

### REVIEWER'S REJOINDER

My conclusion may be erroneous but the authors do write: "Few differences emerged when we compared charges, defendant characteristics, and nature of the evidence across the three cities. The origin of the significant differences in outcomes described in our study becomes evident only when we look at workgroups, sponsoring organizations, and environmental contexts" (p. 299).

The main difference between the authors and this reviewer seems to be widely divergent expectations about what constitutes macrostructural analysis. A description of "sponsoring organizations and *their* environments, appellate courts, the media and the political environment" (see pp. 53-60, 91-95, 121-23, 160-67) is not a macrostructural analysis. Such an analysis would start with the contribution of the courts to legitimating the state apparatus in capitalist societies: legitimating repression by police and prisons, creating an illusion of order, and diverting attention from those who cause massive damage to human beings through racism, exploitation, and sexism. It therefore would go on to study: how the courts help to control eruption stemming from the socioeconomic structure (poverty, unemployment, race discrimination), how police and courts cooperate with the media in the production of a notion of normal crimes, and how, by this very cooperation, a public fear of crime is induced that relieves the state of its self-proclaimed duty to guarantee human dignity to everybody (a claim that, if realized, would lead to the redistribution of life chances).

Whatever disagreement there is, I seriously hope that this exchange of opinions will stimulate readers to evaluate the book themselves.