

September 1998

Review of *Ethnicity, Crime and Immigration: Comparative and Cross National Perspectives*. Michael Tonry (Ed.). Reviewed by Jewelle Taylor-Biggs, University of California at Berkeley.

Jewelle Taylor-Biggs
University of California, Berkeley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>



Part of the Social Work Commons

Recommended Citation

Taylor-Biggs, Jewelle (1998) "Review of *Ethnicity, Crime and Immigration: Comparative and Cross National Perspectives*. Michael Tonry (Ed.). Reviewed by Jewelle Taylor-Biggs, University of California at Berkeley.," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 25: Iss. 3, Article 14.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.2516>

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol25/iss3/14>

This Book Review is brought to you by the Western Michigan University School of Social Work. For more information, please contact wmu-scholarworks@wmich.edu.



that women of different races and ethnicities fear different types of crime and that teenage women were more likely than women in other age groups to report that they refuse to let fear of crime rule their lives. Using information from groups of teenage, adult and senior women who are white, African-American and Latina allows Madriz to discuss fear of crime in relationship to social and economic disadvantages that women, and especially women of color, face in the larger society.

Other important contributions of the book include provocative discussions on sexual harassment, "innocent" and "culpable" victims, the US criminal justice system, and fear of crime as a violation of human rights. Madriz makes particularly good use of women's stories in detailing the social effects of fear of crime in women's lives. While she also mentions economic effects, the role of crime against women and women's fear of crime in shaping their economic status in the home and in the larger social structure deserves more scholarly attention.

This book is an important and interesting addition to the modest literature on fear of crime and will be of interest to everyone who is concerned about the well-being of women, crime, or social control. Those teaching courses on violence against women, gender studies, crime and criminal justice, race and ethnicity, qualitative research methods, and social welfare policy will find *Nothing Bad Happens to Good Girls* particularly useful.

Deborah Page-Adams
University of Kansas

Michael Tonry (Ed.), *Ethnicity, Crime and Immigration: Comparative and Cross-National Perspectives*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1997. \$56.00 hardcover, \$22.50 papercover.

In a scholarly collection of papers, Michael Tonry has edited a comparative cross-national perspective on the interrelationship among ethnicity, immigration and crime in nine Western industrialized nations (Australia, Canada, England, France, Germany, Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States). Following a common framework, the authors describe and analyze the overrepresentation of ethnic minorities and/or immigrants in the criminal justice system of these countries. Despite identifying a

number of similar trends among these countries, Tonry, an American legal scholar, concludes that these racial and ethnic disparities reflect differences in actual offending rates rather than any systemic patterns of discrimination in their respective systems of criminal justice. Although these conclusions are consistent with Tonry's earlier work on the American criminal justice system, they are increasingly challenged by the contrary views of researchers such as Randall Kennedy (United States), John Solomos (England), and Anthony Doob (Canada) who argue persuasively that there is ample evidence of racial and ethnic bias in the administration of justice in these countries.

Major methodological difficulties in conducting this cross-national study include: varying definitions of "race" and "ethnicity"; lack of statistical data on race in countries such as Germany, France, and Sweden; the overlap between "immigrants," "foreigners," and ethnic minorities in several countries; and the variations in legal terminology and processing stages among these countries.

Excellent reviews of the role of race in the United States (by Robert Sampson & Janet Lauritzen), Great Britain (by David Smith), and Canada (by Julian Roberts & Anthony Doob) yield comparable findings that racial disparities in the criminal justice system can be largely attributed to differential rates of offending, severity of offense levels, and differential access to legal resources. However, these authors acknowledge the possible biases that occur at key points in the system, particularly where a prior arrest for a minor offense may result in more punitive decisions for minority defendants in subsequent encounters with the criminal justice system.

The difficulties of distinguishing ethnic identity from nationality or immigrant status (since all "immigrants" or "foreigners" are not visible minorities), are noted in case studies of Germany (by Hans-Jorg Abrecht) and France (by Pierre Tournier). In both of these countries, crime rates of "guest workers" or immigrants of color have increased among the second and third generations, paralleling the increase in discrimination against these groups by the host societies. In contrast, the crime rate of second-generation Swedish immigrants is generally lower than

among first-generation immigrants, perhaps reflecting the effect of Swedish social welfare policies.

Roderic Broadhurst's analysis of aborigines in the Australian criminal justice system reveals similarities to the experiences of native Indians in Canada, as the culture clash between Anglo-European and indigenous people sets up an adversarial situation that inevitably fosters conflict and confrontation particularly in situations where the native peoples are in the majority and resist acculturation.

The analysis of Sampson and Lauritzen about the subtle operation of "indirect racial (or ethnic) discrimination" in the United States is also relevant to these other countries, i.e., that ethnic minorities and immigrants are the victims of economic, educational and political discrimination, resulting in their social marginalization and reduced opportunities for mobility within the host society. In response, some members of these groups engage in illegitimate economic activities, inviting sanctions from the police and involvement in the criminal justice system. To complete the vicious cycle, these groups will then be perceived as a threat to the host society and, thus, in need of social control, political exclusion, and coercive treatment, further reinforcing their marginality and maintaining their low socioeconomic status.

Although their research indicates racial, ethnic or nationality disparities at various stages of the criminal justice system in most of these countries, very few of these authors were willing to raise critical questions about "official" police data and the subtle operation of racial/ethnic discrimination in the criminal justice system in their respective countries. More discussion should have been focused on the key points of the system where discretionary decisions are made that can result in a "cumulative disadvantage" to minority persons, from the initial police decision to stop or arrest a juvenile on a minor offense; to decisions about prosecution, bail or probation; to judicial decisions about the severity and length of a sentence for a convicted offender.

Finally, in the wake of recent well-publicized police brutality and prosecutorial misconduct charges in the United States (against African-Americans and Latino immigrants), Canada (against Native Indians and Afro-Caribbeans), England (against

Afro-Caribbeans and Asian Indians), and Australia (against Aborigines), their conclusions about the lack of systematic bias in the criminal justice system in these countries seem both too uncritical and too naive. However, most social scientists in this field would agree with the apparent consensus of these authors that “. . . disparities appear to result largely from the unfavorable economic, social, and legal position of ethnic minorities.”

Jewelle Taylor Gibbs

University of California at Berkeley