

Introduction

The Power of Images

Marjorie S. Zatz and Coramae Richey Mann

*I'm white inside/But that don't help my
case/Cause I can't hide/What is in my face.*

—"Black and Blue," Razaf,
Brooks, and Waller
(1929)

In the late 1920s, the three African American musical geniuses listed above, one of whom was the renowned pianist Fats Waller, wrote a haunting song called "Black and Blue." Among many other equally gifted African American vocalists over the years, Louis "Satchmo" Armstrong and Dinah Washington, "Queen of the Blues," recorded their renditions of the melody, each plaintively wailing, "My only sin is in my skin/What did I do to be so black and blue?"

The same cry—"What did I do?"—could be made by millions of other men and women in this nation as they, too, face exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, and other forms of oppression simply because of the color of their skin. Because they look "different" from Americans of European descent and, in some cases, speak languages other than English, millions of people are stigmatized, stereotyped, and victimized by our social institutions—in particular, the juvenile and criminal justice systems and the police. This book tells their stories.

Images of Color, Images of Crime is designed to help readers recognize how popular perceptions of crime and criminality are racialized. By linking images of color with images of crime, the book makes the stereotypes underlying media reporting on crime and criminality more apparent. The book also exposes the ways in which politicians have capitalized on the "race card." Once these linkages are understood, readers will be better equipped to recognize how racism permeates our society and its institutions.

With few exceptions, books on race and crime usually focus on only one or two racial/ethnic groups. Even those authors who *do* include information about several groups tend to devote most of their attention to African Americans. There are several reasons for this emphasis. First, in many regions of the country, when people—and perhaps especially Euro-Americans—think about race, they think of African Americans. Second, a consequence of this focus on African Americans has been the practice by the U.S. Census Bureau and local police departments and courts, until very recently, to record ethnicity as *white-nonwhite* or *black-white-other*. As a result, quantitative data on the experiences that members of other groups have had with the criminal justice system are difficult to obtain. This leads to a third reason why books about race and crime tend to focus on African Americans: because far more empirical studies have addressed Afri-

can Americans' experiences with crime and criminal injustice than those of any other group, more information is available from which authors can draw. In contrast, this book devotes equal attention to American Indians, African Americans, Latinos and Latinas, Asian Americans, and Euro-Americans.

We use the word *color* quite purposefully in this book. We have found that when we and our students start thinking about shades of color, we immediately recognize the diversity within ethnic groups. Persons of Chinese, Japanese, Korean, or Samoan heritage, for example, are all Asian Americans, but profound differences exist among them based on culture and language, in addition to differences attributable to gender, income, age, sexual orientation, religion, and physical abilities. Attention to color also reminds us how fluid racial and ethnic boundaries can be. For instance, the terms *Latino* and *Latina* refer to men and women from all parts of Latin America, whether from the Caribbean, Mexico, Central America, or South America. So how do we classify a black Cuban or a black Puerto Rican? As an African American or as a Latino or Latina? What about a Cuban boy whose great-grandparents moved to Cuba from China and whose parents brought him to the United States as a young boy? Is he Asian American or Latino? Or how about the daughter of a Tarahumara Indian from Mexico whose parents moved to the United States before she was born? Is she an American Indian or Chicana?

We are all multiethnic if we go back far enough in our lineages, yet it was only with the 2000 Census that U.S. population counts included categories for multiethnic and multiracial responses.¹ Once institutional analysts for the Census Bureau and other social scientists allowed their conceptual frameworks and coding schemes to expand, they began to see larger numbers of people self-identifying in different ways, depending on which racial or ethnic identity was most salient to them in a given context, or choosing to identify as multiracial (Myers, Cintron, and Scarborough 2000; Grieco and Cassi 2001; U.S. Census Bureau 2003; Zatz and Rodriguez 2006). Thus, the key questions be-

quences; on the contrary, social constructions of race have very real consequences for people's life chances and for race relations in the United States (Ferrante and Browne 2001; Rothenberg 2002). Also, education and wealth offer little protection from abuse by law enforcement agents. Physicians of color with M.D. emblems on their cars are pulled over routinely by police, as are minority lawyers, university professors, and other professionals. Sometimes they are stopped precisely because they are driving "fancy" cars (which could mean anything that is not ready for the junkyard), the implication being that they must have stolen them, because persons of color could not possibly afford nice cars unless they are drug dealers or pimps. The expression "Driving While Black" (and "Driving While Brown") refers to the odious practice of racial profiling of African American (and often Latino/a) motorists by police officers (Meehan and Ponder 2002; Lundman and Kaufman 2003). As will be discussed further in later chapters, such harassment has far-reaching consequences for police-citizen relations and for the civic order more generally.

Like race, racism is socially constructed. Whether we are talking about racist structures or racist ideologies, racism is all about power. Because conditions of dominance and subordination, and of control and resistance, differ across social and historical contexts, racism, too, must be multifaceted and flexible. That is, the ways in which racism displays itself—what we might call its form—change as social conditions change (Zatz 1987, 2000; Mann 1993). For instance, it is hard to imagine a juvenile court judge today saying publicly what Judge Chargin of Santa Clara, California, told a Chicano boy in 1969:

You ought to commit suicide. That's what I think of people of this kind. You are lower than animals and haven't the right to live in organized society—just miserable, lousy, rotten people. . . . Maybe Hitler was right. (cited in Hernández, Haug, and Wagner 1976, 62–63)

Although such overtly racist statements in courts of law are unusual today, stories of

police beatings of young African American and Latino men are not. Rodney King's beating galvanized the nation because it was irrefutably visible on videotape, not because it was rare. The police departments of many major cities today face formal charges or citizen complaints of excessive force in subduing persons of color.

Race relations in our country are complex, however, and we cannot assume that the same stance will be taken by all social control agents. Perhaps one of the most striking aspects of Judge Chargin's tirade is that it came from a member of the judiciary. While it is undeniable that some judges operate on the basis of racial prejudices, such overtly racial statements are, as we stated, rare today. More common are judges who simply follow the law because that is their responsibility, regardless of any personal concern that the law's effects may be racially biased. And yet, several Euro-American state and federal judges and the U.S. Sentencing Commission have taken public stands against the harsher penalties for possession of crack than powder cocaine because they view these statutes as racially discriminatory in their impacts, whether or not that was the intent of the legislators. In addition, the Minnesota Supreme Court in 1991 formally ruled that differing sentences for possession of crack and powder cocaine are racially discriminatory (Tonry 1995; Donziger 1996; Miller 1996; Mauer 2001).

Defining Racism

This brings us to a very important point—the definition of racism. At its most general, *racism* can be defined as

social practices which (explicitly or implicitly) attribute merits or allocate values to members of racially categorized groups solely because of their "race." (Omi and Winant 1986, 145)

Although our nation's history has many positive aspects, it is undeniable that our national economy was based initially on a system of slave labor; on the theft of land from American Indians, and on the conquest of massive territories from Mexico. As Cornel West said of "this democratic experiment we call America,"

[it] began by taking for granted the ugly conquest of Amerindians and Mexicans, the exclusion of women, the subordination of European working-class men and the closeting of homosexuals. . . . What made America distinctly American for [European-Americans] was not simply the presence of unprecedented opportunities, but the struggle for seizing these opportunities in a new land in which black slavery and racial caste served as the floor upon which white class, ethnic, and gender struggles could be diffused and diverted. (1994, 156)

Accordingly, we must consider the ways in which economic, political, and social relations reinforce and perpetuate racial inequalities.

This perspective is in marked contrast to the view of those who would define racism simply as behavior that results from the prejudicial attitude of an individual. Like most social scientists, we think this narrow definition is seriously flawed. Everyone, regardless of skin color, has certain prejudices. However, not everyone has the *power* to act on the basis of those prejudices. As long as Euro-Americans continue to control the major political, economic, and social institutions in this country, including the criminal justice system, they have the institutional resources to discriminate, whereas people of color do not.

Racism has at least three guises: (1) *personal prejudice*, which, as we have discussed, is the most limiting view of racism and serves simply to disguise and defend racial privileges; (2) *ideological*, in which culture and biology are invoked to rationalize and justify the superior social, economic, and political position of Euro-Americans; and (3) *institutional*, in which the policies and practices of societal institutions operate in a way that produces systematic and persistent differences between racial groups (see further Wellman 1977, 39; Omi and Winant 1986; Goldberg 1990). It is the *outcome* that matters most when we look at institutional racism. It does not matter whether those persons creating the policies and continuing the practices consciously intend to discriminate or not. As Daniel Georges-Abeyie has noted,

the key issue is *result, not intent*. Institutional racism is often the legacy of overt racism, of *de facto* practices that often get codified by *de jure* mechanisms. (1990, 28)

Another aspect of institutionalized racism is what Georges-Abeyie (1989, 46–47) has called “petit apartheid realities.” These are the everyday activities that contribute to poor relations between the police and persons of color, such as routine stop-and-question or stop-and-frisk law enforcement practices.

African Americans have been the victims of a particularly virulent form of racism because of their early status as slaves and because their continued economic plight has resulted in substantial media attention to segregated urban communities characterized by poverty, single-parent families, poor schools, and visible street crimes. Nevertheless, American Indians, Asian Americans, and Latinos and Latinas have also suffered from arbitrary and legally sanctioned exclusion and from other forms of discrimination (see, among others, Deloria and Lytle 1983; Mirandé 1987; Ringer and Lawless 1989; Takaki 1993; Lopez 1996; Rothenberg 2001). And, as a number of the chapters in this book remind us, many of the red and brown people in this country were the only residents who did *not* immigrate here. “America” was their land initially.

One consequence of racism that echoes and exacerbates the deep schisms among American citizens is racial segregation in housing and jobs (for further discussions of how segregated housing and jobs have resulted in large part from racist real estate and lending policies and from economic restructuring at the regional, national, and global levels, see Moore and Pinderhughes 1993; Hacker 1995; Oliver and Shapiro 1995). The proliferation of African American rural and inner-city ghettos, Latino barrios, and Chinatowns, and the shameful theft of land from Indians that left them on small, isolated reservations, reflect the imposed segregation that is “more entrenched in American cities today than ever imagined” (Steele 1990, 79). This social isolation creates many deleterious effects, both struc-

tural (for example, systematic differences in opportunities to acquire disposable income and to generate wealth) and psychological (for example, being unable to understand what life is like for members of other groups).

As Peterson and Harrell (1992, 1) suggest, there are many ways to look at isolation:

The concept of isolation has multiple dimensions. There is literal, physical separation such as the distancing of inner-city residents from the suburban locations where jobs are being created and the racial isolation imposed by segregated housing patterns. There is social isolation resulting from class homogeneity of contacts, and according to some authors, weak participation of inner-city residents in social organizations. There is the isolation imposed by high rates of crime and drug activity, as well as the habits of inner-city street life, where acceptance of neighborhood behavioral norms can progressively cut off access to mainstream society. . . . These dimensions of isolation overlap with one another and profoundly affect opportunity patterns.

The renowned African American sociologist William Julius Wilson made us intensely aware of the social isolation of inner-city African Americans in his classic work, *The Truly Disadvantaged* (1987), in which he also introduced the controversial notion of the black "underclass."² Wilson described this underclass as "socially isolated," or lacking contact or "sustained interaction with the individuals or institutions that represent mainstream society" (1987, 60). Mainstream society, in this instance, was epitomized by gainfully employed people who lived in stable areas free from blight, who were not on public welfare rolls, and who could provide conventional role models (see further Fernández and Harris 1992).

It is important to recognize, though, that while many impoverished communities are quite isolated socially, others retain residents who serve as *bridge people*, to borrow Regina Austin's (1992) term. Bridge people are typically well-educated and hold stable jobs in respected professions, often coming back to the neighborhoods in which they grew up after living elsewhere. As the term

suggests, bridge people can cross social and economic borders fairly readily, with ties to both those who survive through the illegal or underground economy and those who are considered quite respectable by middle-class norms. They serve as social buffers and, in at least some cases, carry sufficient political, economic, and social clout to bring new resources to bear on the community's problems.

Recent theoretical work on *racialized space* offers promising possibilities for better understanding how fears of dangerous places are closely intertwined with economic restructuring and other manifestations of institutionalized racism, and how these are reinforced by the media and politicians and manifested daily in policing practices (Herbert 1997; Bass 2001; Portillos 2004; Weitzer and Tuch 2004).

Racial Formation

Another term we must introduce here is "racial formation," the process by which people attach meaning and importance to racial categories (see Omi and Winant 1986: 61). What it means to be African American in the United States at this time, for instance, is determined by social, economic, and political factors such as the globalization of the economy, the decline of the middle class, the political decision to wage a "war" on drugs and drug users, the assault on affirmative action policies, and so forth. The meaning and material consequences attached to being black are thus different now from what they were at the apex of the civil rights movement or under slavery.

At the individual level, racial formation is part of the process by which people formulate their identities; at the societal level, racial formation is structural, based on social relations between groups. When we think about racial formation this way, it becomes clear that race plays a central role in social relations and cannot be reduced to something else, such as socioeconomic class or nationality. Thus, although a poor Euro-American person and a poor African American person will both face some of the same difficulties, such as an inability to pay the necessary bail to get out of jail until his or

her trial date, their situations will not be identical. To the extent that these differences are structured in such a way that most African Americans have one set of experiences and most Euro-Americans another, the differences can be said to be racialized. More formally, *racialization* is "the extension of racial meaning to a previously racially unclassified relationship, social practice, or group" (Omi and Winant 1986, 64). Racialization is an ideological process, and it is necessarily historically specific.

Race and Gender as Interlocking Systems of Oppression. Thus far, we have been speaking only in terms of race; however, people's relations with others and with societal institutions are simultaneously constructed along *gender* lines. Race, ethnicity, and gender intersect in multifaceted and interlocking ways. Sometimes, race or ethnicity is most salient; at other times, gender is most salient. But most of the time, race, ethnicity, and gender cannot be separated. To try to do so risks splitting a person in two. Kimberlé Crenshaw (1989, 1991) refers to this as the "intersectionality" of race and gender. An African American woman is never just black, she is also always a woman; and she is never just a woman, she is also always black.

Failure to recognize this intersectionality has been the bane of the women's movement and of movements based on ethnicity (see Harris 1990; Spelman 1990; and Hurtado 1996, for excellent critiques). Many women of color have described feeling subordinated and oppressed in these contexts by the Euro-American women who felt that they could speak for every woman and by the men of color who felt that they could speak for everyone of color.³ For instance, within the white women's movement a central concern has been the "public-private" split. This split reflects the invisibility and exclusion of Euro-American women from the public arena of the workplace and the state's reluctance to interfere in the private sphere of the home, where the women are to be found, because this is the jurisdiction, or "castle," of the man who lives there. Yet this split ignores the reality of many African American women's lives, which are spent not only in the paid labor force but also physically in the

homes of wealthier Euro-American women, caring for their babies, scrubbing their floors, and cleaning their toilets. Viewing gender in context of the experiences of various groups shows how "gender is configured through cross-cutting forms of differences that carry deep social and economic consequences" (Baca Zinn, Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Messner 2005, 6).

The conflicts are not just between women, and they are not based solely on race, ethnicity, or class. There are also serious conflicts between men and women of the same race or ethnicity, as well as between straight and gay, liberal and conservative, and rich and poor women or men of the same race. As Toni Morrison (1992, xxx) states in the book she edited, appropriately entitled *Race-ing Justice, En-gendering Power*,

It is clear to the most reductionist intellect that black people think differently from one another; it is also clear that the time for undiscriminating racial unity has passed. A conversation, a serious exchange between black men and women, has begun in a new arena, and the contestants defy the mold. Nor is it as easy as it used to be to split along racial lines, as the alliances and coalitions between white and black women, and the conflicts among black women, and among black men, during the intense debates regarding Anita Hill's testimony against Clarence Thomas's appointment prove.

If *intersectionality* describes how each person simultaneously experiences racial and gender oppression at the individual level, at the societal level we can speak of how race, gender, and class—the three fundamental and interrelated axes of our social structure—create interlocking systems of domination and oppression. As Margaret Anderson and Patricia Hill Collins point out, the patterns of race, class, and gender relations that are formed and reformed from this matrix affect individual consciousness, interactions between and within social groups, and group access to institutional power and privileges (Anderson and Collins 1995, xi; see also Frankenberg 1993; Oboler 1995; Wing 1997; Bobo, Hudley, and Michel 2004).

The essays in this volume demonstrate that racial and ethnic typifications are very much gendered. Consider, for example, the centrality of gender to stereotypes of African American welfare queens, drunken American Indian men, and Latino drug-dealing gangbangers. Consider, too, Aunt Jemima of pancake batter and syrup fame; the evil Fu Manchu and the sexy Susie Wong; and Pocahontas and her Mexican counterpart, La Malinche, who fell in love with white conquerors and are depicted alternatively as race traitors and mothers of "new" races. Gender is very much a part of each of these racist depictions.

One of our aims in this book is to help unravel the ways in which these stereotypes reflect our *simultaneously racialized and gendered* social relations, institutions, and ideologies. We also want to help readers see that gender is not just about women and that race is not just about people of color. *Everyone's* experiences are shaped by the interrelationships among race, gender, class, culture, sexual orientation, and, in many parts of the world, religion.

The Faces of Oppression and the Power of Stereotypes. When we begin to think about social relations, and especially race or ethnicity, gender, and class simultaneously and as inextricably interwoven, what Iris Young (1990, 48–65) has called the "faces of oppression" become quite evident. Young identifies five such faces: exploitation, marginalization, powerlessness, violence, and cultural imperialism.

Exploitation is the process whereby the work performed by one group benefits a different group. Slavery is the starkest example of this form of oppression, but exploitation can also be seen in other contexts, such as when garment workers in the Third World and in U.S. slums are paid very low wages for their work while the clothes they produce are sold for tremendous profits.

Young suggests that today *marginalization* is a more common form of social oppression than exploitation. "Marginals," she suggests, "are people the system of labor cannot or will not use" (1990, 53). Among other social categories, the marginalized may be old people, young African Americans

and Latinos who are unable to secure jobs, single mothers, the physically disabled, or American Indians living on reservations.

Powerlessness refers to the daily situation of those who have little or no control over their working conditions. They can make few if any decisions in the workplace and are not allowed any creativity in designing the work product or even in deciding how best to do their work. No one reports to them, but they are constantly reporting to and being judged by others. Think of the clerk at a drugstore, a food server at McDonald's, or a factory worker on an assembly line and you will realize how little say any of these people have over their work conditions. They are powerless. Powerlessness is also evidenced by the inability of women and girls in patriarchal cultures to control their own destinies and to make their own decisions about their health, their sexuality, and how they will earn their livelihood.

Hate crimes exemplify yet another face of oppression—systemic *violence*. Random, unprovoked attacks on persons or their property that have no purpose other than to damage, humiliate, or destroy the person—and that occur *because* the person is a member of a given social group—are oppressive. Consider, for example, the string of church burnings throughout the South in recent years—31 incidents since 1989 (Southern Poverty Law Center 1996, 12). These churches were set on fire solely because most members of their congregations were African American. Consider, too, the practice of "gay bashing," in which groups of straight young men go looking for gay men to beat up; the looting of Korean groceries in urban neighborhoods; the painting of swastikas on synagogues; and the old practice of giving "gifts" of smallpox-infested blankets to American Indians. (See Jenness and Grattet 2004 for an excellent discussion of hate crimes.)

The senseless and blind bigotry associated with hate crimes are vividly underscored by reports of recent attacks on Arab Americans in this nation. Citizens who had lived peaceably in the United States for generations found themselves targets of racial hatred and violence following the Septem-

ber 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. One of the most insidious examples of race hate crimes was the slaughter of a Sikh gas station owner in Mesa, Arizona, in the aftermath of these attacks. Balbir Singh Sodhi was shot by an ignorant racist zealot because Sodhi had a beard and wore a turban, and thus was presumed to be Muslim (Walsh 2001). The attacks of Arab and Arab American students on college and university campuses, supposedly bastions of enlightened thought and liberalism, are also quite chilling.

The final face of oppression identified by Young is *cultural imperialism*. This occurs when members of one group, which has power over another group, assume that their way of doing something is the only way. The dominant group's experiences, values, goals, and achievements are taken as normal, as the way things are. And thus it becomes surprising when members of a subordinated group do things differently, whether we are speaking of styles of dress, religious practices, ways of conducting business, or any other category.

Stereotyping is an important part of cultural imperialism. Typically, stereotypes connect something about the "nature" of subordinated groups to an undeniable and often visible aspect of their bodies. Young (1990, 59) states,

These stereotypes so permeate the society that they are not noticed as contestable. Just as everyone knows that the earth goes around the sun, so everyone knows that gay people are promiscuous, that Indians are alcoholics, and that women are good with children. White males, on the other hand, insofar as they escape group marking, can be individuals.

Ironically, it is the very invisibility of race when we are talking about Euro-Americans, and of gender when we are talking about men, that should signal that we are dealing with a social construction. Members of certain groups—Euro-Americans, men, heterosexuals, the able-bodied, and the wealthy—often do not even recognize their own privilege. They simply take it for granted as "normal." The danger, of course, is that anyone different becomes "not normal," or "the Other."

The media play very important roles in portraying members of some groups as normal and others as Other. In particular, films and television programs use the power of visual images to create and reinforce stereotypical images of Others as scary and different. As Michael Omi and Howard Winant suggest, these media

have been notorious in disseminating images of racial minorities which establish for audiences what people from these groups look like, how they behave, and "who they are." The power of the media lies not in their ability to reflect the dominant racial ideology, but in their capacity to shape that ideology in the first place. (1986, 63)

They note further that efforts to reach a large and diverse television audience have led "to the perpetuation of racial caricatures, as racial stereotypes serve as shorthand for scriptwriters, directors and actors" (p. 63).

Organization of the Book

We have called this book *Images of Color, Images of Crime* because we hope to help readers recognize that the myriad images confronting them daily are racialized and gendered. Except in old movies, images are not black and white; they come in a multitude of hues and tones. Generally speaking, the darker the color, the greater the evil associated with it and the more dehumanizing the stereotypes (Steele 1990, 43). When *Time* magazine altered O. J. Simpson's skin color, making him appear darker than he is, many African Americans were furious because the newsweekly appeared to recognize that a darker skin tone would cause people to react negatively to Simpson and because *Time* used this artistic trick to attract readers. It appeared, then, that *Time* was making money by playing into racist stereotypes of violent African American men.

Attention to "color" also reminds us that not all people of that "color" identify as a group. Americans tend to think of all Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders as "Orientals," lumping together Japanese Americans and Chinese Americans, for ex-

ample. Yet their cultures and languages are very different, and historically there has been great antipathy between the Japanese and Chinese peoples. This reasoning can be taken a step further. When Americans think of people from China, we tend to think of members of the dominant Chinese ethnic group, ignoring other groups indigenous to China that were conquered by the Han. It is only when "yellow" people are made the Other that their tremendous heterogeneity is forgotten.

We know of no other criminology text that devotes equal attention to all of the major racial and ethnic groups in the United States. To draw attention to the heterogeneity of racial and ethnic groups, not only in terms of gender, wealth, sexual orientation, and physical abilities but also and fundamentally in terms of skin coloration, we toy with the word *color*. Although there are many pinkish skin tones called *white*, white is not a color in the same way as red, black, brown, and yellow. It is, as we have discussed, the very invisibility of white skin to Euro-Americans, the fact that Euro-Americans do not notice when someone else is white but only when they are *not* white, that accords Euro-Americans racial privilege in our society.

Thinking in terms of gender may make this point more apparent. Everyone and everything is gendered, but it is the presence of women in certain settings that reminds us that we have taken the presence of men and the invisibility of women for granted. Parents of young children today often must remind their preschoolers that because many members of the police force are women, we call all of them police *officers* rather than *police men*. Use of the gendered terms *police men*, *firemen*, *garbagemen*, and so forth evokes images of men, even though many of the persons in these occupations are women. This is also why we purposely use the terms *Latinos* and *Latinas* or *Latinos/as* instead of subsuming *Latinas* under the term *Latinos*. From our perspective, *Latinos* does not include women any more than *mankind* does. *Both terms make men the norm and make women invisible*. Throughout this book, we try to jolt readers out of such complacency.

The chapters in this book offer numerous examples of the ways in which American Indian, African American, Latino/a, and Asian American men and women experience oppression and domination. Although our primary emphasis is on racial oppression, our identities, social relations, and institutions are not solely racialized; they are also gendered. In some circumstances, the ways in which social structures and ideologies are racialized are clearly apparent. In others, the ways in which they are gendered are readily visible, but they are always and simultaneously *both* racialized and gendered. And these racialized and gendered identities, relations, and institutions play out differently across social contexts and cultures.

To assist readers in recognizing the many ways in which race and ethnicity are experienced in U.S. society, each section of *Images of Color*, *Images of Crime* includes perspectives from the five primary racial or ethnic groups in the United States. The book is organized into four major sections: personal narratives, stereotyping by the media, stereotyping by politicians, and images of crime and punishment. Each section consists of five chapters, one for each of the "colors" red, black, brown, yellow, and white. The first section is written in a narrative, storytelling format. This genre of writing, which is often associated with critical race theory, merges autobiographical material with theoretical and historical insights to jar readers out of their comfortable assumptions. The narratives demonstrate quite powerfully how skin color, language, cultural traditions, gender, sexual identity, age, and class position shape and constrain our experiences. In so doing, these personal narratives also debunk some of the popular stereotypes about people of that color. The authors present real situations as they are lived and perceived through the lens of color. These are images from the authors' lives and those of their friends and family members, depicted in their own words. As these readings so clearly demonstrate, no one color is exempt from negative life experiences in America. Rather, skin color permeates discussions of opportunities and barriers. of in-

dividual achievements and institutional impediments.

The second section addresses stereotyping by the media, and the third section explores stereotyping by politicians. These sections draw attention to how and why particular stereotypes were generated, the role of the media and politicians in creating or perpetuating them, and the effects of the stereotypes on the racial or ethnic group and on society more generally. As we have mentioned and as the authors of these chapters demonstrate artfully, the film and television media (and to a lesser extent, the print media) are powerful conveyers of racist ideology. By teasing out the ways in which the media use images of color in stereotypical ways, the contributors to this section make us aware of the dangerous consequences of an unfettered press. As these readings demonstrate so strikingly, the media are quite willing to fan flames of racial hatred if that is what their audiences wish to see and hear. The third section exposes how today's politicians use stereotypes and misrepresentations of people of color to ignite the fears of the populace to secure support for their objectives. The essays in this section also demonstrate that politicians' speeches and advertisements are laden with errors of historical fact, and show the willingness of politicians to pit racial and ethnic groups against one another if it serves their interests. Given the importance of media images to electoral politics today, it is perhaps not surprising that politicians have very effectively used what has come to be called the "race card" in their campaigns.

The final section builds on its predecessors to show how these racialized images relate to issues of crime and punishment. The scholars contributing to this section demonstrate how American Indians, African Americans, Latinos and Latinas, and Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders are inequitably enmeshed in and processed by an unjust, biased system of "justice." The offenses committed by people of color have assumed the status of heinous crimes to be dealt with fervently. On the other hand, white-collar crimes, the theft of land and other resources, and other crimes (frequently committed by

white men and women) against the health and well-being of both people and our fragile environment in pursuit of monetary gain are not seen as fearsome. Yet, in a strict dollar sense, the damage caused by such offenses far exceeds that from street crimes and other offenses committed by people of color or by poor and working-class people of any race or ethnicity. This third edition also includes a new chapter that examines the relationship between race and ethnicity and criminal justice policy. It highlights the central role that images of color play in law enforcement and correctional practices. It also includes weblinks to help readers seeking to learn more about specific topics.

Following the four major sections of the book, we conclude with a discussion of some of the policy recommendations raised by the contributors and our own reflections about the political and social implications of linking images of crime with images of color.

Our hope is that *Images* will help readers to better understand the complex and multifaceted relations between color and crime. In particular, it seeks to clarify the links between (1) social structures that institutionalize racism by reinforcing dominant-subordinate group relations; (2) stereotypic perceptions of members of various racial and ethnic groups, and the complicity of the media and politicians in maintaining these stereotypes; (3) racialized images of crime and criminology; and (4) variation in how the criminal and juvenile justice systems respond to people of other colors.

Finally, readers have a right to know who we, the editors and authors, are, particularly given the unique and personal approach taken in this book. We, the editors, are three women, one black, one white, and one Latina. The authors of the chapters in each section are all persons of that "color." Some are men, some are women. Some are gay, some are straight. Some are younger, some are older. A few are graduate students, others are established academics, and still others are political activists. The academic authors represent a wide range of disciplines, including sociology, political science, history, communication, criminology, and women's studies. As a group, then, we are highly diverse.

Our hope is that you, our readers, will come to better recognize and value that diversity of perspectives—not only in the chapters of this book, but also in all aspects of your lives.

Notes

1. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 97.6 percent of the population self-identified as belonging to one race. Nearly 7 million people, or 2.4 percent of the total U.S. population, self-identified as multiracial. Three-quarters of the population (75.1 percent) self-identified as white, 12.3 percent as black or African American, 0.9 percent as American Indian or Alaska Native, 3.6 percent as Asian, 0.1 percent as Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, 5.5 percent as "other," and 2.4 percent as members of two or more races. Separate from these racial and ethnic breakdowns, another question asked respondents whether they were Hispanic. Twelve and one-half percent of the total U.S. population self-identified as Hispanic, putting them roughly in parity with African Americans as the nation's largest racial and ethnic minorities. Indeed, in California, Latinos/as make up one-third of the population, significantly outnumbering African Americans. Non-Hispanic whites are now a minority in California and may soon be in Texas (Schmitt 2001, 18).
2. For a critique of the concept of the underclass as it applies to Latinos/as, see Moore and Pinderhughes (1993).
3. See, for instance, the following collections of writings by women of color: *This Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, edited by Cherrié Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa (1983); *All the Women Are White, All the Blacks Are Men, But Some of Us Are Brave: Black Women's Studies*, edited by Gloria Hull (1981); *Making Face, Making Soul: Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Women of Color*, edited by Gloria Anzaldúa (1990); and *Building With Our Hands: New Directions in Chicana Studies*, edited by Adela de la Torre and Beatriz Pesquera (1993).

References

- Anderson, Margaret L., and Collins, Patricia Hill (eds.). (1995). *Race, class, and gender: An anthology*. 2nd ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Anzaldúa, Gloria (ed.). (1990). *Making face, making soul: Haciendo caras: Creative and critical perspectives by women of color*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Foundation.
- Austin, Regina. (1992). "The Black community, its lawbreakers, and a politics of identification." *Southern California Law Review* 65(4): 1769–1817.
- Baca Zinn, Mazine, Hondagneu-Sotelo, Pierrette, and Messner, Michael A. (eds.). (2005). *Gender through the prism of difference*. 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bass, Sandra. (2001). "Policing space, policing race: Social control imperatives and police discretionary decisions." *Social Justice* 28(1): 156–175.
- Bobo, Jacqueline, Hudley, Cynthia, and Michel, Claudine, eds. (2004). *The Black studies reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé. (1989). "Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of anti-discrimination doctrine, feminist theory and anti-racist politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum*: 139–167.
- . (1991). "Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color." *Stanford Law Review* 43: 1241–1299.
- De la Torre, Adela, and Pesquera, Beatriz M., eds. (1993). *Building with our hands: New directions in Chicana studies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Deloria, Vine, Jr., and Lytle, Clifford M. (1983). *American Indians, American justice*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Donziger, Steven A. (ed.). (1996). *The real war on crime: The report of the National Criminal Justice Commission*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Fernández, Roberto M., and Harris, David. (1992). "Social isolation and the underclass." In Adele V. Harrell and George E. Peterson (eds.), *Drugs, crime, and social isolation: Barriers to urban opportunity*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.
- Ferrante, Joan, and Browne, Prince, Jr. (2001). *The social construction of race and ethnicity in the United States*. 2nd ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Frankenberg, Ruth. (1993). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Georges-Abeyie, Daniel E. (1989). "Race, ethnicity, and the spacial dynamic: Toward a realistic study of black crime, crime victimization, and criminal justice processing of blacks." *Social Justice* 16(4): 35–54.
- . (1990). "Criminal processing of non-white minorities." In Brian D. MacLean and Dragan