

Justification Defenses and Just Convictions

This major study advances an interpretation of criminal justification defenses that views them as an integral component of the structure of the criminal law defined as the institutional representation of the underlying principles of political morality in a liberal society.

Criminal offense definitions prohibit certain types of conduct and prescribe criminal punishment for those engaging in that conduct. Yet people sometimes violate those prohibitions in circumstances that render their conduct acceptable. Justification defenses provide legal devices that allow courts to exonerate those who violate criminal offense definitions in such circumstances. Such controversial cases as the use of force by battered women or the violation of trespass laws by those engaged in civil disobedience raise important questions about the proper scope and limits of justification defenses. The purpose of the book is to explain the function and limits of these defenses in a way that will enable the reader to apply them to difficult cases.

The book extends the traditional scope of the legal and philosophical discussion of justification defenses. It integrates philosophical analysis with a consideration of contemporary applications, it shows how these defenses are key components of criminal law, and it explores the relationship between legal and moral justification.



Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and Law

GENERAL EDITOR JULES COLEMAN (YALE LAW SCHOOL)

ADVISORY BOARD

Antony Duff (University of Stirling)
David Lyons (Boston University)
Neil MacCormick (University of Edinburgh)
Gerald Postema (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)
Joseph Raz (University of Oxford)
Jeremy Waldron (Columbia University)

Other books in the series:

Jeffrie G. Murphy and Jean Hampton: Forgiveness and Mercy Stephen R. Munzer: A Theory of Property

R. G. Frey and Christopher W. Morris (eds.): Liability and Responsibility: Essays in Law and Morals

Robert F. Schopp: Automatism, Insanity, and the Psychology of Criminal Responsibility

Steven J. Burton: Judging in Good Faith Jules Coleman: Risks and Wrongs

Suzanne Uniacke: Permissible Killing: The Self-defense

Justification of Homicide

Jules Coleman and Allen Buchanan (eds.): In Harm's Way: Essays in Honor of Joel Feinberg

Warren F. Schwartz (ed.): Justice in Immigration
John Fischer and Mark Ravizza: Responsibility and Control

R. A. Duff (ed.): *Philosophy and the Criminal Law*Larry Alexander (ed.): *Constitutionalism*



Justification Defenses and Just Convictions

ROBERT F. SCHOPP

University of Nebraska College of Law





PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge CB2 1RP, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, United Kingdom 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA 10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia

© Robert F. Schopp 1998

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 1998

Typeset in Times Roman

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data Schopp, Robert F.

Justification defenses and just convictions / Robert F. Schopp.

p. cm. – (Cambridge studies in philosophy and law)Includes index.

ISBN 0-521-62211-5 (hardback)

Justification (Law) – United States.
 Self-defense (Law) –
United States.
 Judgments, Criminal – United States – Moral and ethical aspects.
 I. Title.
 II. Series.

KF9246.S36 1998 345.73'04 – dc21 97-26889

CIP

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN 0 521 62211 5 hardback

Transferred to digital printing 2003



Contents

Preface					
Fre	equen	tly Cite	d Sources	xi	
1	Justification Defenses: The Issues				
	1.1	The Theoretical Debate about the General Category of			
		Justification Defenses			
		1.1.1	The Context	2 4	
		1.1.2	Justified Conduct as Right or as Permissible		
		1.1.3	Unknowingly Justified Defendants	5	
		1.1.4	Putative Justification	6	
		1.1.5	The Social Matrix and the Incompatibility Thesis	7	
			Duress as a Problematic Classification	10	
		1.1.7	Summary	10	
	1.2	·			
		1.2.1	General Self-defense	11	
		1.2.2	Battered Women and Self-defense	12	
	1.3	Necessity, Nullification, and Crimes of Conscience		13	
	1.4	Summary and Plan			
2	Justification Defenses and the Conventional Public Morality				
	2.1	Right or Permissible			
	2.2	Knowledge and Justification			
	2.3	Moral	Condemnation and Criminal Punishment	22	
		2.3.1	Five Types of Condemnation in Criminal Punishmen	it 22	
		2.3.2	Hard Cases for Moral Condemnation	25	
		2.3.3	Moral Condemnation and Justification Defenses	26	
	2.4	Knowledge and Justification Revisited			
		2.4.1	Moral Condemnation, Prohibitory Norms, and		
			Unknowingly Justified Defendants	29	
		2.4.2	Justification Defenses with Subjective Elements	31	
		2/13	Hard Cases and the Knowledge Requirement	37	



vi Contents

	2.5	The S	ocial Matrix and the Incompatibility Thesis	40		
		2.5.1	Assisting Justified Acts	40		
		2.5.2		42		
		2.5.3	Hard Cases and the Revised Matrix of Social			
			Responsibility	47		
	2.6	Concl	usion	52		
3	Self-	defense	5	55		
3	3.1		mporary Theories	56		
	5.1	3.1.1		56		
		3.1.2		60		
	3.2		Defenses and Individual Interests	62		
	3.3	The Normative Structure				
	3.3		Political Liberalism	64 65		
			The Criminal Justice System in the Liberal Society	71		
			Justification Defenses	73		
	3.4		defense as Justified Conduct in a Liberal Society	75		
	3.5		lefense as Morally Justifiable Law	83		
	3.6	Concl	•	87		
				89		
4	Self-defense and Battered Women					
	4.1		lefense Doctrine	90		
	4.2	The B	attered Woman Syndrome and Self-defense	92		
		4.2.1	The Battered Woman Syndrome	92		
		4.2.2	The Putative Relevance of the Battered Woman			
			Syndrome to Self-defense	93 94		
	4.3	Battered Woman Syndrome Research				
	4.4	The Battered Woman Syndrome and Conventional		98		
		Self-defense Law				
		4.4.1		98		
		4.4.2	,			
			Justificatory Foundation	99		
		4.4.3	Learned Helplessness as Disordered Thought and			
			Special Capacity	102		
		4.4.4	Necessary Force: Battered Woman Syndrome or the			
			Pattern of Battering	104		
		4.4.5	Reasonable Belief in the Necessity of Deadly Force	106		
		4.4.6	Retreat as a Legal Alternative to Defensive Force	108		
		4.4.7	Institutional Legal Alternatives	109		
		4.4.8	The Pattern of Battering as Support for			
			Reasonable Belief	111		
		4.4.9	Credibility and the Failure to Leave Previously	111		
	4.5	Self-d	lefense by Battered Women as Justification and Excuse	114		
		4.5.1	Reasonable Belief	114		



	Contents					
		4.5.2 4.5.3 4.5.4	Culpability and Battered Women as Justified	116 120		
	4.6	Concl	or Excused usion	126 134		
5	Duress and Systemically Complete Mitigation			136		
	5.1					
	5.2					
	5.3	Two F	Potential Criticisms	146		
	5.4 Conclusion			151		
6	The Limits of Justification: Necessity and Nullification					
	6.1		es of Conscience	154		
	6.2	Jury N	Nullification	156		
		6.2.1	The Central Explicit Debate	156		
		6.2.2	\mathcal{E}	157		
		6.2.3	±	163		
	6.3		ssity and Nullification in a Liberal Society	167		
		6.3.1	1			
			Justice System	167		
		6.3.2	-	168		
			Necessity	170		
		6.3.4	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
			to Justice	177		
		6.3.5	Nullification beyond Necessity: Intrasystemic Appeals to Mercy	180		
		6.3.6	Nullification beyond Necessity: Extrasystemic	100		
		0.5.0	Nullification	183		
		6.3.7	Summary	185		
	6.4	The R	Responsibilities of Persons in a Liberal Society	187		
		6.4.1		187		
		6.4.2	Judicial Nullification	193		
		6.4.3	Conflicting Obligations: Tension Rather than			
			Contradiction	197		
	6.5	6.5 Conclusion				
7	Con	Conclusions				
In	Index					



Preface

The contemporary debate regarding justification defenses in the criminal law tends to emphasize the logical relationships among offense elements, justification defenses, and excuses in the context of the traditional justifications for criminal punishment. These are important concerns, and this book joins that debate. This book seeks a broader foundation, however, in the principles of political morality represented by the criminal law. The theory advanced here demonstrates the importance of the expressive function of criminal conviction and punishment in a system of criminal law that serves as an official representation of liberal principles of political morality. It also contends that appreciation of the abstract foundations and functions of the criminal law can inform the search for the most defensible resolution of difficult contemporary applications, such as those involving claims of justification by defendants who kill their batterers or engage in crimes of conscience.

As with any extended intellectual project, this book builds upon the contributions of many individuals. I am particularly grateful to Barbara Sturgis and Megan Sullivan, who served as my coauthors in writing one of the articles in which we initially presented some of the arguments developed in this book. Many of my colleagues at the University of Nebraska participated in an extended (some of them might say interminable) series of discussions and faculty colloquia regarding many of the issues and arguments presented here. Robert Audi, Marty Gardner, Steve Kalish, Jo Potuto, and John Snowden read and commented upon various manuscripts that contributed to the analysis in this book. I am also grateful to the faculty of the University of Utah College of Law for providing resources, stimulation, and hospitality during a sabbatical semester in which I worked on this project. In light of the dedication, I should also mention Ed, who listened to parts of this in a truck, Ralph, who listened to it in New Jersey, and Josiah S. Carberry. I have searched my memory for some contribution for which I would be able to thank Professor Carberry. Alas, I can think of none.



x Preface

Many of the arguments developed in this book were initially presented in prior articles. I am grateful for permission to draw on these in developing the analysis defended here. These include: Justification Defenses and Just Convictions, 24 Pacific Law Journal 1233 (1993) (copyright held by the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law); Self-defense, in In Harm's Way 255 (Jules L. Coleman and Allen Buchanan, eds.; Cambridge University Press, 1994); Battered Woman Syndrome, Expert Testimony, and the Distinction between Justification and Excuse, 1994 University of Illinois Law Review 45 (coauthored with Barbara J. Sturgis and Megan Sullivan; the copyright to the University of Illinois); and Verdicts of Conscience: Nullification and Necessity as Jury Responses to Crimes of Conscience, 69 Southern California Law Review 2039 (1996) (copyright held by the University of Southern California).



Frequently Cited Sources

This book employs abbreviated citation forms for the following frequently cited sources. The abbreviated form follows the full citation below in square brackets.

American Law Institute, *Model Penal Code* (Official Draft and Revised Comments 1985) [MPC].

Joshua Dressler, *Understanding Criminal Law* (New York: Mathew Bender, 2d ed. 1995) [Understanding].

George P. Fletcher, *Rethinking Criminal Law* (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1978) [Rethinking].

Wayne R. LaFave and Austin W. Scott Jr., *Criminal Law* (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 2d ed. 1986) [Criminal Law].

Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford: Oxford University Press, compact ed. 1971 with 1987 supplement) [Oxford English Dictionary].

Paul H. Robinson, *Criminal Law Defenses* (St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1984) [Defenses].



For the teachers, students, and friends with whom we seek to understand, especially JOEL FEINBERG