

# To What Extent do Race, Gender and Social Class Impact the Criminal Justice Processing System in Different Countries Around the World?

**Author: Rania Sarker**

Email: [Rania.sarker@gmail.com](mailto:Rania.sarker@gmail.com)

**DOI: 10.26821/IJSRC.12.5.2024.120501**

## **Abstract**

Criminal justice processing systems are an essential part of all countries and the procedures and regulations governing them differ from nation to nation. However, as these systems are studied, it becomes more evident that justice is in fact not for all. Whilst these systems are meant to be free of bias, the unfortunate truth is that race, gender and social class among other factors have a great influence on the manner in which an individual is treated within this system. This research paper conducts a thorough analysis and evaluation of the aforementioned with the aim of identifying the root causes of the discrimination which exists within the systems of different countries. Ultimately, the objective is to advocate for a more equitable and just criminal justice system; one that recognizes and addresses the intersecting axes of privilege and oppression that shape the contours of societal justice.

**Key Words: Criminal Justice Processing System, Race, Gender, Social Class, Bias**

## **Introduction**

Through the corridors of justice, where the gavel's bang echoes amongst the tapestry of society, an unavoidable truth remains: the criminal justice system is not the unbiased conciliator it claims to be. Underneath the covers of blind justice, race, gender, and societal class, shapes the fate of different individuals, fabricating a story that continues far beyond a courtroom setting.

The historical roots of inequality within the criminal justice system stretch across epochs, mirroring societal prejudices that have persisted through time. From the legacy of slavery and Jim Crow laws to contemporary challenges like mass incarceration and racial profiling, the system has been a mirror reflecting and perpetuating deeply ingrained biases. Similarly, women have historically found themselves marginalised within the annals of criminological discourse, while economic disparities continue to wield influence over legal trajectories, creating a justice system that is far from blind. In the face of these historical and systemic inequalities, a critical

examination and acknowledgement of the manner in which race, gender, and class impact the criminal justice system around the world becomes not only pertinent but imperative. In line with the aforementioned, a fundamental question propelling this exploration is: **“To what extent do race, gender and social class impact the criminal justice processing system in different countries around the world?”**

This paper endeavours to scrutinise the complex dynamics of race, gender, and class within the criminal justice system. By dissecting the ways in which each of these dimensions of identity influences an individual's interactions with the legal system, using case studies of different countries, we aim to contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of the root causes of disparities.

## **Race and the Criminal Processing System**

As a concept, ‘race’ emerged in the 1600s when it was used as a means to justify slavery by regarding Africans as innately and biologically inferior during the Transatlantic slave trade (Smedley and Smedley, 2005). Race refers to the classification of humans based on observable physical differences i.e. phenotypes which are assumed to reflect biological differences. However, there has been plenty of scientific evidence to prove that race, reflected by the hair texture, facial features and most importantly skin colour of an individual, in fact, has nothing to do with their biology (Braveman and Parker Dominguez, 2021). Thus, the scientific consensus of today is that race is a social construct as opposed to a biological one (Gannon, 2016).

One of the main arguments in favour of race being a socially constructed ideology is that the concept of it has remained very fluid whereby it has been implemented in different ways at different times. For instance, during the Nazi movement in the 20th century, Germans regarded Jewish people as a ‘race’ whereby the rationale for their mass extermination was that they were acknowledged as an inferior race that must be eliminated to avoid contamination among the Aryans i.e. superior race (Shirer, 2011). The fluidity of the concept of race may also be witnessed amongst the population identified as being ‘White’. In the earlier years, during the late 19th century and early 20th century to be precise, there was an influx of immigrants from Ireland, Italy and Poland into the United States who were willing to work for relatively lower wages. These people were all considered to belong to a race different and inferior to the Whites i.e. what was used to refer to the more established European immigrants (Roediger, 2006).

It is also the concept of race which enables racism. Racism most commonly is defined as a system of race that is rooted in notions of inherent racial group superiority and inferiority consequently giving rise to unjust privileges to the Whites whilst oppressing the non-Whites (DOMINGUEZ, 2008). Racism can manifest at multiple levels. For instance, it may be internalised, interpersonal, institutional, structural or systemic. Racism, in whatever form it may exist, is a threat to social well-being as it denigrates the core aspect of a person’s identity. This is further worsened by racism enabling racial discrimination whereby unfair treatment is given to people belonging to certain races. It is true that racial discrimination is now no longer legal, however, the unfair systems and structures are so deeply rooted and to date may be evidenced in the practices, policies, laws and beliefs (Braveman and Parker Dominguez, 2021).

In line with the above, differential treatment based on race is well documented at each decision point in the US criminal legal system. Starting with policing itself, much of the racial discrimination is influenced by the stereotypes that exist. For instance, according to research from Duncan (1976) and Sagar & Schofield (1980), stereotypes linking black people with aggression are shown to make people judge the behaviour of Black people as more aggressive than the identical behaviour of White people. Several studies have also highlighted stereotypes of African Americans as violent, hostile and dangerous. All of these traits have close links to criminality and consequently are important factors in the decision of whether an individual poses a threat to personal safety - a critical component of an officer's decision to use force. Other than stereotypes influencing the decisions made by police, as per Fridell (2017), police officers' behaviour may also be heavily impacted by implicit bias. Implicit biases are those that operate outside of conscious awareness and control but influence judgements through processes of misattribution and disambiguation. For instance, the Affect Misattribution Procedure, wherein participants are first exposed to stimuli outside of conscious awareness and then asked to rate subsequent novel stimuli, is an empirical illustration of the manner in which implicit bias can lead to misattribution. If the participants have favourable attitudes toward the first stimulus then they tend to rate the subsequent stimulus favourably as well (Payne et al., 2005). In line with this, when participants are primed with Black faces, there is a higher tendency to evaluate the subsequent stimuli more negatively than the stimuli following White faces. With regard to disambiguation, several relevant studies illustrate the role of disambiguation in the application of racial stereotypes in domains greatly relevant to policing. For instance, as per findings from Eberhardt, Goff, Purdie, and Davies (2004) found that college students and police officers were faster to identify images of weapons as they became de-pixelated when they were preceded by subliminal images of Black faces as opposed to White faces.

Racial discrimination, based on racial biases and stereotypes, in policing has been evident in several policies and practices implemented in the United States over the years. Strategies such as hot-spot policing, dragnet policing and increased surveillance tactics exacerbate stereotypes about criminality amongst people of colour as they are commonly used by law enforcement in Black neighbourhoods (Hinton and Cook, 2020). Another policing practice that has now been ruled unconstitutional on the grounds that it violated the constitutional rights of people of colour in the city, stop and frisk (when police officers briefly detain and search individuals without a warrant when they have reasonable suspicion of criminal activity), saw the New York City Police Department racially profile people of colour time and time again (Brooks, Brock and Bolling-Williams, 2014). It is a result of such practices that the arrests and use of force against people of colour are significantly higher than for the White population. As per statistics, while Black people represent around 13.6% of the US population, they account for nearly 27% of the arrests. Moreover, Black people experience over one-quarter of arrests for drug law violations, despite similar rates of drug use among racial and ethnic groups. A paper published by Goff et al. (2016) provides some more eye-opening realities including that Black people are twice as likely as white people to be killed by police. This disparate killing of Black people persists even when they and white people are unarmed - in 2018, more than 300 Black people were killed by law enforcement, and one-quarter of them were unarmed (Bor et al. 2018).

Other than policing, racial disparities exist even in pretrial case processing and detention, charging and

sentencing decisions, and incarceration rates and treatment during incarceration. As a result of the biases ingrained in the system, it is assumed that people of colour are more likely than white people to have a criminal record and more likely to be assessed as safety risks and detained pretrial due to a lack of resources to pay fees, fines and bail (Sentencing Project, 2018). Once again, these biases result in the disproportionate incarceration of Black people and American Indian/Alaskan Native people in US jails (Zang and Minton 2019). Furthermore, as per Mizel (2018), the disparities persist as one moves through the court system with Black people being more likely than white people to receive punitive charges at arraignment as well. For instance, in federal courts, prosecutors are more likely to charge Black people with offences carrying higher mandatory minimums than white people who have similar situations whilst in state courts the prosecutors are more likely to charge Black people under habitual-offender laws than white people (Crawford et al., 2006; Hinton, Henderson, and Reed, 2018). It is these biases throughout the court process that ultimately result in racial and ethnic disparities in prisons and in more severe sentences and disciplinary actions for people of colour. Further, in the criminal justice processing system, biases can also impact parole decisions in which an individual's incarceration length, behaviour during incarceration, crime severity, criminal history and mental health are considered (Coplan, 2007). Racial and ethnic discrimination leads to black people spending more time in prison awaiting parole than white people (Huebner and Bynum, 2008) with such discrimination extending itself even into community supervision whereby Black men are 3.5 times more likely than white men to be under some form of community supervision (Horowitz and Utada, 2018).

Overall, it remains evident that racial discrimination influenced by racial stereotypes and biases is present in all decision points of the US criminal justice processing system - from policing all the way through to community supervision.

## **Gender and the Criminal Processing System**

Similar to race, gender is also deemed a social construct. WHO defines gender as “the characteristics of women, men, girls and boys that are socially constructed. This includes norms, behaviours and roles associated with being a woman, man, girl or boy, as well as relationships with each other”. The main evidence of gender being socially constructed is in the different definitions of gender roles across cultures, times and contexts. Gender roles often give rise to stereotypes i.e. the manner in which one is expected to behave or the characteristics one is expected to possess based on their gender. As per OHCHR (2014), “a stereotype is harmful when it limits women’s or men’s capacity to develop their personal abilities, pursue their professional careers and make choices about their lives and life plans. Both hostile/negative or seemingly benign stereotypes can be harmful”.

Whilst these gendered stereotypes influence various walks of life, they most definitely also have an impact on the criminal justice processing system. The aforementioned is however more true for the systems of certain countries in comparison to others. For example, as per a report published by MRG (2019), when analysing Iran, the country’s Penal Code is largely based on the government's interpretation of Islamic sharia precepts. This gives rise to gender discrimination on many levels - starting right from what age an individual can be held criminally responsible. To elaborate further, the Penal Code enforces that the age of reaching puberty is to be taken as the age of criminal responsibility. As a result of this, girls are considered

criminally responsible from a much younger age than men (Article 147 of the Penal Code states that the age is nine lunar years for girls, around eight years and nine months, while the age for boys is fifteen lunar years, equivalent to about fourteen years and seven months). Because of the low age at which children can be legally tried as adults, on the one hand, and because it is inherently discriminatory, on the other - this provision is a stark violation of international standards.

Beyond the discrimination in the criminal age, many women in Iran also face increased scrutiny and chances of arrest on mere grounds of defending their human rights. Many of the women in Iran have reported being arrested without any prior notice or a warrant as well as being unable to contact their family during detention. These women are typically prosecuted under very vaguely worded national security charges such as 'assembly and collusion against national security' and 'propaganda against the state' (MRG, 2019). Such charges are regularly used by the Iranian government to criminalise peaceful acts of expression and portray the women human rights defenders as political opponents who are attempting to overthrow the government. Moreover, once imprisoned, women political prisoners are kept in a dedicated section of the women's ward in Evin Prison in Tehran. This women's ward is reportedly cramped, dirty and lacking natural light and medical supplies, in violation of international standards. Such women prisoners have also been denied family visits and phone calls (MRG, 2019).

The gender discrimination against women in Iran in the justice system extends itself to the judicial institutions as well. For instance, women can hold the position of legal advisers allowing them to oversee case proceedings, however, they can not be appointed as judges in Iran's courts meaning that they are unable to render final verdicts (IFP News, 2018). Even when they work in judicial positions, women have pointed out the unequal power dynamics that exist between men and women in the judicial system whereby women are oftentimes pressured by male judges to issue decisions against their judgment (Sahar Maranlou, 2015).

Once again, Iran is only one example of a country wherein there is evident gender discrimination, fueled largely by gender stereotypes, against women in the criminal processing systems. The systems of many other countries too are guilty of such discriminatory practices - some even discriminate highly against men whereby it is perceived that men are much more likely to commit crimes than women and in the case that a crime has been committed by the latter then more leniency may be shown especially at the detention and sentencing stages (Geppert, 2022).

## **Class and the Criminal Processing System**

As per Britannica (2018), the term class started to be used in the 19th century as a replacement for terms such as rank and order to describe the hierarchical groupings of society. The use of the term class was an indicator of the changes in the structure of Western European societies post the industrial and political revolutions that took place in the late 18th century. This is because new social groups were developing representative of the commercial and industrial capitalists and the urban working class in the new factories. These classes were and continue to be largely defined in economic terms, either with regard to dependence on wages or then the ownership of capital.

In modern societies, there is a general agreement among social scientists on the characteristics of the principal social classes - upper, working (or lower), and middle.

- In modern capitalist societies, the upper class is distinguished by the possession of largely inherited wealth. Individuals belonging to this class are recognised to have ownership of a large number of assets and the income derived from these confer many advantages upon the members of this class. For instance, they are able to develop a distinctive life based on extensive cultural pursuits and leisure activities. In addition to the aforementioned, they are also most likely able to exert a considerable influence on economic policy and political decisions. Finally, by being able to procure superior education and economic opportunities for their children, they can perpetuate family wealth.
- The upper class has historically been contrasted with the working class which mainly consisted of manual workers in the manufacturing industries. However, as industrialisation has occurred and the service sector has widely expanded, there has been a requirement to refine this comparison. In modern societies, the lower class is thus defined as those people who hold low-paying, low-skilled and nonunionized jobs in industries beyond manufacturing including retail sales and food service, for example. Even with the lower class, there may be differences in income levels which give rise to further categorization of such individuals as being skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers. Ultimately, the main characteristic of the broader working class is that they lack asset ownership and tend to largely depend on their wages for survival. As a result of this, they tend to have low living standards, restricted access to higher education and exclusion to a great extent from spheres of decision-making.
- The middle class consists of the middle and upper levels of clerical workers, supervisors and managers, some self-employed workers including small-scale shopkeepers and businesspersons and those involved in technical and professional occupations. Most commonly, at the top of the middle class are those who merge into the upper class and may be known as the upper middle class. On the other hand, at the bottom of the middle class are those who hold routine and relatively poorly paid jobs in sales, transport and distribution making them merge into the working class and be recognized as the lower middle class.

The idea of social class gives rise to classism. Classism is defined as bias, prejudice, oppression, or discrimination toward a person or group of people based on social class or SES, perpetrated by those who have the privilege and power to do so. The definition highlights well how such biases in the context of the criminal justice processing system are dependent on both the actors involved, including perpetrators or suspected perpetrators and the legal practitioners. Speaking of the role of the legal practitioners involved, Angela Davis, a professor at American University in Washington, D.C., said that the prosecutors have great power to decide the defendant's fate. As per Davis, "Prosecutors in my view are probably the most powerful players in the criminal justice system," when a policeman brings a case to a prosecutor, for example, the prosecutor decides whether the case should be thrown out. She concludes that "whenever you've got discretion, you have the ability to discriminate" (Equal, 2021).

The reason for the prevalence of classism in the criminal justice processing system is that much of the influencing criminology theories created and established back in the day are predicated on the belief that certain

characteristics of the lower class lifestyle are inherently criminogenic. In fact, during the early and middle decades of the 20th century, most new criminological theories began with the assumption that crime was primarily a lower-class phenomenon (see, for example, Cloward & Ohlin, 1960; Miller, 1958). One of the countries that suffers from high levels of class bias in their criminal justice processing system is India. Many have titled India's criminal justice processing system as 'anti-poor'. An article by Sharma (2022) does a good job of explaining this bias by considering 5 paradigms;

- *Access to justice* - the ability for the lower class to approach court regardless of complicated legal procedures and high fees
- *Bail granted* - whether those belonging to the lower class are able to get bail or not
- *Investigation aspect* - whether the lower class are jeopardized by the police or other investigation agencies when registering the complaint or carrying out the investigation
- *Legislative aspect* - whether the laws made by the parliament favour the lower class or not
- *Post-conviction difficulties* - whether the lower class face any difficulties in prison after being convicted

Some interesting arguments made in the study by Sharma (2022) include that with regard to obtaining bail in the country, the accused has to give a surety amount. Unfortunately, the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 does not mention the amount of security that is to be paid by the accused to secure his release. As a result of the aforementioned, the decision of the surety amount is in the hands of the court and it has been repeatedly noticed that the courts of the country are not sensitive to the plights of those in the lower classes. With India being a country wherein more than 50% of the population lives below the poverty line and earns less than INR10,000 in a year, bail demands of INR10,000 all the way to INR1,00,000 are unreasonable. It is because of the lack of realistic bail surety amounts being demanded that many who have been granted bail still end up back in prison. Furthermore, from a post-conviction perspective, the idea of beneficial treatment at the cost of bribes once again reiterates the preferential treatment given to those belonging to the higher classes and not the lower ones. Despite no bribes allowed signs being hung outside the jails of the country, an article by a leading newspaper highlighted how a structured bribe system was in place whereby "a visitor has to pay Rs 50 for registration and Rs 20 for each additional visitor. He needs to pay Rs 100 to the official to enter the prison premises. For bringing food, books or clothes, he has to pay a minimum of Rs 100. In summary, a visitor has to shell out Rs 250 to Rs 300 to meet an inmate" (Yadav, 2017).

This dual justice system in India has been noticed and spoken against by many experts. For instance, as per Prashant Bhushan, a senior advocate, "It is true that there is a class bias, otherwise, why would we have so many people languishing in jail because they cannot afford a lawyer to get bail?" (Dhawan and Thakur, 2015). Furthermore, a bench of justices D Y Chandrachud and Hrishikesh Roy made their stance very clear by stating that "India cannot have two parallel legal systems, one for the rich and the resourceful and those who wield political power and influence and the other for the small men without resources and capabilities to obtain justice or fight injustice. The existence of a dual legal system will only chip away the legitimacy of the law" (Thomas, 2021).

## Conclusion

This research paper aimed to analyse the root causes of the discrimination present in the criminal justice processing systems of different countries around the world. Race, gender and social class are all social constructs. With regard to race especially, while many believe that the concept lies in biological explanation, several studies have proven otherwise. Regardless, over the years, race has given rise to racism and subsequently racial discrimination. This racial discrimination persists in the criminal justice processing system as seen in the case study of the United States. In particular, the first stage of the criminal justice system is contact with law enforcement and as per the analysis in this paper, the main finding is that implicit bias gives way to racial discrimination in policing in the United States which has been seen in several policing practices developed and implemented in the country. Moving on to gender, in defining genders, societies have also given rise to gender roles and stereotypes which once again have an influence on the criminal justice processing system. In the case study of Iran, for instance, the analysis suggests that there are many practices enforced throughout the criminal justice processing system which discriminate against women - this is reflected in the early criminal age set for girls, the harsh arrest and detention practices for women human rights defenders and even in the employment in judicial institutions. Finally, social class as a concept has existed for years and in our modern society is divided into the upper class, worker/lower class and middle class, each distinguished by their economic health. That being said, this segregation of society also gives rise to class bias which influences the criminal justice processing system as seen in the example of India wherein the rules and regulations formulated are more in favor of the wealthy than those belonging to the lower class. It is worth reiterating that for a country with a large percentage of the population living under the poverty line or belonging to the lower classes, this is ironic and once again far from what one may define as justice for all.

Overall, it stands true that race, gender and social class impact the criminal justice processing system to a great extent. Whilst this paper analysed the inherent characteristics of race, gender and social class individually, it is worth noting that there is a great tendency for these to intersect and lead to even further discrimination against specific individuals. It is a key finding then that the term 'justice' in the 'criminal justice processing system' is far from being practised in different countries around the world.

## Bibliography

Bor, J., Venkataramani, A.S., Williams, D.R. and Tsai, A.C. (2018). Police killings and their spillover effects on the mental health of black Americans: a population-based, quasi-experimental study. *The Lancet*, [online] 392(10144), pp.302–310. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(18\)31130-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(18)31130-9).

Braveman, P. and Parker Dominguez, T. (2021). Abandon 'Race.' Focus on Racism. *Frontiers in Public Health*, [online] 9(689462). doi:<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2021.689462>.

Britannica (2018). Social class | Definition, Theories, & Facts. In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. [online] Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/social-class>.

Brooks, C.W., Brock, R.M. and Bolling-Williams, B. (2014). *Stop-and-Frisk Abuses & the Continued Fight to End Racial Profiling in America*. [online] NAACP. Available at:

<https://bja.ojp.gov/sites/g/files/xyckuh186/files/bwc/pdfs/born-suspect-report.pdf>.

Cloward, R.A. and Ohlin, L.E. (1960). *Delinquency and Opportunity : a Theory of Delinquent Gangs*. New York: Free Press.

Coplan, J.M. (2007). *What factors affect parole: A review of empirical research*. [online] Research Gate. Available at:  
[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288167516\\_What\\_factors\\_affect\\_parole\\_A\\_review\\_of\\_empirical\\_research](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288167516_What_factors_affect_parole_A_review_of_empirical_research).

CRAWFORD, C., CHIRICOS, T. and KLECK, G. (1998). RACE, RACIAL THREAT, AND SENTENCING OF HABITUAL OFFENDERS\*. *Criminology*, 36(3), pp.481–512.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1998.tb01256.x>.

Dhawan, H. and Thakur, P. (2015). Here's proof that poor get gallows, rich mostly escape. *The Times of India*. [online] 7 Aug. Available at:  
[https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/heres-proof-that-poor-get-gallows-rich-mostly-escape/articleshow/48151696.cms?utm\\_source=contentofinterest&utm\\_medium=text&utm\\_campaign=cppst](https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/heres-proof-that-poor-get-gallows-rich-mostly-escape/articleshow/48151696.cms?utm_source=contentofinterest&utm_medium=text&utm_campaign=cppst).

DOMINGUEZ, T.P. (2008). Race, Racism, and Racial Disparities in Adverse Birth Outcomes. *Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology*, 51(2), pp.360–370. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1097/grf.0b013e31816f28de>.

Duncan, B.L. (1976). Differential social perception and attribution of intergroup violence: Testing the lower limits of stereotyping of Blacks. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(4), pp.590–598. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.34.4.590>.

Eberhardt, J.L., Goff, P.A., Purdie, V.J. and Davies, P.G. (2004). Seeing Black: Race, Crime, and Visual Processing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), pp.876–893. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.876>.

Equal (2021). *Social Class and Access to Justice: How Class System Works in a Legal Process*. [online] Medium. Available at:  
<https://towardsequal.medium.com/social-class-and-access-to-justice-how-class-system-works-in-the-legal-process-eb02e9e852f2>.

Fridell, L.A. (2017). *Producing Bias-Free Policing : A Science-Based Approach*. Springer International Publishing.

Gannon, M. (2016). *Race Is a Social Construct, Scientists Argue*. [online] Scientific American. Available at:  
<https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/race-is-a-social-construct-scientists-argue/>.

Geppert, K. (2022). Explaining the Gender Gap in the Criminal Justice System: How Family-Based Gender Roles Shape Perceptions of Defendants in Criminal Court. *Inquiries Journal*, [online] 14(02). Available at:  
<http://www.inquiriesjournal.com/articles/1936/explaining-the-gender-gap-in-the-criminal-justice-system-how->

family-based-gender-roles-shape-perceptions-of-defendants-in-criminal-court.

Goff, P.A., Lloyd, T., Geller, A., Raphael, S. and Glaser, J. (2016). *THE SCIENCE OF JUSTICE RACE, ARRESTS, AND POLICE USE OF FORCE*. [online] Center for Policing Equity. Available at: [https://policingequity.org/images/pdfs-doc/CPE\\_SoJ\\_Race-Arrests-UoF\\_2016-07-08-1130.pdf](https://policingequity.org/images/pdfs-doc/CPE_SoJ_Race-Arrests-UoF_2016-07-08-1130.pdf).

Hinton, E. and Cook, D. (2020). The Mass Criminalization of Black Americans: a Historical Overview. *Annual Review of Criminology*, [online] 4(1). doi:<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-criminol-060520-033306>.

Hinton, E., Henderson, L. and Reed, C. (2018). *An Unjust Burden: The Disparate Treatment of Black Americans in the Criminal Justice System*. [online] Vera. Available at: <https://www.vera.org/downloads/publications/for-the-record-unjust-burden-racial-disparities.pdf>.

Horowitz, J. and Utada, C. (2018). *Community Supervision Marked by Racial and Gender Disparities*. [online] Pewtrusts.org. Available at: <https://www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/articles/2018/12/06/community-supervision-marked-by-racial-and-gender-disparities>.

Huebner, B.M. and Bynum, T.S. (2008). The role of race and ethnicity in parole decisions. *Criminology*, 46(4), pp.907–938. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2008.00130.x>.

IFP News (2018). *Iran's First Female Judge Talks Of Her Experiences - Iran Front Page*. [online] ifpnews.com. Available at: <https://ifpnews.com/irans-first-female-judge-talks-of-her-experiences/>.

Miller, W.B. (1958). Lower Class Culture as a Generating Milieu of Gang Delinquency. *Journal of Social Issues*, 14(3), pp.5–19. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1958.tb01413.x>.

Mizel, M.L. (2018). *A Plea for Justice: Racial Bias in Pretrial Decision Making*. [online] UCLA. Available at: <https://escholarship.org/content/qt7dg565rr/qt7dg565rr.pdf>.

MRG (2019). *Beyond the Veil: Discrimination against Women in Iran*. [online] Available at: <https://minorityrights.org/app/uploads/2024/01/mrg-cfr-iran-en-sept191.pdf>.

OHCHR (2014). *Gender stereotypes and Stereotyping and women's rights*. [online] OHCHR. Available at: [https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Women/WRGS/OnePagers/Gender\\_stereotyping.pdf](https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Issues/Women/WRGS/OnePagers/Gender_stereotyping.pdf).

Payne, B.K., Cheng, C.M., Govorun, O. and Stewart, B.D. (2005). An inkblot for attitudes: Affect misattribution as implicit measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(3), pp.277–293. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.3.277>.

Roediger, D.R. (2006). *Working Toward Whiteness: How America's Immigrants Became White: The Strange Journey from Ellis Island to the Suburbs*. Basic Books.

Sagar, H.A. and Schofield, J.W. (1980). Racial and behavioral cues in Black and White children's perceptions of

ambiguously aggressive acts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39(4), pp.590–598.  
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.39.4.590>.

Sahar Maranlou (2015). *Access to Justice in Iran: Women, Perceptions, and Reality*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sentencing Project (2018). *Report of The Sentencing Project to the United Nations Special Rapporteur on Contemporary Forms of Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Related Intolerance Regarding Racial Disparities in the United States Criminal Justice System*. [online] Available at: <https://www.sentencingproject.org/app/uploads/2022/08/UN-Report-on-Racial-Disparities.pdf>.

Sharma, A. (2022). *Criminal Justice System: The Triturator Of Poor*. [online] [legalserviceindia.com](http://legalserviceindia.com). Available at: <https://www.legalserviceindia.com/legal/article-9100-criminal-justice-system-the-triturator-of-poor.html#:~:text=If%20the%20poor%20fails%20to>.

Shirer, W.L. (2011). *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*. Simon & Schuster.

Smedley, A. and Smedley, B.D. (2005). Race as Biology Is fiction, Racism as a Social Problem Is real: Anthropological and Historical Perspectives on the Social Construction of race. *American Psychologist*, 60(1), pp.16–26.

Thomas, A. (2021). *India cannot have two parallel legal systems for rich, poor: SC*. [online] Hindustan Times. Available at: <https://www.hindustantimes.com/india-news/india-cannot-have-two-parallel-legal-systems-for-rich-poor-sc-101626978663889.html>.

Yadav, U. (2017). Want to meet your dear ones in central jail? Just bribe the staff. *The Economic Times*. [online] 3 May. Available at: <https://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/politics-and-nation/want-to-meet-your-dear-ones-in-central-jail-just-bribe-the-staff/articleshow/58490431.cms?from=mdr>.

Zeng, Z. and Minton, T. (2021). *Jail Inmates in 2019*. [online] Available at: <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/ji19.pdf>.