



# THE WESTERN CRIMINOLOGIST

Fall 2013

THE OFFICIAL NEWSLETTER OF THE WESTERN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

Editor: Dr. Yvette Farmer, Criminal Justice Division, CSU – Sacramento, 6000 J St., Sacramento, CA 95819-6085



## FROM THE PRESIDENT

Paul Kaplan

San Diego State University

Dear Colleagues,

I hope that your summer 2013 was productive and yet also offered some time for rest, recreation, and fun! The 2013-2014 academic year is upon us and there's plenty of news in the WSC. Let me start with what I think is the most important. As of this writing, the WSC and the University of California Press have been unable to come to a mutually-beneficial agreement regarding the Press publishing *Western Criminology Review*. Although there is strong mutual interest between the WSC and the UC Press to publish our journal, the Board is now exploring other options. Don't forget to read the newest issue of [WCR](#)—a special issue devoted to white collar crime, and focuses on Gregg Barak's award-winning book, *Theft of a Nation*.

It is with great regret that I announce that after nine years of service as Editor of *The Western Criminologist*, Dr. Yvette Farmer has decided to resign her position. Since Fall, 2005, Dr. Farmer has edited a whopping 16 editions of *The Western Criminologist*, including this one. The WSC owes her much gratitude for this incredible dedication!

Two other Board members—Drs. Marie Griffin and Dena Carson—will end their terms as Executive Counselors at the end of the conference in February, 2014. Hearty thanks to both for their excellent terms of service to the WSC! Their departure means that the Board has two open Executive Counselor positions—please announce these openings to colleagues and consider running yourself. Please send nominations to Marie Griffin ([Marie.Griffin@asu.edu](mailto:Marie.Griffin@asu.edu)) or John Hepburn ([john.hepburn@asu.edu](mailto:john.hepburn@asu.edu)) no later than September 27, 2013.

In other news, the Board has begun discussing the possibility of establishing a Director of Social Media to establish and maintain social media accounts (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, etc.) connected to the WSC's main webpage. The Director of Social Media would work with the Board to promote the WSC, recruit membership, announce calls, etc. on social media. The Board has yet to vote on this matter, and before we do, we will send a survey to you all for feedback. Please take a moment to share your thoughts with us when you receive an email from us containing an electronic link to the online survey.

### IN THIS ISSUE:

From the President .....	1
From The Editor .....	2
Come Join Us .....	3
WSC Awards and Recipients for 2014.....	3
Call for Participation .....	4
Critical Criminology and Social Justice .....	5
An Invitation to Share Your Thoughts and Words.....	5
Thoughts on the <i>State v. Zimmerman</i> Verdict.....	5
Miki's Reflections .....	8
WCR Call for Papers .....	9
Internet Access .....	10
Flyer for 2014 Conference .....	11

The 41<sup>st</sup> annual WSC conference will take place February 6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> in beautiful Honolulu, Hawaii! Let's thank in advance Co-Program Chairs Ryan Fischer and Samantha Smith-Pritchard for what promises to be a substantively outstanding conference. And, as I mentioned in my previous message, the WSC Board is working hard to arrange a similar level of hospitality services as last year in Berkeley. I can't

---

guarantee TWO nights of open bar, but we're working on plans for good opportunities to relax and mingle.

Note that all abstract submissions for the conference are made through the WSC website's 'Conference' page (<http://www.westerncriminology.org/conference.htm>). There you can find directions for submitting a proposal for a paper, a full panel, or a poster. The deadline to submit abstracts is October 4, 2013. Please also note that in order for the Board to handle the finances and logistics of the conference, all presenters are required to pre-register for the conference no later than January 6, 2014.

One final bit of logistical news related to the conference: for 2014, Panel Chairs will be responsible for organizing computer usage at the conference. For the last several years, Board members have brought personal or school issued laptops to the conference for use in breakout sessions. This has proven to be inefficient and inconvenient for a number of reasons (not least of which is monitoring the laptops between sessions!). So, this next year, Panel Chairs will be responsible for organizing the use of a laptop during their panel. Note that the WSC will continue to provide projectors; Panel Chairs need only arrange for the use of a laptop.

Last but not least, let me thank all the members of the Board for their hard work over the last year—it has been and continues to be a real pleasure to work with you all. Special gratitude goes to the Publications Committee for their work on placing the *WCR* with the UC, Press: Nicole Bracy (SDSU), Stuart Henry (SDSU), Chris Curtis (SDSU), Yvette Farmer (CSU, Sacramento), and Hank Fradella (CSULB). Stuart and Hank especially deserve a round of applause for their work on this project. Extra thanks also go to Kim Richman (University of San Francisco) and Keremet Reiter (UC, Irvine) for their work on the Awards Committee; this is a heavy logistical load that (I hope) is lightened a little by the satisfaction of conferring deserving awards on colleagues. Justin Ready (Arizona State University) and Penny-Bee Bovard (University of Hawaii) deserve thanks in advance for taking on the annual Book Exhibit in the wake of Mary Maguire's retirement from WSC service. More in-advance thanks goes to Marie Griffin and John Hepburn for handling the upcoming job of facilitating nominees to the Board. Finally, I am personally very grateful to Hank Fradella and Kim Richman for their incredible help and support in their respective roles as Immediate Past President and Vice President.

On behalf of the Board, I will sign off by saying we are glad to have you all as colleagues and members of the WSC...and we hope to see you in Hawaii in February!



---

## FROM THE EDITOR

Yvette Farmer

Our Fall issue includes a message from the new WSC President, shares information about the upcoming WSC conference in Hawaii, and identifies the WSC award winners that will be honored at that conference. Please take a moment to think about the work that you want to present at this conference and be sure to submit your abstracts by the October 4<sup>th</sup> deadline.

In an effort to see that the newsletter remains informative and continues to challenge its readers to critically evaluate important issues in criminology and criminal justice, you will see Hank Fradella's thoughts on the *State v. Zimmerman* verdict. In *Miki's Reflections*, she highlights her position on AB109 as a correctional change. We appreciate the contributions to the newsletter and if an article motivates you to share your thoughts in an upcoming issue, please let me know.

This is *our* newsletter and I would like to encourage all of the readers to take an active role in sharing important ideas and information with our membership. The deadline for receipt of materials will be March 1<sup>st</sup> for the Spring issue and August 1<sup>st</sup> for the Fall issue. Prior to February 1, 2014, ideas should be sent to Dr. Yvette Farmer, California State University, Sacramento, 6000 J Street, Sacramento, California 95815-6015. The telephone number is (916) 278-5062 or 278-6487 (message). If you would like to submit an article on or after February 1<sup>st</sup>, please send your submission to Dr. Paul Kaplan, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182-4505.

On a personal note, this is the last issue for which I am the Editor of this newsletter and Dr. Paul Kaplan has volunteered to edit the Spring 2014 newsletter. At the end of my term in February, I will have served the WSC and its membership for nine years. I have enjoyed serving this organization as Editor of the newsletter and I wish the WSC continued success in all of its endeavors.



## COME JOIN US!

### WESTERN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY 41<sup>ST</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE

HONOLULU, HI – FEBRUARY 6-8, 2014

We encourage you to mark your calendar for the 41st Annual Conference of the WSC!



**Hotel:** [Ala Moana Hotel](#)  
410 Atkinson Drive  
Honolulu, Hawaii  
(808) 955-4811

**Rate:** \$129\*/night in the Kona Tower  
\$159\*/night in the Waikiki Tower

*Book by January 6, 2014. Mention Western Society of Criminology Annual Conference to receive group rate; rate is good 3 days pre and post conference*

\*Rates are subject to availability.

The Program Chairs are: Dr. Ryan Fischer, Department of Criminal Justice, California State University, Long Beach, 1250 Bellflower Blvd., Long Beach, CA 90840; and Dr. Samantha Smith-Pritchard, Northrop Grumman Technical Service, Defense Personnel Security Research Center, 2411 Dulles Corner Park, Suite 800, Herndon, VA 20171.

The Call for Papers appears in this issue, but you may also want to contact Dr. Fischer, Dr. Smith-Pritchard, or check out our website - [www.westerncriminology.org](http://www.westerncriminology.org) for additional information about the conference.



## WSC AWARDS AND RECIPIENTS FOR 2014

---

June Morrison – Tom Gitchoff Founders Award:

★ **Steven Belenko**

---

Paul Tappan Award:

★ **Richard Leo**

---

Joseph D. Lohman Award:

★ **Hank Fradella**

---

Western Society of Criminology Fellows Award:

★ **Rosann Greenspan and David T. Johnson**

---

President's Award:

★ **Richard Leo**

---

Meda Chesney-Lind Award:

★ **Barbara Bloom and Barbara Owen**

---

Richard Tewksbury Award:

★ **Valerie Jenness**

---



# CALL FOR PARTICIPATION

## WESTERN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY 41<sup>ST</sup> ANNUAL CONFERENCE FEBRUARY 6-8, 2014 • HONOLULU, HI

❖ Please note that the deadline to submit abstracts is October 4, 2013 ❖

### PANEL TOPICS

- COURTS AND JUDICIAL PROCESSES  
(INCLUDING SENTENCING)
- CORRECTIONS
- CRIME ANALYSIS  
(INCLUDING GEOGRAPHY & CRIME AND SOCIAL  
NETWORKS & CRIME)
- CRIMINOLOGICAL THEORY
- CYBERCRIME
- DRUGS/SUBSTANCE ABUSE & CRIME
- GENDER, SEXUALITY, & CRIME
- JUVENILE JUSTICE
- LEGAL ISSUES IN CRIMINAL JUSTICE  
(CRIMINAL LAW & CRIMINAL PROCEDURE)
- ORGANIZED CRIME & GANGS
- SEX CRIMES
- TEACHING  
(PEDAGOGY & ASSESSMENT IN JUSTICE EDUCATION)
- TERRORISM
- WHITE COLLAR CRIME

The Abstract Submission System is now online. To access it:

1. From our **Home Page**, navigate to the **Conference** page and then click the link in the table which says **Present: Press here** to be taken to our online Abstract Submission System.
2. Alternatively, the Abstract Submission System can be accessed directly at the following URL:  
[http://www.westerncriminology.org/abstract\\_submission\\_gateway.htm](http://www.westerncriminology.org/abstract_submission_gateway.htm) (note the underscores).

In deciding the most appropriate topic area for your abstract, think about the main focus of your paper and how it might fit within a panel organized around a larger topical theme. For example, if your paper examines both race and juvenile issues, think about whether you would like to be placed on a panel with other papers discussing race issues or other papers dealing with juvenile issues and then submit it to the topic area in which you think it fits best.

All presenters are asked to submit an abstract of 1,100 characters or fewer to only one of the panel topics listed above (on or before October 4, 2013). In addition to the abstract, please include the name, mailing address, email address, and phone number for all authors on the submission for the participant directory. Note that all presenters must pre-register for the conference by January 6, 2014.

*All proposals must be electronically submitted through the WSC's online Abstract Submission System:*

[http://www.westerncriminology.org/abstract\\_submission\\_gateway.htm](http://www.westerncriminology.org/abstract_submission_gateway.htm)

---

❖❖❖❖❖❖❖

**CRITICAL CRIMINOLOGY  
AND SOCIAL JUSTICE**

Special Sessions at the Hawaii WSC Meetings

For the past 5 years Dr. Karen Glover of CSU San Marcos had organized the CCJS, which was one year longer than she'd intended. Cofounded by Karen and Stuart Henry the critical-criminology mini-conference was a whole day of plenaries that preceded the regular WSC conference. As WSC President Paul Kaplan says "This has always been a fantastic little meeting with unbelievable keynote speakers that have included Ray Michalowski, Gregg Barak, Meda Chesney-Lind, Elliott Currie, and Jonathan Simon." In fact Ray was the first keynoter when the CCJS was held in San Diego in 2009. Indeed, not only did the mini-conference encourage graduate students to attend and present, but it also published a cluster of presented papers, including the keynote, in Special Issues of the *Western Criminology Review* (starting with WCR v.11, No. 1 April 2010).

This year CCJS is trying something different. Instead of holding the mini-conference the day before, we are integrating the papers into a special series of panels across the days of the conference. If you are interested in being a part of Critical Criminology and Social Justice panels and would like to present in one of those sessions, simply follow the normal paper proposal submission process and submit an abstract by October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2013 through [http://westerncriminology.org/abstract\\_submission\\_gateway.htm](http://westerncriminology.org/abstract_submission_gateway.htm)

Then send the same title/abstract/contact email to [stuart.henry2@gmail.com](mailto:stuart.henry2@gmail.com) indicating that you want to be on one of the critical criminology panels.

❖❖❖❖❖❖❖

**AN INVITATION TO SHARE YOUR  
THOUGHTS AND WORDS...**

The scholarly exchange of ideas and experiences that takes place between academics and professionals in Criminology and Criminal Justice enriches all of us. If you feel strongly about a certain topic, would be willing to write about it, and believe that others would enjoy reading it, please consider sending an article to the Editor for consideration to be published in the newsletter. Your thoughts and words may

inspire another person and should be sent to Paul Kaplan at [pkaplan@mail.sdsu.edu](mailto:pkaplan@mail.sdsu.edu).

❖❖❖❖❖❖❖

**THOUGHTS ON THE  
STATE V. ZIMMERMAN VERDICT:  
EVERYTHING THAT'S RIGHT AND WRONG  
WITH THE U.S. JUSTICE SYSTEM**

Henry F. Fradella

*California State University, Long Beach*

The morning after the jury's verdict in the trial of George Zimmerman's for killing Trayvon Martin, I read dozens—perhaps as many as hundreds of Facebook posts, news articles, and blogs concerning the case. One of the most infuriating posts I saw praised the justice system and said, "We cannot allow politics, political correctness, and race to enter into justice." Rather than responding by posting a "comment" decrying the author's ignorance, I decided to write this instead. My seemingly paradoxical premise is that the Zimmerman verdict is both right and wrong at the same time.

First and foremost, a young, unarmed teenaged boy was shot and killed. And that in and of itself is a tragedy. Life is precious and the loss of an innocent life is something that should be mourned by all. Trayvon Martin and his family deserve "justice" of a sort that the verdict denied.

Second—and to respond directly to the first of the uninformed assertions I wish to address, "justice" is inextricably tied to politics. There is no separating the two. Why? Well, for one thing, laws are created through a political process. In other words, no laws get enacted unless the body politic endorses them. But perhaps more importantly, all of our individual conceptualizations of "justice"—including those who serve as jurors—are based on the political philosophies we have adopted as our own worldviews. Some see "justice" as equality of outcomes; others deride such views as inherently unjust (often labeling them "socialist" or "communist"), and instead focus on "justice" as a quality that protects individual rights and liberties (the foundation of libertarianism). Some others (including many lawyers) see "justice" as a nothing more than equality of processes—an emphasis on fairness of procedures rather than outcomes; others reject the notion that processes can be "fair" if they lead to unjust outcomes. And



---

still others see “justice” as serving retribution—either through revenge (“an eye for an eye”) or through the atonement of sin; others reject the notion that it is ever “just” to seek retribution, arguing that “two wrongs don’t make a right.” My point here is that whatever one considers to be “just” is tied to one’s philosophical beliefs which, in turn, affect one’s beliefs about law and politics. Any argument, therefore, that politics doesn’t affect the law, its implementation, its enforcement, or its interpretation is misplaced.

Third, in the words of Dr. Cornell West, “race matters” (1994). I literally shuddered when I read the posting arguing that we “cannot allow . . . race to enter justice” because race affects nearly every aspect of the justice system’s operations! Let’s start with looking at the “stand your ground” (SYG) law. Substantively, SYG is nothing more than a definitional part of the law of self-defense. Procedurally (and depending on the jurisdiction), SYG affects the way in which a case might be litigated.

Unless one is the initial aggressor, a person is generally privileged to use a reasonable amount of force when necessary to prevent the imminent application of unlawful force against himself or herself. One may even use deadly force in self-defense to defend against what the actor reasonably perceives as necessary to protect against imminent death or serious bodily harm. But in approximately half the states, the law prohibits the use of deadly force if there is non-deadly alternative known as “retreat.” In these so-called retreat states, one must retreat, provided it can be accomplished safely, before using deadly force to defend oneself from unlawful, imminent attack. (Note that no state imposes a duty to retreat from one’s home before using deadly force in self-defense since one’s home is one’s “castle”; the duty to retreat applies only outside the home.) The remaining states, of which Florida is one, impose no duty to retreat. Rather, one may “stand one’s ground” without having to retreat before using deadly force in self-defense (assuming all of the other requirements of self-defense are satisfied).

The SYG law operated in three ways in the Zimmerman case. First, it most certainly influenced police and prosecutors when they decided to arrest and charge Zimmerman. That is a procedural requirement of the Florida SYG law, since its applicability needs to be considered in the charging phase.

Second—and also procedurally—the defense could have asked the trial court judge to dismiss the criminal charges against Zimmerman under the Florida SYG law. Zimmerman’s defense team waived such a pretrial immunity

hearing. That was a tactical decision. Such a hearing would have allowed a judge (and not a jury) to free Zimmerman without subjecting him to trial. But it also would have required Zimmerman’s defense team to divulge the details of his case. So, the defense team opted not to have such a hearing and instead present their case at a jury trial. But just because there was no SYG hearing does not mean this was not a SYG case; it was—in terms of the substantive law the jury was told to apply, which is my third point—the one laypersons seem to miss when they assert that the Zimmerman case did not involve the SYG law simply because a pretrial hearing on possible immunity under the law was waived.

In a non-SYG jurisdiction, Zimmerman would have been under a legal duty to retreat if he was able to do so before using deadly force (even if all of the other requirements for using deadly force were satisfied). But the Florida SYG law excused him from that obligation. Hence, the jury was never instructed that had to convict Zimmerman if they found he could have avoided using deadly force by retreating from the encounter. This is a matter of substantive criminal law.

The SYG law itself reflects a certain politic—that it is justifiable to take a life rather than retreat in safety—a perspective adopted primarily in southern and western states. In contrast, the law in most northern and mid-western states imposes a duty to retreat (if one can do so safely) before the use of deadly force is considered justifiable. Which approach is the more just? People with diverse political philosophies would undoubtedly answer that question differently. But empirical data provides an answer to this question with which it is hard to argue.

SYG laws clearly tilt “the odds in favor of the shooter” (Roman & Downey, 2012, para. 3). In fact, “in SYG states, 13.6% of homicides under these circumstances are found to be justified. In non-SYG states, only 7.2 percent are justified” (para. 8). But, Dr. Lisa Wade (2013) asks, the real question is “which homicides?” (para. 3). Wade argues—and the Zimmerman verdict illustrates—that although SYG laws increase the chances of a not-guilty verdict, they do so only when the defendant is accused of killing a Black person. There is no such increase when the accused kills a White person (Roman & Downey, 2012). In other words, SYG laws increase “racial bias in legal outcomes” (Wade, 2013, para. 5). This comes as no surprise to those of us who actually study the justice system (as opposed to those who—thanks to social media, the nature of web-based self-publishing, and the de-professionalization of journalism vis-à-vis punditry—espouse rhetoric that is unsupported by factual evidence). After all, scholars have argued for years that death penalty

---

laws similarly promote racial bias in legal outcomes as illustrated by the fact that (after controlling for a wide array of nonracial variables such as socio-economic class and mode of killing), Blacks are 3.5 to 8 times more likely than Whites to face trial on a capital crime than Whites are (Baldus, Pulaski, & Woodworth, 1983; Baldus, Woodworth, Zukerman, Wiener, & Broffitt, 1998; Paternoster, 2013; Pierce & Radlet, 2005). In fact, the U.S. General Accounting Office (1990) conducted a meta-analysis of peer-reviewed research on the death penalty in 1990 and reported that 82% of the studies reviewed found that the races of the victim and accused significantly influenced the likelihood of being charged with capital murder or receiving the death penalty. Consider, for example that only 27.6% of murder victims in California are White, yet 80% of executions in the state involved defendants convicted of killing Whites (Pierce & Radlet, 2005). And that's in a supposed "liberal" state; the statistics are starker in the South (Baldus et al., 1983).

If one is not persuaded by statistics (even though such empirical proof comes from peer-reviewed studies), all one needs to do is look at how SYG laws have been applied to see that the Zimmerman verdict aligns with Roman and Downey's findings. In May 2012, "Marissa Alexander, a 31-year-old mother of three, with a master's degree and no criminal record" was convicted in Florida for aggravated assault for firing a warning shot at her abusive husband (Halper, 2013, para. 3). Although no one was hurt, she was convicted and sentenced to 20 years (a sentence, I would argue, that is inherently unjust as a disproportionate punishment for the underlying act, regardless of whether it was justified or not). The SYG law didn't work for this Black woman—par for the course for SYG laws. Whites who shoot and kill Blacks successfully use SYG laws in approximately 34% of cases nationwide (a figure that staggeringly increases to 73% in Florida). In contrast, only 3% of homicides in which Blacks shoot and kill White victims are ruled justifiable under SYG laws (Roman & Downey, 2012). In short, only by ignoring the actual facts (or by being oblivious to them) can someone say that race does not affect the justice system; it does. End of story.

Additionally, I can't help but feel that there is something wrong with a legal system that justifies the use of deadly force against an unarmed teenage boy, but condemns the use of nonlethal force to stop an attack by firing a warning shot—especially by a woman who had been repeatedly victimized by her estranged, abusive husband. There's an incongruity here that is more than illogical to me. But perhaps this is a function of misguided prosecutorial discretion. But that explanation raises social justice concerns since the exercise of

discretion is supposed to be guided by "doing justice" and that does not to be the case in either the Alexander or Zimmerman cases. This, in turn, raises questions of whether racial bias accounts for the differences in the exercise of such discretion in these cases.

Having refuted the baseless claims that neither politics nor race affects the criminal justice system, I want to turn my attention to the Trayvon Martin killing. Strictly *legally speaking* (i.e., from a purely procedural justice point of view), the Zimmerman verdict was the right outcome. The prosecution produced very little evidence to sustain a guilty verdict on any homicide charge in light of the burden of proof of "beyond a reasonable doubt." This burden is already a high one, but the concept of "reasonable doubt" is widened (perhaps exponentially so) when the SYG law comes into play. As law professor Dan Markel (2013) pointed out in a PrawfsBlawg posting the morning after the Zimmerman verdict, "there was nothing provably unlawful about Zimmerman's following Martin, and there's also no evidence about who was the aggressor, which is a distinct and critical aspect to whether one forfeits one's privilege of self-defense" (para. 2). The fact is that the legal standard of proof in criminal cases demands an acquittal when there is "reason to doubt" the defendant's guilt. The forensic evidence in the case supported George Zimmerman's story that he shot Trayvon Martin while Martin was on top of Zimmerman. From a legal standpoint, that constitutes reasonable doubt in the absence of persuasive evidence that Zimmerman was the initial aggressor (indeed, it supports a classic self-defense argument without the need to even consider the impact of SYG laws, which create a wide berth for finding reasons to doubt). But it is the very absence of proof regarding what happened when the two engaged each other that causes so much consternation. If Trayvon Martin had lived to tell his side of the story, the verdict may have been different. But Zimmerman killed him, and in doing so, eliminated the only person whose testimony could have overcome the presumption of innocence that the law accords all criminal defendants at trial. So that's the real rub with this sad case—the justice system worked as it was supposed to work. The parties presented evidence, the jurors deliberated, and they returned the "correct" verdict when there are reasons to doubt. But this outcome is "fair" and "just" only if one views justice from a process standpoint; it's procedural justice in action in exactly the same way that the O.J. Simpson acquittals on double homicide charges were procedurally just. But this narrow view of justice does not satisfy those of us whose politics cause us to believe in broader justice principles.

---

As David Schraub (2013) poignantly stated, “Lay people may not know the formal definition of ‘reasonable doubt,’ but as lawyers we certainly should know that the formal definition often bears little in common with what actually gets people convicted. The problem with citing our highest ideals is that it seems only certain people with certain victims get access to them” (para. 3). Our criminal justice system places procedural justice—fair processes—above all other philosophical forms of justice, primarily because it is the only conceptualization of justice that the judicial process can come close to insuring (at least most of the time). But that type of “justice” seems woefully unsatisfying for those of us who seek social justice. We yearn for a justice system that is not racially-biased (since the one we have clearly is). And we yearn for outcomes that are “just” insofar as we hope for verdicts that lead to punishment for a man who shot an unarmed teenager whom he profiled and followed on account of his race.

#### References

- Baldus, D. C., Pulaski, C., & Woodworth, G. (1983). Comparative review of death sentences: An empirical study of the Georgia experience. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 74(3), 661-753.
- Baldus, D. C., Woodworth, G., Zukerman, D., Wiener, N. A., & Broffitt, B. (1998). Race discrimination and the death penalty in the post-*Furman* era: An empirical and legal overview with preliminary findings from Philadelphia. *Cornell Law Review*, 83, 1638-1770.
- Halper, K. (2013, June 11). “Stand your ground” law helps white defendants a lot more than black ones. *Salon*. Retrieved from [http://www.salon.com/2013/06/11/stand\\_your\\_ground\\_la\\_w\\_helps\\_white\\_defendants\\_a\\_lot\\_more\\_than\\_black\\_one\\_s/](http://www.salon.com/2013/06/11/stand_your_ground_la_w_helps_white_defendants_a_lot_more_than_black_one_s/)
- Markel, D. (2013, July 13). Zimmerman’s not guilty. [Web log comment]. *PrawfsBlawg*. Retrieved from <http://prawfsblawg.blogs.com/>
- Paternoster, R. (2013). Racial disparity in the case of Duane Edward Buck. A final report. Retrieved from <http://www.documentcloud.org/documents/616699-duane-buck-final-signed-paternoster-report.html#document/p1/a95424>
- Pierce, G., & Radelet, M. (2005). The impact of legally inappropriate factors on death sentencing for California homicides, 1990-1999. *Santa Clara Law Review*, 46, 1-47.
- Roman, J., & Downey, M. (2012). Stand your ground laws and miscarriages of justice. *The Urban Institute MetroTrends Blog*. <http://blog.metrotrends.org/author/mitchandjohn/>
- Schraub, D. (2013, July 14). Zimmerman’s not guilty. [Comment #6 to web log comment]. *PrawfsBlawg*. Retrieved from <http://prawfsblawg.blogs.com/prawfsblawg/2013/07/zimmermans-not-guilty.html#comments>
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1990). *Death penalty sentencing: Research indicates pattern of racial disparities*. (GAO Publication # GGD-90-57). Washington, DC: Author.
- Wade, L. (2013). Stand your ground increases racial bias in “justifiable homicide” trials. [Web log comment]. *Sociological Images: The Society Pages*. Retrieved from <http://thesocietypages.org/socimages/2013/07/13//>
- West, C. (1994). *Race matters*. New York: Vintage Books.

*This essay is an expanded version of the blog commentary written by Dr. Fradella and published on July 14, 2013 on iPinion at <http://ipinionsyndicate.com/thoughts-on-the-state-v-zimmerman-verdict-everything-thats-right-and-wrong-with-the-u-s-justice-system/>*



## MIKI’S REFLECTIONS

Miki Vohryzek-Bolden

When I begin to ponder what to write about in this column, I focus on some of the critical criminal justice issues facing us. I make a note in my calendar a week or two before my wonderful editor has to remind me that the column is due and then begin my mental deliberations. I initially thought about discussing the California Public Safety Realignment Act of 2011 [AB 109]. This law represented a major correctional policy shift, motivated in part by the federal court ruling to reduce prison overcrowding. Realignment transferred significant funding and oversight from the state to the 58 counties for most non-serious, non-violent, and non-sexual offenders. While the impetus may have come from the requirement to reduce the number of inmates in California prisons, the arguments for such a shift were based on hard evidence, particularly the impact of providing treatment and rehabilitative services closer to an offender’s residence.



Well, once I began my research, I realized that there is plenty written about realignment with a focus on both the intended (see above) and unintended consequences (jail overcrowding, early release of inmates due to insufficient capacity, allegations of an increase in crime by these offenders). There are those who are concerned that individuals who previously would have gone to prison are now allowed to remain in our communities, potentially engaging in criminal activity. In addition, we have a gubernatorial candidate who is using the realignment law and its perceived negative consequences as the platform for his candidacy. So I decided, since I am in the process of re-imagining how I will lead the rest of my life, rather than provide an academic discussion of the merits and pitfalls of realignment, I would use this opportunity to share some more personal reflections on this correctional change.

As a former legislative staff member and lobbyist, the following comment may appear very naïve but here we go – When are we ever going to get the politics out of the policy debates? The answer is probably never. Yet I think we need to examine the outcome of mixing politics and policy, especially in the correctional arena. Where has it gotten us before? Nowhere close to guaranteeing fairness and equity in terms of how we handle suspects and offenders in our communities and in our state prisons, and ensuring public safety for all Californians.

In terms of realignment, our goal now should be to determine the what, how, when of data collection that would provide evidence-based, defensible data to assess each county's approach and identify policies and practices that reduce recidivism and more successfully integrate the offender back into the community. There are several existing high quality studies that allow researchers to effectively assess realignment outcomes, though the critics of realignment continue to forecast increases in crime. In the political arena, it is easy to espouse a particular position without providing documentation to support that position. There are still many questions to answer about realignment and our efforts should be focused on collecting appropriate data to address the issues.

As you can probably surmise by now, I am in full support of AB 109. My hope is that we continue on this path of reducing our state prison population and put more of our effort and our monies toward local correctional practices that provide effective services and treatment to reduce reoffending.



## CALL FOR PAPERS

The *Western Criminology Review* is the official journal of the Western Society of Criminology, and we invite scholars to submit articles to the journal for publication. *WCR* provides a forum for publication and discussion of theory, research, policy, and practice in the rapidly changing and interdisciplinary fields of criminology and criminal justice. Historical and contemporary perspectives are encouraged, as are diverse methodological approaches.

Published three times a year, *WCR* is an on-line, peer-reviewed outlet for scholarly research. The journal, which currently has a 17% acceptance rate for submitted articles, is intended to reflect U.S. regional (Western), national, and international concerns. Indeed, 32% of submissions come from the West, 28% from the South, 14% from the Midwest, 5% from the Northeast and 21% of submissions to the journal are from International scholars. The following are titles from the August issue of *WCR*, Volume 14, No. 2, August 2013, which is a special issue on white collar crime edited by Danielle McGurrin and Stuart Henry, and featuring a symposium on Gregg Barak's award winning book, *Theft of a Nation* on the 2008 financial crash and the financial fraud that was involved.

### Contents:

#### Preface

Special Issue: Critical Criminology: White Collar Crime (Danielle McGurrin)

#### Feature Article

White Collar Crime Representation in the Criminological Literature Revisited, 2001-2010 (Danielle McGurrin, Melissa Jarrell, Amber Jahn, and Brandy Cochrane)

#### Symposium on Gregg Barak's *Theft of a Nation*

An Economy Run by Criminals: Reflections on Gregg Barak's *Theft of a Nation* (Elliott Currie)

The Importance of Integrating Victimology in White-Collar Crime: A Targeted Comment on Barak's Analysis in *Theft of a Nation* (Mary Dodge)

Too Big to Jail (Robert Tillman)

---

Corporate Crime and the Corporate Agenda for Crime Control: Disappearing Awareness of Corporate Crime and Increasing Abuses of Power (Paul Leighton)

The Extraordinary Relevance of Barak's *Theft of a Nation* (Michael J. Lynch)

### Commentary and Reflection

The Flickering Desires for White-Collar Crime Studies in the Post-Financial Crisis: Will They Ever Shine Brightly? (Gregg Barak)

The *Western Criminology Review* particularly invites your responses to AB 109 Realignment in calling for papers addressing this shift in criminal justice policy and practice in California.

Because WCR is an online journal, there are no page, color, or appendix restrictions; therefore, authors can include hypertext links and images at their discretion. Manuscripts are submitted electronically, and all correspondence is conducted online to speed up the review process. Our evaluation process for submitted papers involves a brief internal review by editorial staff, followed by a blind assessment by at least two external reviewers. The time from submission to acceptance for published articles averages 3.8 months and the time from acceptance to publication is approximately 4.9 months, making the total time from submission to publication of approximately 9 months.

Replies and comments to previously published articles are encouraged. All submissions should be formatted according to the journal's guidelines for manuscripts, which can be found on the WCR website at <http://wcr.sonoma.edu>. Authors interested in submitting their work to the WCR should send inquiries to co-editors Stuart Henry and Christine Curtis, San

Diego State University and Karen Glover, California State University, San Marcos. Send all new submissions via e-mail as an attachment to Dr. Nicole L. Bracy, Managing Editor, *Western Criminology Review*: [EditorWCR@gmail.com](mailto:EditorWCR@gmail.com).



### INTERNET ACCESS



President: Paul Kaplan - [pkaplan@mail.sdsu.edu](mailto:pkaplan@mail.sdsu.edu)

Vice-President: Kim Richman - [kdreichman@usfca.edu](mailto:kdreichman@usfca.edu)

Secretary/Treasurer: Hank Fradella -  
[Hank.Fradella@csulb.edu](mailto:Hank.Fradella@csulb.edu)

Newsletter Editor: Yvette Farmer - [drfarmer@csus.edu](mailto:drfarmer@csus.edu)

Membership Information: Erich Schellhammer -  
[erich.schellhammer@royalroads.ca](mailto:erich.schellhammer@royalroads.ca)

*Western Criminology Review* Co-Editors:

Stuart Henry - [stuart.henry2@gmail.com](mailto:stuart.henry2@gmail.com)

Christine Curtis - [christinecurtis2@msn.com](mailto:christinecurtis2@msn.com)

Nicole Bracy - [nl.bracy@gmail.com](mailto:nl.bracy@gmail.com)

WSC Webpage: <http://westerncriminology.org/>

---

# WESTERN SOCIETY OF CRIMINOLOGY

## 2014 ANNUAL CONFERENCE

### HONOLULU, HI



**Dates:** February 6-8, 2014

**Hotel:** Ala Moana Hotel  
410 Atkinson Drive  
Honolulu, Hawaii  
(808) 955-4811

**Rate:** \$129\*/night in the Kona Tower  
\$159\*/night in the Waikiki Tower

*Book by January 6, 2014. Mention Western Society of Criminology Annual Conference to receive group rate; rate is good 3 days pre and post conference*

For additional membership or conference information visit us online at:

[www.westerncriminology.org](http://www.westerncriminology.org)

**Submission Deadline for Abstracts – October 4, 2013**