to institutionalize critical criminology as separate here.

Canadian critical criminologists tend to look with disdain on much of the American criminological enterprise as blinkered, methodologically fetishistic, and compromised by its close alignment with the criminal justice system.

Looking at a good deal of the criminology work of our southern neighbours, it is often as if the postmodern turn, with its critical interrogation of grand narratives and presumptions about scientific certainty, never occurred. This is a frustrating situation to those of us who cut our intellectual teeth on Foucault, Donna Haraway, and Dorothy Smith. We tend to wince at unreflexive appeals to truth and scientific methodology and are immediately suspicious of the power politics inherent in appeals to established categories.

However, although this is still the case for too much American criminology, we must also acknowledge that it too is a very diverse enterprise that contains important currents of critical thought. Even so, critical criminology seems to be much more obviously marginalized in the United States than here in Canada or in Britain. It might be argued that outside the United States there has been movement to close the schism between critical and mainstream criminology, with a few key scholarly examples being the advent of journals such as *Theoretical Criminology* or the 2000 special issue of the *British Journal of Criminology*, edited by David Garland and Richard Sparks, on criminology and social theory (Garland and Sparks 2000) or the prominent place in the *Oxford Handbook of Criminology* of criminology rooted in broader critical social theory (Maguire, Morgan, and Reiner 2007).

Like a large portion of Canadian sociology, much of Canadian critical criminology is more oriented toward European theory, and particularly the work of Michel Foucault, than that of our American counterparts. It may be argued that the dire state of American criminology has led many to look to Britain in particular for inspiration. Yet, this British influence too has presented its own difficulties. The immersion of Canadian criminologists in the robust history of British radical criminology and left realism means that many of us are strangely familiar with developments that are iconic in British criminology, such as the miners' strike, the Thatcherite revolution, left realist statistical surveys, the increasing influence of the Home Office on British crime policy, and the unflinching embrace in the United Kingdom of closed-circuit TV cameras. The problem is that these developments occurred thousands of miles away in a very different political climate and were motivated – at least in part – by uniquely British historical factors. Many of these stories were not paralleled in Canada or took on very different forms across the Atlantic. The end result has been a form of intellectual colonization where junior Canadian critical criminologists can be more familiar with developments overseas than with what has happened in their own country. This situation is exacerbated by the precarious state of Canadian academic publishing, which can make it

difficult to communicate uniquely Canadian observations to a Canadian audience.

Canadian criminologists also face the particular research issue of exploring the distinctiveness of Canadian penal culture (Hatt, Caputo, and Perry 1992; Doob and Webster 2006). Although we live in an increasingly globalized world, the question of national differences in practices of punishment and the reasons for them remain very important. "Neo-liberalism" is often used as a blunt conceptual tool to talk about continuity across nations in recent penal practices – how and why, then, do penal politics vary by nation-state (O'Malley 1999)? Some claim Canada has "missed the punitive turn" compared with other jurisdictions (Meyer and O'Malley 2005). This is highly debatable (Moore and Hannah-Moffat 2005), but at least Canada has thus far offered somewhat of a favourable contrast to the nightmarish penal politics and prison population explosion of our neighbour to the south. Given our proximity geographically and socially to America, it is important to understand sociologically why, at least so far, we are sometimes not so punitive as the United States is, but also why sometimes, as in the case of our overcrowded provincial jails, Canada may be just as bad. Furthermore, we need to understand fully as researchers the socio-politics behind the Conservative government's current drive toward more American-style penal policies that will swell our prison population at great cost. These policies come despite Statistics Canada telling us that Canadian crime statistics have been declining since the beginning of the 1990s, and even as the State of California's finances are in ruins partly because of its own parallel laws leading to massive prison overcrowding (S. Moore 2009; *The Economist* 2009).

In Canada, critical criminologists sometimes make a straw figure of much mainstream positivist or managerial criminology and romanticize the marginalization of more critical scholars. Some critical criminologists (including ourselves) are highly frustrated with the tendencies toward reduction, conflation, and parody that too often characterize the repetitive and simplistic debate between "positivists" (our thoughtless pejorative term for them) and "postmodernists" (their thoughtless pejorative term for us). Critical criminologists too often unfairly characterize everyone doing any kind of quantitative research as automatically atheoretical, unreflexive, and conservative, when it is easy to think of quantitative criminologists who are none of these things. Meanwhile, others characterize anyone doing qualitative research informed by critical theory as "postmodernists" incapable of any empirical rigour, in



so doing collapsing the whole history of interpretive social science, and of social theory, into the now-exhausted 1990s debates around postmodernism.

Of course, there persists managerialist criminology that helps reproduce and reinvent oppressive and brutal features of criminal justice. Prevalent in the US, such criminology is less vital and hegemonic here in Canada, with the exception of a small number of academic departments. Historically, the civil service and its research branches have also often served as moderating influences on Canadian crime policy (Hatt, Caputo, and Perry 1992). The problem instead is the current federal government ignoring not only the vast majority of criminologists but also its own internal research. The government thus disregards the recommendations of officials in its own Public Safety ministry that “credible research shows that longer sentences do not contribute to public safety” and that “there is little or no empirical evidence to support the premise that hiring more police, as proposed in the platform, will have the result of reducing victimization” (Tibbetts 2006).

In considering whether critical criminology is marginalized in Canadian universities, it is important to look across the whole country. Historically, Canadian criminology has been oriented around four main departments, at the Université de Montréal, University of Ottawa, University of Toronto, and Simon Fraser University. The bleak and poignant account by Dorothy Chunn and Robert Menzies (2006; Menzies and Chunn 1999) of the marginalization of critical criminology at Simon Fraser, once a radical fountainhead, and of their departure from the School of Criminology along with two critically leaning colleagues, fortunately seems to reflect mostly their grim local experience. Criminology at Simon Fraser represents the extreme, not the situation of Canada as a whole. At other universities – for example, the Centre of Criminology at the University of Toronto, where both of us completed graduate degrees – there is much more of a healthy coexistence and collegiality between criminologists of varying theoretical and methodological persuasions. Critical and theoretical criminologists also now play a strong role at the University of Ottawa. Historical accounts arguing that critical perspectives have been marginalized in Canadian criminology also seem to ignore major, extremely influential figures such as the late Richard Ericson or Mariána Valverde, perhaps because of a difficulty in situating them neatly.

There have also long been blurred boundaries between criminology and socio-legal studies, and thus crossover with various law schools as well (D. Moore 2002). Socio-legal studies seems very institutionally healthy in

Canada, thanks in large part to the vibrant Canadian Law and Society Association (CLSA), and is a space where feminist scholarship is prominent. The CLSA is a key home for critical criminologists, with a number of criminologists on the board, and many of the presentations at national conferences being criminological.

The institutional bases of criminology in Canadian universities are also shifting. In part because of the expansion of criminology undergraduate programs, there are also new institutional foci at other universities (for example, at Carleton University, which both of us call home) and often in other disciplines, especially sociology and legal studies. In many of these emerging places, critical criminology seems to be thriving among professors and graduate students alike. Some argue that criminology should fundamentally be the province of those with doctoral degrees in the discipline itself; others, including ourselves, see critical criminology as more interdisciplinary. Sociology has always been perhaps the most prominent discipline informing criminology, especially in North America, and it goes without saying that Canadian critical criminology is also a sociological criminology and one connected to broader social theory. It is always a critical move to connect private troubles to public issues (Mills 1959). Sociological criminology battles the profound social tendencies to individualize wholly the problem of crime, tendencies that are prominent in the criminal justice system, in the media and wider culture, and in other disciplines such as psychology. In Canada, there is also strong interplay between criminology and thriving work on political economy, on risk, on governmentality, on security, on legal geography, and in surveillance studies, much of which is substantively concerned with criminal justice. Much of this work is done by people with graduate degrees in disciplines other than criminology.

All of this is encouraging, but there are also some very significant negatives. The destruction by the Harper government of the Law Commission of Canada, one of the sponsors of the conference that was the starting point of this book, kicked out one key support for research that asked tough questions about criminal justice policies.

Martel, Hogeveen, and Woolford (2006) cite studies demonstrating the marginalization of scholarship by women and African Americans in criminology. In Canada, a parallel problem is the marginalization of French Canadian criminology. The strong tradition of French Canadian criminology, centred at the Université de Montréal and the University of Ottawa, continues to operate very far away from Anglo-Canadian criminology, as Benoît Dupont



discusses in Chapter 1, and this is one very important gap for us to work to bridge.

Theoretical and Substantive Debates

As is clear from impassioned discussions at the conference, our critical criminology also features numerous other theoretical and substantive debates. For instance, what should be our object of study: something called crime, or processes of criminalization, or something tied to a broader notion of harm or social justice? Several chapters here extend the focus to people and topics that have not historically been studied by criminologists, such as genocide (Andrew Woolford's Chapter 5). Stacey Hannem (Chapter 7) likewise proposes extending the critical ambit empirically to incorporate research on the families of prisoners, even as she extends it theoretically to bring in an earlier sociological tradition of research on stigma. Others offer new ways of thinking about existing fields. James Williams (Chapter 4) offers novel and important approaches to corporate and white-collar crime. Diana Young (Chapter 6) takes a fresh look at the implication of social services in the criminal justice system.

More questions: Does critical criminology mean abandoning the question of the etiology of crime or simply refocusing etiological analyses on the criminogenic properties of late capitalism or of contemporary masculinities? Where should critical criminologists stand on the restorative justice movement? How much can the heterogeneity of critical criminologies incorporate both realist and strong constructionist ontologies? One position is that people on both sides of these realist-constructionist debates should nevertheless acknowledge that their critical projects have a great deal in common. George Rigakos and Jon Frauley argue otherwise in their provocative chapter (Chapter 9) on critical realism.

Certainly, there is sometimes validity to the intellectual criticisms people have of critical criminology, to the things people say about us. These include, as we have said, not only reductionism and adopting "straw figure" opponents without fully engaging with those positions but also other failures: inverse functionalism; fetishization of social theory and key theorists, especially Foucault, in a way that is inaccessible; retreat into obscurantism (see Boyd 2007), lack of methodological rigour; empirical studies with outcomes pre-ordained by theory; and perhaps most crucially, lack of meaningful practice.

Criminological work in governmentality studies is critical of political economy for narrowly focusing on the state as opposed to a broader focus

on governance beyond the state (Williams and Lippert 2006). Governmentality studies is criticized in turn for its lack of realist ontology and praxis (Balfour, this volume; and Rigakos and Frauley, this volume). One approach is to argue that a more pressing question is a lack of ability by either to turn critical theory into practice.

What kind of truth claims can we criminological experts make in the world beyond academia? With initiatives such as the Conservatives' introduction of new mandatory minimum sentences, should we be saying, for example, that a decisively large body of research shows convincingly that long prison sentences do not reduce crime – or are we somehow trying to destabilize the machinery of truth that makes such statements possible? We are on stable enough ontological and epistemological footing to say that prisons and capital punishment do not accomplish their alleged goals, and it is very important to say this. This leads to the next question. If we say that “tough” sentencing regimes mostly do more harm than good, how and where do we say this?

Feminist Criminology: Advances and Challenges

Feminists made key contributions to the early critical movement in the United Kingdom and the United States, yet often their work was marginalized and ignored within “malestream” critical criminology that routinely treated women, especially women in conflict with the law and issues of women’s victimization, as ancillary to the larger project (Naffine 1996; Ratner 2006). Naffine (1996) describes the critical criminological project as one that takes maleness as the accepted norm of criminological inquiry, applying an “add women and stir” strategy that routinely fails to appreciate how women’s experiences differ in criminal justice as both victims and offenders. Feminist criminology has often been marginalized in Canada also (see Gillian Balfour’s Chapter 8), but it has progressed considerably nevertheless, and we celebrate the growing and important body of feminist criminological research here.

Feminist scholarship is taking its place more and more in undergraduate and graduate criminology programs across the country. This is overdue but still so far insufficient. Meanwhile, women students often predominate numerically in these programs. For example, of the 200 or so students a year entering criminology as a major at Carleton, about two-thirds are women. The rates for female enrolment in criminology run ahead of the rates of women entering the social sciences more generally. Encouragingly, courses on women and the law, if not core curriculum, are now standard fare for most criminology/law

and society programs, and young women scholars are being hired consistently as professors in criminology programs across the country. Of course, we cannot assume that every woman scholar is interested in feminist scholarship (just as it is wrong to assume that men in the academy are not feminists). However, there is sometimes a sense that departments have an informal quota of feminist-oriented criminologists (typically one or two). Given this, emerging scholars (male or female) may be disinclined, at least initially, to frame their work as feminist lest they render themselves less marketable. Meanwhile, introducing feminism in the classroom remains sometimes a precarious endeavour. Some students appear willing to accept one week of feminism taught in a survey course but become resistant and in some cases belligerent when faced with more extensive feminist interventions (D. Moore 2008). This seems especially true when the professor is a woman whom the students read (rightly or wrongly) as a feminist. Thus, feminist thought does not always appear to enjoy the same degree of legitimacy among the student population as it does in select academic circles. One encouraging example has been the third-year sociology of gender and justice course at Carleton, which has been taken mostly by criminology students using it to fulfill a core course requirement and which has been very popular. (One factor was that the class was taught for many years by the late Robynne Neugebauer, an outstanding teacher who won multiple awards and was much loved by the students. Her sudden and untimely death in 2007 was a huge blow to many.)

We also faced challenges in including feminist criminology in this collection. When we organized the workshop on the future of critical criminology that was the starting place for this book, we foresaw a key role that feminist criminology would play in our event, but in the end this did not happen to the extent we wanted. Two women presenters withdrew fairly close to the workshop, one citing as the primary reason her need to provide child care, unfortunately still too often a constraint for women academics in particular. Although feminist concerns were repeatedly raised and some of the authors featured here take up feminist frameworks elsewhere, there was little explicitly feminist work among the papers presented at the event. This absence bothered us a lot. This book is not intended to be a comprehensive survey but is merely meant to provide an outlet for one set of new voices, and, as with many such works, the selection is biased toward people we know. There are other key exclusions in the book, both geographical (no one from eastern Canada) and substantive, for example, not enough on questions of racialization and First Nations people. Nevertheless, we decided that it would be

wrong to put together a collection intending to speak to the future of the critical criminological movement without acknowledging the centrality of feminist work. At our request, Gillian Balfour kindly agreed to contribute a revised version of her previously published piece.

Feminist criminology is still engaged in ongoing and, in some cases, losing struggles (D. Moore 2008). Perhaps this is most obvious in the uneasy relationship between feminist criminologists and criminal justice reforms. Feminist criminologists are arguably among the most successful critical criminologists in putting theory into practice, and the Canadian criminal justice has offered many opportunities in the last thirty years – for example, the Prison for Women, Jane Doe, rape shield laws, police inattention to violence against women, the acute marginalization of Aboriginal women, including the many missing and murdered “Stolen Sisters,” such as Pamela George. There is not only much more work to be done but also huge cause for concern that earlier feminist work has been co-opted or is now under threat in an increasingly conservative political climate.

For example, Minaker and Snider (2006) offer an apt consideration of the rise of “husband abuse” as a perceived cause for concern by the criminal justice system. They take issue with claims that wives’ abuse of their husbands is anywhere near as pervasive and egregious a problem as wife assault. Minaker and Snider raise timely concerns for feminists, suggesting that equality claims can have deleterious effects on women, often working to bring them closer to the male norm, resulting in a system that ignores gender differences and thereby constitutes women as equally violent (and equally worthy of punishment) as men.

The Harper government has also attempted to claw back gains made specifically for women. The Correctional Service of Canada has moved to close the only minimum security facility for federally sentenced women in the country, Isabel McNeill House in Kingston. The Harper crime package cut against previous bids for decarceration, instead calling for a more Americanized system of criminal justice that relies on heavy funding for law enforcement and a range of mandatory minimum sentences. Such legislation will have terrible effects on the system as a whole and impact not only women in conflict with the law but also the mostly female partners of the largely male population that will be incarcerated as a result (see Hannem, this volume).

The Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women and its aftermath is a fundamental example of the co-optation of feminist ideals in the Canadian criminal justice system. Feminist activists and scholars were called to the table

to address the egregious circumstances of federally sentenced women. However, more than a decade after the task force report was released (and close to a decade after the infamous Prison for Women in Kingston was finally closed), the same activists and scholars are deeply concerned about new manifestations of gendered discrimination and institutional violence endemic in the system (Hannah-Moffat and Shaw 2000). The human rights complaint launched by the Canadian Association of Elizabeth Fry Societies is a case in point. This complaint cited myriad human rights abuses, including holding women in much more extreme security conditions than warranted and failing to meet women's basic health, cultural, and educational needs (Marriner and Moore 2006). Similarly, the superintendent of the Ottawa-Carleton Detention Centre testified in April 2006 in a case alleging human rights abuses at that institution. The superintendent indicated that women prisoners often faced what was essentially an extra punishment, being housed in the segregation unit, simply because there were no other facilities for them (Doyle and Walby, unpublished).

Feminist criminology also has its internal debates, the most contentious of which over the last ten years or so concerns the massive influence of Foucault – the “Foucault effect” that has swept much of the social sciences – and how this can interfere with feminist politics and praxis. As Gillian Balfour points out in this collection, the core issue is a tension between standpoint feminism and what Carol Smart (1995) describes as “postmodern feminism.” The trouble, according to Balfour, is that the Foucault effect is anaesthetizing, dampening the feminist activist spirit and lacking any clear political agenda. Balfour’s concerns (echoed by Snider 2003 and others) are worthy of consideration. At the same time, perhaps, as Clare Hemmings (2005) suggests in her consideration of the “waves” of feminism, feminist scholars and activists are better served by drawing on their commonalities rather than focusing on their differences. Hallway conversations at conferences reaffirm that we share similar political and intellectual concerns and that scholars are very capable of strategically adopting different positions when the situation warrants. Thus, regardless of their intellectual divisions, feminist criminologists have been close to unanimous on major issues such as the condition of women in prison.

Teaching Critical Criminology

We also need to reflect critically on the huge growth in undergraduate criminology programs across Canada, as Laura Huey discusses in Chapter 3. Our

duty to these students in the coming years is extended discussion and analysis: Why has this happened? What should we do about it?

Criminology undergraduate programs seem to prove very attractive to university administrators in the current marketplace, apparently because of their extreme popularity with students. Yet, the reasons for the rapid rise and popularity of these programs are not well understood. Is it a "CSI effect," as some claim, in which the massive popularity of the various ubiquitous TV series since 2000 has glamorized criminology? Are such criminology programs popular just because of their alleged vocational or perceived vocational orientation? Although criminology undergraduates are often stereotyped as wannabe cops, the students and their motivations are clearly diverse and, like the rest of our student populations, increasingly so. What accounts for the high proportion of women in undergraduate criminology courses?

Even if we are teaching a good proportion of the next generation of police, correctional, and probation officers (though, equally, we are teaching a good proportion of current and future activists, policy makers, defence lawyers, academics, and social workers), many universities, as opposed to colleges, reject the notion of skills-based training in favour of an analytical stance that problematizes crime and its control.

Our experience, having taught hundreds of criminology students, is that the current appeal by post-secondary institutions to students who are only interested in "getting a job" in criminal justice is actually targeting only one segment of criminology students. It was never the case that students (even in ostensibly applied criminology programs) went exclusively into criminal justice careers. As early as the 1980s, in one of the first empirical studies of an undergraduate criminology program in Canada, it was found that fully 40 percent of the students in an applied criminology program envisioned themselves going on to further education, including graduate school, law, and teacher's college (Buckley 1986). The BA criminology programs at the University of Alberta and at Carleton fit with this pattern – a large portion of these students during the course of their degrees come to be attracted to further education. The field placement coordinator at Carleton estimates that of eighty students each year in the placement program, forty will go on to further education once completing their criminology bachelor's degrees. And, of course, many of the contributors to this book were criminology undergraduates at one time.

Another implication of the explosion of criminology programs is that there is a furious scramble to find qualified people who will teach these



courses and, more difficultly, to fill full-time faculty positions. Is it possible that one consequence is that more people are being hired into criminology positions from a wider range of fields and subfields than has historically been the case? This is an open empirical question, but, if it is indeed the case, it might mean that students are exposed to an even wider range of perspectives and viewpoints from ostensible criminologists? Would those new faculty members be inclined toward (or even capable of) teaching “applied” criminology?

At Carleton, the undergraduate criminology program is shared between the departments of sociology and anthropology, of law, and of psychology, allowing the students to triangulate between different disciplinary perspectives. Our experience is that the resulting disjunctions in vision often raise troubling questions for the students in the program, disjunctions that we see as creating very valuable and important “teachable moments.”

In such programs, perhaps the goal is to foster more amicable relations between the varying camps and disciplines and to dream of doing away with such divisions altogether. This does not mean that the promise has to be one of cohesiveness. Rather, as we all participate in developing curricula, this offers the possibility of opening up dialogues with those with whose work we may find ourselves in conflict. This move is as much for ourselves as for our students. Such a situation helps keep us honest. A key is not to force the students to take sides or to be entrenched. One way those on one side of the realist-constructionist debate see this situation is that none of us produces truth in the classroom; that, at best, we give our students different ways of seeing the world. The goal, then, is not to usurp the teachings of other disciplines but to offer a heterogeneous array of viewpoints. In other words, we need to teach our students to think critically, but that is not necessarily the same thing as teaching them some kind of critical criminology party line, if there is or could be such a thing. Critical thinking means thinking for oneself, not just “thinking critically like we do.” At the same time, it goes without saying that it is crucial to get students to re-examine and question much of what they understand as “common sense” about criminal justice coming into our courses – system definitions of crime, and popular and media understandings of who criminals are and how law enforcement and deterrence works. It is our experience that this is best done through classroom methods that promote critical discussion and active learning, rather than by simply memorizing a new orthodoxy to replace the old one. Although there are numerous critical criminological textbooks, critical criminologists seem to have focused

mostly on producing appropriate content for their courses, rather than on reflecting very much on pedagogy. Indeed, there is something of a silence in critical criminological literature about pedagogy. Concerns with social justice have not connected up with the literature on critical pedagogy, the work of people such as Paulo Freire (1970) and Henry Giroux (2006). We need to theorize more about the ways in which students themselves are often a marginalized group. In hallway talk, faculty sometimes seem to take on board the notion that undergraduates are privileged consumers who hold sway over us disempowered professors, and there is too much of a culture of disdain at many universities about undergraduates in general and criminology undergraduates in particular, often stemming from faculty members who themselves have little actual contact with criminology students. We need to take more account of the ways in which undergraduates are disempowered and exploited and how this is tied with the point that teaching is very undervalued in our universities.

Another social justice issue needs to be addressed in the area of pedagogy: the long history of exploitation of the cheap post-Fordist “flexible” labour force of non-tenure-stream sessional faculty in the two-tier teaching system of Canadian universities (Rajagopal 2002). Huge criminology programs are a prime context in which this has been occurring. The sessional phenomenon is a good example of what we call “the gap”: the inability to apply critical social theory to the things right under our noses.

How Do We Put Critical Criminology into Practice?

Teaching is one of the most important ways we put criminology into practice. But it is not enough. What role can and should criminologists now take in criminal justice politics and policy making? Academically, at least, as we have argued, critical criminology is thriving in many ways in Canada. Even though some veteran critical criminologists (see, for example, Cohen 1988) tend to focus only on what was not achieved as part of a tremendously ambitious agenda outlined in the 1960s and 1970s, many notions previously considered radical are now widely accepted, at least intellectually within the discipline itself. Yet, in the bleak account of David Garland (2001, 65-68), although the intellectual influence of critical criminology has been long lasting, perhaps its most significant medium-term consequence in practice was to help undermine penal welfarism, opening the way for more punitive approaches to criminal justice in Western states. In this narrative, critical criminology, rather than being marginalized within the discipline, simply shares the fate



of the discipline as a whole: institutionally strong but increasingly irrelevant beyond the campus.

The weak voice of criminology in criminal justice policy making has been attributed to the rise of neo-liberal governance, the ascendancy of a punitive popular politics (though historically perhaps somewhat less prominently in Canada than elsewhere), and the growth of a technological infrastructure tied to other disciplines (Haggerty 2004). Criminologists themselves, as Garland (2001) argues, along with the structure of the university reward system, must also take some of the responsibility. In an academic world with increasing pressure on our time and pressure for publishing productivity, there is a tendency to limit our focus to publications that build one's CV but speak only to a narrow audience of the scholarly converted, rather than to work that reaches an audience beyond the university but is of more ambiguous currency in the tenure stream (Currie 2007).

Another source of ambivalence: critical criminology has also always been characterized by a tension between abolitionism versus reformism. Are these goals indeed mutually exclusive though? The body of sociological research on social movements suggests that radical change is more likely to occur when conditions are improving rather than worsening, as in the final years of the Soviet Union, when the reforms of Gorbachev were followed by the dismantling of the entire oppressive Soviet system (Tarrow 1998). One can argue that working for criminal justice reform is "propping up the system"; the danger is that this can simply become a handy rationalization to avoid doing demanding work that pushes us out of our comfort zones. Early reforms might be steps toward more thorough-going changes that address the fundamental difficulties at the heart of the system.

We recognize the potential danger of having one's work co-opted in policy makers' hands in contexts like the Task Force on Federally Sentenced Women, for example, contributing to the kind of nightmare that George Pavlich (1999) would call left-wing managerialism. Some argue we lose an important political sensibility because we end up working within rather than outside the system. Pavlich reminds us of the importance of people standing on the outside.

Others argue that such co-option is an unlikely scenario. Instead, many of us who are critical have developed a sensibility that is immediately suspicious or dismissive of any policy option that has any realistic chance of being implemented as compromised and likely to be co-opted. It is possible that "left-wing managerialism" has become an overblown chimera. In the current political situation, is it really a valid concern that critical scholars will be so

successful in shaping crime policy that we have to worry about oppressing people through misguided liberal coercion? Instead, the real dilemma may be exactly the opposite one – that for assorted reasons we find ourselves in a situation where critical criminologists make very few concrete proposals for policy development that have a realistic chance of being implemented. Moreover, critical criminologists may be inherently suspicious of those who try to make such proposals. Indeed, the types of cautions that Pavlich advances further reinforce habits of thought that effectively predispose critical criminologists from ever getting involved in the messy, compromised real-world pragmatics of policy development. The end result is a situation where the role of critical researchers in policy debates is typically a form of “trashing” (to use the critical legal studies lexicon) or deconstruction of existing options. Yet, there are simple reforms we can push for – reforms that might not revolutionize the system or get to the root of problems but that would incontrovertibly make the justice system somewhat more humane. Battling to keep conditional sentences rather than scrap them, introducing bail reform to keep more people accused of relatively marginal offences out of our jails as they await trial, or bringing in reforms to stop incarceration of impoverished offenders for non-payment of small fines, or improving conditions in institutions like detention centres, infamous for overcrowding, vermin, chaos, and violence, are a few examples of changes that could make a giant difference in the lives of marginalized people.

Another arena of political engagement that pushes critical criminologists out of our comfort zones is speaking to the news media. The work we do does not always translate easily into the short “talking point” needed to reach the ears of the public or policy makers, and this is one way in which reaching beyond the campus is risky. It is also fair to say that critical criminologists are not always the best communicators. Gregg Barak’s (1994, 2007) call for critical criminologists to engage in “newsmaking criminology” has never really been explicitly taken up to any great degree in Canada (or elsewhere). There has long been ambivalence in university culture toward those who are seen as seeking the media spotlight, and, in particular, there is at times ambivalence toward those few criminologists who get a good deal of media attention in Canada, even though these same criminologists are often effective public advocates for humane and progressive approaches to crime. Increasingly, university administrators are pressuring faculty to get involved with the media. Indeed, the University of Alberta has established a media



liaison office responsible for linking the national and local media with experts on campus. Although this provides new opportunities and institutional support for a form of “public criminology,” such encounters remain intermittently frustrating because of the ongoing structured limitations inherent in trying to convey a critical message in the mainstream media (Ericson, Baranek, and Chan 1989; Doyle 2003). Such constraints are exacerbated by profound media misperceptions about what criminologists do. Nevertheless, as Hackett (1991) argues, following Gramsci, if the news media are not a level playing field, sometimes it is still possible to win playing uphill. The rise of “do-it-yourself” media such as blogs also opens spaces for different forms of news-making criminology.¹

A final point on this theme: discussions of practice in critical criminology tend to focus on taking an insider role working on criminal justice policy rather than on activism working outside the system. The book closes with two interesting chapters by Lisa Freeman (Chapter 10) and Kevin Walby (Chapter 11) on their more anarchic political projects. The notion of radical flanking suggests complementary and mutually supporting roles for more mainstream versus more radical activists in promoting social change, and such projects may be seen as a complement rather than an alternative to the work of others in more mainstream settings. Critical criminologies are defined by an urgent sense of social justice. How this successfully translates into impact beyond academia is perhaps, we argue, the most difficult question facing us.

NOTES

- ¹ See, for example, Justin Piché’s blog, “Tracking the Politics of Crime and Punishment in Canada,” at <http://tpcp-canada.blogspot.com>, which is increasingly read by media, politicians, and other audiences.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. 2001. *Chaos of Disciplines*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barak, G., ed. 1994. *Media Process and the Social Construction of Crime: Studies in News-making Criminology*. New York: Garland.
- . 2007. Doing Newsmaking Criminology from within the Academy. *Theoretical Criminology* 11(2): 191-207.
- Boyd, N. 2007. Letter to the Editor. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*. 49(1): 125-26.

- Buckley, D.L. 1986. What Does the Future Hold for Criminology Undergraduates in Canada: A Look at Past Trends and Future Prospects. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 14(1): 47-60.
- Chancer, L., and E. McLaughlin. 2007. Public Criminologies: Diverse Perspectives on Academia and Policy. *Theoretical Criminology* 11(2): 155-73.
- Chunn, D.E., and R. Menzies. 2006. So What Does All of This Have to Do with Criminology? Surviving the Restructuring of the Discipline in the Twenty-First Century. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 48(5): 663-80.
- Cohen, S. 1988. *Against Criminology*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Currie, E. 2007. Against Marginality: Arguments for a Public Criminology. *Theoretical Criminology* 11(2): 175-90.
- Doob, A.N., and C.M. Webster. 2006. Counteracting Punitiveness: Understanding Stability in Canada's Rate of Imprisonment. *Law and Society Review* 40(2): 325-68.
- Doyle, A. 2003. *Arresting Images: Crime and Policing in Front of the Television Camera*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Doyle, A., and K. Walby. Unpublished paper. The Forgotten Worst Third: The Neglect of Jails in Theorizing Punishment.
- The Economist*. 2009. Canada's Criminal Justice Policy: Prisoners of Politics; Less Crime, More Punishment. December 17.
- Ericson, R.V., P. Baranek, and J. Chan. 1989. *Negotiating Control: A Study of News Sources*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989.
- Foucault, M. 1977. *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Vintage.
- Freire, P. 1970. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Garland, D. 2001. *The Culture of Control: Crime and Social Order in Contemporary Society*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Garland, D., and R. Sparks. 2000. Criminology, Social Theory and the Challenge of Our Times. In *Criminology and Social Theory*, ed. D. Garland and R. Sparks, 1-22. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Giroux, H. 2006. *The Giroux Reader*. Ed. C. Robbins. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.
- Hackett, R. 1991. *News and Dissent: The Press and the Politics of Peace in Canada*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Haggerty, K. 2004. Displaced Expertise: Three Constraints on the Policy-Relevance of Criminological Thought. *Theoretical Criminology* 8(2): 211-31.
- Hannah-Moffat, K., and M. Shaw, eds. 2000. *An Ideal Prison? Critical Essays on Women's Imprisonment in Canada*. Halifax: Fernwood.
- Hatt, K., T. Caputo, and B. Perry. 1992. Criminal Justice Policy under Mulroney, 1984-90: Neo-Conservatism, Eh? *Canadian Public Policy* 18(3): 245-60.
- Hemmings, C. 2005. Telling Feminist Stories. *Feminist Theory* 6(2): 18-41.
- Huey, L., and P.-P. Paré. 2010. Bridging Divides in Canadian Criminology: Some Thoughts on a Possible Future. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 52(3): 237-41.

- Maguire, M., R. Morgan, and R. Reiner. 2007. *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Marriner, S., and D. Moore. 2006. Women's Imprisonment: How Getting Better Is Getting Worse. In *Humane Prisons*, ed. D. Jones, 112-39. Oxford: Radcliffe.
- Martel, J., B. Hogeveen, and A. Woolford. 2006. The State of Critical Scholarship in Critical Criminology and Socio-Legal Studies in Canada: An Introductory Essay. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 48(5): 633-46.
- Menzies, R., and D. Chunn. 1999. Discipline in Dissent: Canadian Academic Criminology at the Millennium. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 41(2): 285-98.
- Meyer, J., and P. O'Malley. 2005. Missing the Punitive Turn? Canadian Criminal Justice, "Balance" and Penal Modernism. In *The New Punitiveness: Trends, Theories, Perspectives*, ed. J. Pratt, 201-17. Cullompton, UK: Willan.
- Mills, C.W. 1959. *The Sociological Imagination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Minaker, J., and L. Snider. 2006. Husband Abuse: Equality with a Vengeance. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 48(5): 243-78.
- Moore, D. 2002. What Exactly Is It You Do? The Problem of Spanning Jurisdictional Divides in Law and Society Scholarship. *Studies in Law, Politics and Society* 24(2): 33-48.
- . 2008. Feminist Criminology: Gain, Loss and Backlash. *Sociology Compass* 2(1): 48-61.
- Moore, D., and K. Hannah-Moffat. 2005. The Liberal Veil: Revisiting Canadian Penality. In *The New Punitiveness: Trends, Theories, Perspectives*, ed. J. Pratt, D. Brown, M. Brown, S. Hallsworth, and W. Morrison, 214-35. London: Willan.
- Moore, S. 2009. The Prison Overcrowding Fix. *New York Times*, February 11.
- Naffine, N. 1996. *Feminism and Criminology*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- O'Malley, P. 1999. Volatile and Contradictory Punishment. *Theoretical Criminology* 3(1): 175-96.
- Pavlich, G. 1999. Criticism and Criminology: In Search of Legitimacy. *Theoretical Criminology* 3(1): 29-51.
- Pratt, J., D. Brown, M. Brown, S. Hallsworth, and W. Morrison. 2005. *The New Punitiveness: Trends, Theories, Perspectives*. London: Willan.
- Rajagopal, I. 2002. *Hidden Academics: Contract Faculty in Canadian Universities*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ratner, R.S. 2006. Pioneering Critical Criminology in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 48(5): 647-62.
- Smart, C. 1995. *Law, Crime and Sexuality: Essays in Feminism*. London: Sage.
- Snider, L. 2003. Constituting the Punishable Woman: Atavistic Man Incarcerates Post-Modern Woman. *British Journal of Criminology* 43(2): 224-43.
- Sumner, C. 2004. The Social Nature of Crime and Deviance. In *The Blackwell Companion to Criminology*, ed. C. Sumner, 3-31. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Tarrow, S. 1998. *Power in Movement*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taylor, I., P. Walton, and J. Young. 1973. *The New Criminology: For a Social Theory of Deviance*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Tibbetts, J. 2006. PS Experts Opposed Tory Crime Agenda: Party Ignored Advice That Get-Tough Policies Don't Protect Public. *Ottawa Citizen*, August 9.
- . 2010. Tories' Planned Prison Legislation to Cost Billions. *Montreal Gazette*, April 28.
- Tonry, M. 2009. The Mostly Unintended Effects of Mandatory Penalties: Two Centuries of Consistent Findings. *Crime and Justice* 38(1): 65-114.
- Williams, J., and R. Lippert. 2006. Governing at the Margins: Exploring the Contributions of Governmentality Studies to Critical Criminology in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 48(5): 703-20.
- Woolford, A., B. Hogeveen, and J. Martel. 2006. Introduction: An Opening. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice* 48(5): 631-32.
- Young, J. 2002. Critical Criminology in the Twenty-First Century: Critique, Irony and the Always Unfinished. In *Critical Criminology: Issues, Debates, Challenges*, ed. K. Carrington and R. Hogg, 251-74. Cullompton, UK: Willan.

PART 1

Canadian Criminology
in the Twenty-First Century

Textbooks often present the discipline of criminology as having developed through a procession of conceptual and theoretical advancements. Such an orientation can overlook how institutional processes help to fashion an academic field. In Part 1, Benoît Dupont, Bryan Hogeveen, and Laura Huey accentuate some of those processes in the context of Canadian criminology. In so doing, they draw attention to issues of language, pedagogy, and institutional history, all of which structure the discipline and will undoubtedly inform the possible futures of Canadian criminology.

Benoît Dupont focuses on criminology in Quebec, outlining several reasons why the vibrant works of francophone criminologists remain marginalized within the anglophone scholarly community. Language differences play a role here, but how language operates among French criminologists is more complicated and surprising than might have been anticipated. For example, Quebec has secured a notable position in a wider global intellectual geography because it is physically located at the crossroads of a unilingual North America and a multilingual Europe. Paradoxically, Quebec has become an intellectual hub for visiting international francophone scholars who seek to access English language publications. Indeed, scholars arriving in Montreal from France and Belgium have been known to fill their computer hard drives with downloaded English-language publications that are unavailable in their home countries.

Since the 1970s, the often passionate linguistic politics in Quebec have helped establish French as the language used in most provincial workplaces. Things, however, are more complicated in the academy where English dominates the world of scientific publication. Quebec social scientists publish in French comparatively more than is the practice in other disciplines. For example, approximately 75 percent of the publications associated with Montreal's International Centre for Comparative Criminology are published in French. That said, the publishing market for Quebec criminologists is highly differentiated and characterized by three distinct linguistic markets. The most prestigious caters to an international audience of English speakers, and French-speaking junior scholars are often pressured to publish in that market. There is also a fragmented international French-language market, also prestigious, but which tends to be politicized and policed by gatekeeping mandarins. Finally, a local French-language market in Quebec serves as a secondary option for senior scholars and as a testing ground for students and younger researchers.

This variegated linguistic marketplace produces pressures that help keep Quebec scholars out of Canadian English publications, which do not offer the same level of returns on their investment as international publications. Likewise, there are few incentives for English scholars to enter into Quebec's French-language publishing market. Such linguistic divides are unfortunate for many reasons, including that they often thwart the possibility of comparative research on the many distinctive attributes of criminal justice in Quebec.

The contemporary field continues to be structured by tensions that have characterized the historical emergence of criminology in Quebec. Dupont notes that institutions are built by individuals and that the idiosyncratic biographies and personal motivations of these individuals inform the evolution of all disciplines. The most notable figure in the rise of criminology in Quebec is Denis Szabo. A Hungarian immigrant, Szabo was instrumental in introducing an MA and subsequent PhD program at the Université de Montréal. An energetic institution builder, Szabo sought to establish criminology as an unassailable attribute of Quebec higher education. He did so by capitalizing on wider developments related to education, occupational structures, and criminal justice. Notable here were a series of governmental inquiries and royal commissions on crime and criminal justice and the attendant growth in the rehabilitative ideal. The dramatic expansion of post-secondary education in Quebec and the professionalization of the criminal justice system also produced career opportunities for graduates of criminology programs – a development that, as Laura Huey accentuates in her chapter, has been a mixed blessing.

To secure the disciplinary standing of criminology, Szabo hired graduate students from potential rival departments. He also championed a dual model of criminology that embraced both the treatment focus of the medical model and the analytical concentration on the social origins of crime. This dual model not only allowed the institute to emerge largely unscathed from historical vacillations in intellectual currents, but it also fostered an ongoing identity crisis, a feature that emphasizes the precursors to contemporary debates among criminologists about interdisciplinary subjects.

In the past decade, Quebec criminology has undergone a series of transformations related to its professional standing. As the state has progressively withdrawn from welfare provision, new interdisciplinary criminal justice projects in higher education have emerged. Many of these programs exhibit a pragmatic treatment focus. Notwithstanding that the Université de Montréal's criminology program became a professional school in 1972, the rise of these

new programs appears to have contributed to a markedly different professional orientation for criminology. This came to a head in the hearings of a government of Quebec committee on the professions in the health and human relations sector in 2000. Concerned about the potential social harms that criminological practitioners might produce, the committee proposed further professionalization as a way to mitigate these risks. Remarkably, the committee's definition of "criminologist" was almost completely aligned with the medical model's focus on treatment, assessment, and risk profiling. In this model, many Quebec academics who self-identify as criminologists and who have taught in criminology programs for years would not qualify as professional criminologists.

Bryan Hogeveen also interrogates some of the legacies of initiatives by an earlier generation of Canadian criminologists. More specifically, he investigates the promises made by certain seminal Canadian criminologists when criminology was burgeoning as a discipline in this country in the 1960s, and how these may structure and constrain contemporary criminology.

Some key members of that generation of Canadian criminologists promised institutional and political audiences that the emergent discipline could help to control crime, something it would accomplish through effective research, teaching, and policy advice. This promise entailed appeals to scientific understandings of truth, knowledge, objectivity, and mathematical certainties, with relevance to government and policy as a driving force.

Hogeveen quotes pioneering criminologist Tadeusz Grygier (1963, 42): "The main problem ... is the scientific control of criminal behaviour." Although such gestures helped legitimate the nascent discipline, they also imposed continuing expectations that criminologists justify their investigations in light of the standards of the natural sciences. Early Canadian criminologists made promises about relevant research, where the standard of relevance was set by the administrators of the criminal justice system. Frank Potts (1963, 8), director of psychology for the Department of Reform Institutions of the province of Ontario, suggested that "the problem for research usually is one that has been identified by, or in consultation, with, the policy maker, the administrator or the practitioner in the field." Promises of pertinent teaching were also espoused, where education was characterized as a form of professional training, stimulated by and relevant to the field. Finally, there were promises of ongoing consultations with legislators and administrators, who would be provided with practical advice about managing the criminal justice system. These promises continue to haunt contemporary criminology.



– for example, when we are contacted by the media or compete for research grants – despite that many criminologists have conspicuously disavowed the feasibility or desirability of such undertakings.

Particularly distasteful to Hogeveen is that, as he argues, early criminological promises were bound up with a project that implied and required otherness. Rejecting the Other from “society” through criminological praxis has taken many forms. Ironically, though, the successful realization of the criminological promise would require the death of both the discipline and the Other. In lieu of these inaugural promises, Hogeveen advocates for a criminology that negates the appropriation of the Other. Such a project would continually open up to alterity. For this project to advance, we must develop new standards to evaluate the relevance of criminological research that embraces a promise of emancipation and of being continually open to difference, as well as a restructured praxis. Hogeveen’s second key argument concerns disciplinary identity. Hogeveen argues that we should rework disciplinary boundaries such that nothing is beyond question, critique, or deconstruction. Hogeveen looks back at the diverse disciplinary backgrounds of those advocating for an institute of criminology in the 1960s: law, forensic psychiatry, social work, psychology, psychoanalysis, and theology, among others. Criminological problems were so complex they required a multidisciplinary solution. This interdisciplinary aspect of criminology is still seen as essential in today’s criminology textbooks. Hogeveen laments, however, how instead some contemporary Canadian criminologists and departments now seem increasingly myopic and concerned with policing disciplinary boundaries. A tendency during the burgeoning of criminology to want to pull “crime” away from other disciplines and give its study scientific legitimacy has increasingly resulted in a narrowing and limiting of criminological thought; critical scholars are migrating to other disciplines. Hogeveen advocates instead a “post-disciplinary” criminology, an expanded scholarly space not circumscribed by the traditional criminological promise. He not only urges a restructured promise that is opened up to otherness but also cautions against too much fixity being imposed on it. Hogeveen urges instead a constant reworking of established limits, a “criminology of possibility.”

Laura Huey highlights ways that the contemporary university system works against the emergence of such a radically utopian criminological project. As she notes, the growth of criminology in Canada has been spectacular, but this expansion has foregrounded a deep tension inherent in the very idea of the university. Although universities have long been associated

with professional training, this mission has been augmented over the past several decades by the liberal notion that universities should train individuals in critical thinking and help transmit cultural capital. Contemporary criminology programs exemplify the reascendancy of the professional training model, one that is often pushed to its extreme as university degrees risk becoming little more than consumable products.

A funding crisis in higher education has exacerbated these tensions, forcing university administrators to embrace a more entrepreneurial orientation to secure resources and meet enrolment quotas. University programs are now advertised through transparent appeals to student careerist aspirations. Some of the more distasteful of these overtures include championing criminology programs by referring to the remarkable “growth capacity” of the criminal justice system. The coterminous rise of a public discourse on the “knowledge economy” has intensified students’ consumerist orientation, as they are encouraged to see university education predominately as an investment in career advancement.

These tensions come to a head in the classroom. Instructors schooled in critical orientations encounter students quick to vocalize their distaste for both theory and abstraction, which they see as being at odds with pragmatic career training. Facing the prospect of poor teaching evaluations and, for junior faculty, the always stressful tenure process, instructors are pressured to quietly shelve their critical orientation in favour of narrow forms of applied criminology.

For students, the promise of such applied criminology programs is a career in criminal justice, including work in policing, courts, and corrections. Questions remain about whether this promise can be fulfilled – if there are enough desirable jobs to employ the reserve army of criminology graduates being churned through the diploma mill. The employment that awaits many of these students is less of a career and more of a low-level job in the expanding world of private security. It is a formula almost consciously designed to foster student resentment.

REFERENCES

- Potts, F. 1963. Institute of Criminology. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections* 5(1): 7-10.
- Grygier, T. 1963. Dimensions of Criminology. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Corrections* (5)1: 40-46.