

CASES AND MATERIALS ON
CRIMINAL LAW

Third Edition

Joshua Dressler

American Casebook Series®

THOMSON



WEST

CASES AND MATERIALS ON
**CRIMINAL
LAW**

Third Edition

By

Joshua Dressler

*Frank R. Strong Chair in Law
Michael E. Moritz College of Law
The Ohio State University*

AMERICAN CASEBOOK SERIES®

THOMSON
—★—™
WEST

West, a Thomson business, has created this publication to provide you with accurate and authoritative information concerning the subject matter covered. However, this publication was not necessarily prepared by persons licensed to practice law in a particular jurisdiction. West is not engaged in rendering legal or other professional advice, and this publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. If you require legal or other expert advice, you should seek the services of a competent attorney or other professional.

American Casebook Series and West Group are trademarks registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

COPYRIGHT © 1999 By WEST GROUP

© 2003 By West, a Thomson business
610 Opperman Drive
P.O. Box 64526
St. Paul, MN 55164-0526
1-800-328-9352

ISBN 0-314-14560-5



TEXT IS PRINTED ON 10% POST
CONSUMER RECYCLED PAPER



*But the student should not imagine,
that enough is done, if he has so far mastered
the general doctrines of the common law,
that he may enter with some confidence into practice.
There are other studies, which demand his attention.
He should addict himself to the study of philosophy,
of rhetoric, of history, and of human nature.
It is from the want of this enlarged view of duty,
that the profession has sometimes been reproached . . .
with a deficiency in liberal and enlightened policy.*

Joseph Story, "The Value and Importance of Legal Studies,"
in *Miscellaneous Writings of Joseph Story* 527
(William W. Story ed. 1852)

*

Preface to the Third Edition

The response to the first two editions of this casebook has been gratifying. In preparing the third edition, therefore, I have followed the wise but grammatically poor adage, “if it ain’t (too) broke, don’t fix it (too much).” Previous adopters of the casebook will find no significant changes in its structure and no changes in the general philosophy animating it (as set out in the preface to the first edition, published below). The casebook, I trust, will remain familiar and comfortable.

A very few changes from the second edition were made. First, I moved the materials on euthanasia and suicide assistance from Chapter 11 to Chapter 10 (section on proposed new defenses). Second, I updated the casebook by adding a few new cases and more Note materials where I felt that changes or additions would significantly improve the casebook. Third, I reduced the coverage of a few areas (e.g., involuntary intoxication), based on polling of prior adopters’ wishes, to ensure that the casebook does not increase in length. (For greater specificity of the changes, I urge professors to see the Teacher’s Manual. All significant changes are set out at the start of each chapter of the Manual.) I trust that previous users of the casebook will find the new edition at least as successful as previous ones. Of course, I hope other professors will consider adopting the casebook.

Outside reading materials. My recommendations from the first edition remain valid today. Two of the texts mentioned there are now in newer editions: my own treatise, *Understanding Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2001); and Wayne LaFare, *Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2000) (formerly, LaFare and Scott).

Personal acknowledgements. I had a lot of help on the third edition. Many users of the casebook provided advice and suggestions. Many suggestions found their way into the new edition, and even where they did not, I benefitted from the comments. Among those who helped are: Dwight Aaron, Phil Bates, Stephanos Bibas, Charles Bobis, Gerald Caplan, Stacy Caplow, Catherine Carpenter, Tony Dillof, Beth Farmer, Katherine Federle, Jeffrey Finer, William Fortune, Rick Garnett, Stephen Garvey, Laura Gomez, Abner Greene, Lenese Herbert, Michael Heyman, Ellen Kreitzberg, Susan Kuo, Susan Mandiberg, Alan Michaels, David Miller, David Moran, Daniel Moriarty, Stephen Morse, Fred Moss, Janice Nadler, Camille Nelson, Molly O’Brien, Ellen Podgor, Sadiq Raza, Katherine Ridolfi, Michael Simons, Rick Singer, James Smith, George Thomas, and Rachel Van Cleve. Various Moritz College of Law (Ohio State University) students also contributed substantively to the casebook, especially Sean Scheiderer and Sarah Stanton. Due to poor record-keeping, I am

sure I have omitted other deserving persons. My thanks and apologies to them, too.

Two students helped me prepare the third edition of the casebook: Melissa Zujkowski (my casebook Executive Assistant) and Todd Nist (Research Assistant), both of whom will be Moritz 2004 graduates. I thank them for their special assistance.

As before, my inspiration comes from my wife, Dottie.

JOSHUA DRESSLER

Summer, 2003

Preface to the First Edition

This casebook was prepared for use in a basic course on criminal law. Although it is designed for a three- or four-unit semester-long class, the casebook will also work well in a shorter course, with deletions, some lecturing, and/or use of outside readings.

As its “author” I bring to this casebook my own experiences and philosophies, but ultimately the book is intended for *your* use, and not simply to please me. Therefore, the cases and readings were selected, the Notes and Questions formulated, and the casebook organized, so that it can comfortably be used by teachers who do not share all, or even most, of my pedagogical goals.

My goals in teaching criminal law. I have taught Criminal Law for nearly twenty years, in five different law schools, to students with widely varied academic backgrounds and capacities, life experiences, and levels of interest in the subject. But, I have always been guided in my teaching by certain general principles:

—Doctrine matters. I use the term “doctrine” here broadly to mean that students ought to leave a course in Criminal Law with a substantial body of knowledge. In the context of this casebook, this means that students will become familiar with the general and the specific: primary attention is directed to the “general part” of the criminal law, i.e., the common law principles of criminal responsibility that serve even today as the core of Anglo-American criminal law; but, as the general cannot be understood except in the context of the specific, some of the most important crimes against persons and property are covered in detail, both in their common law and modern statutory forms.

—In understanding doctrine, penal theory matters. A course in Criminal Law offers students an opportunity to consider jurisprudential concerns more forthrightly than in other first-year courses. Therefore, I want students to put the criminal law in its philosophical context, in particular, to test the rules of criminal responsibility by the standards of retributivism and utilitarianism, in order to see if the criminal law is fair, rational, or even intellectually consistent. I teach my class, and this casebook is written, with the view that these principles of punishment can inform our understanding of the law and guide us in our efforts to reform it.

—In understanding doctrine, other things matter, too. Since the criminal law seeks to affect and to render judgments about human behavior, it seems prudent to take some note of the findings of the behavioral sciences, e.g., psychology, anthropology, and sociology. Students should also see that social, economic, and political forces inevitably shape the

law. Often these forces are noncontroversial, but not always. Therefore, the materials in the casebook invite discussion regarding social attitudes about such matters as race, gender, and sexual orientation, where they may have had a substantial impact on the development or application of the criminal law (e.g., rape law, self-defense, provocation, the death penalty).

—Statutes matter. Students start law school bewildered by the case method of study, yet they so quickly grow accustomed to it that many of them lose interest in statutes, even when good lawyering requires their attention. Consequently, I have selected materials that help students understand the rules of statutory construction and appreciate the lawyering skills relating to statutory interpretation. Also, the casebook emphasizes the Model Penal Code, in part so that students have ample opportunity to work with an integrated criminal code.

—Professional ethics matter. Even before they take courses on criminal procedure and professional responsibility, students should be sensitized to some of the ethical issues confronting criminal defense lawyers and prosecutors. I have selected various cases in part because they lend themselves to discussion of professional ethics, to the extent that the teacher wishes to follow this route.

—Controversy in the classroom is good if discussion of it is thoughtful, wide-open, and relevant. I want students to be angry—or pleased—with where the law may be going, because this means that they understand that the criminal law matters deeply in everyone's lives. Consequently, I want students to be aware of the "cutting edge" controversies in the criminal law. In support of this, the casebook is attentive to the Model Penal Code, since virtually all recently drafted penal codes are based, at least in part, on it, and because it provides a thoughtful alternative to the common law. The casebook also brings to the forefront—it does not shy away from—many present-day controversies, such as the death penalty, subjectivization of the objective "reasonable man" standard, "battered woman/child self-defense," suicide assistance and euthanasia, and acquaintance rape.

As I stated earlier, although this casebook is shaped by the preceding principles, it was prepared for use by teachers whose pedagogical goals may differ from mine. I do expect, however, that there will be at least one common link among adopters of this book: A belief that Criminal Law is an exciting subject to teach, in large part because it allows students to confront some of the Big Questions—questions about human nature, personal and social responsibility, and "right and wrong"—which philosophers, theologians, scientists, and poets, as well as lawyers, have grappled with for centuries.

Editing policies. I prefer students to read judicial opinions in largely intact form. Nonetheless, deletions are necessary. Because this book is intended for pedagogical use, rather than for serious scholarly pursuits, I have not followed all scholarly conventions in identifying omissions from

the extracted materials. Therefore, users of the book should not quote directly from the extracts in legal or scholarly documents, but should instead go to the primary sources. Specifically, I have applied the following rules of thumb to extracted materials:

1. Footnotes and citations have been omitted, unless there was a sound pedagogical reason for their retention. Neither ellipses nor other signals have been used to indicate their omission. Asterisks or brackets have been used, however, to indicate deletions of other textual material.

2. Numbered footnotes are from the original materials and retain their original numbering. My own footnotes are designated by letters.

Outside reading materials. Students who wish to go beyond the case-book for additional study will find excellent references in various forms. Among “hornbooks,” I recommend the following, in alphabetical order:

Joshua Dressler, *Understanding Criminal Law* (Matthew Bender & Co. 1987). This book, addressed to law students, focuses on the issues most commonly covered in criminal law case-books. Obviously, it is especially suited for use with this case-book. A second edition will be published in the near future.

Wayne LaFare and Austin Scott, Jr., *Criminal Law* (West Publishing Co. 2d ed. 1986). The student edition is an abridgement of the authors’ two-volume lawyers’ treatise. Widely cited by courts and lucidly written, it emphasizes modern law and the Model Penal Code.

Rollin M. Perkins and Ronald N. Boyce, *Criminal Law* (Foundation Press 3d ed. 1982). The late Professor Perkins, one of the foremost scholars of the common law of crimes, originated this treatise. It remains strong in setting out the common law definitions of crimes. There is no special student edition.

Glanville Williams, *Criminal Law : The General Part* (Stevens & Sons 2d ed. 1961). Written by one of England’s paramount scholars, this is the classic English treatise on the general principles of the criminal law.

By far the best reference source regarding the Model Penal Code is:

American Law Institute, *Model Penal Code and Commentaries* (1980 and 1985). This six-volume reference contains all of the sections of the Model Penal Code and their supporting Commentaries. The Commentaries are exceedingly helpful in explaining pre-Code law and the method and rationale of Code provisions.

Among the best books dealing with the underlying theories of the criminal law are:

George P. Fletcher, *Rethinking Criminal Law* (Little Brown & Co. 1978). Building heavily on common law traditions and the

views of Continental, especially German, legal theorists, the author has written “neither a hornbook nor a treatise, but a reformist, critical work.” (Preface, xxiii.) This book has deservedly received substantial scholarly attention since its publication.

Jerome Hall, *General Principles of Criminal Law* (Bobbs Merrill 2d ed. 1960). Now a classic in the field, the author states as his goal, “to elucidate the basic ideas of criminal law in light of current knowledge and to organize the law in terms of definite theory.” (Preface, v.) The book centers on the general part of the criminal law.

H.L.A. Hart, *Punishment and Responsibility* (Oxford University Press 1968). This book contains previously published essays by the author, then Professor of Jurisprudence at Oxford University, regarding theories of punishment and legal standards of responsibility. These writings have greatly influenced thinking on the subjects.

Leo Katz, *Bad Acts and Guilty Minds: Conundrums of the Criminal Law* (University of Chicago Press 1987). Katz draws on insights from philosophy, psychology, and anthropology, as well as on well-known fictional incidents, to reflect on the basic concepts of the criminal law. Written for a general audience, the book provides considerable “food for thought.”

*Personal acknowledgements.*¹ Many people assisted me in producing this book. Various colleagues offered useful advice and specific suggestions (many of which found their way into the book), including: Peter Arenella (UCLA); Pamela Bucy (Alabama); Linda Carter (McGeorge); Deborah Denno (Fordham); Catherine Hancock (Tulane); Yale Kamisar (Michigan); Leo Katz (Pennsylvania); Larry Levine (McGeorge); Fred Lawrence (Boston University); Steve Morse (Pennsylvania); Michael Perlin (New York); Michael Vitiello (McGeorge); and David Yellen (Hofstra). Especially generous with their time were two of my colleagues from Wayne State University: Lee Lamborn, who gave me many leads on materials to include in the text; and Jessica Litman, who was amazingly patient as I hounded her with copyright law questions.

My student research assistants helped me search for cases, commented on early drafts of the manuscript, and did critical cite checking. From Wayne State, I thank Joseph Hart, Sarah Resnick, Ted Tow and Mark Zousmer; from McGeorge, my thanks go to Sidonie Christian, Debra Larson, and Barry deWalt.

Thanks also go to June Frierson (Wayne State), on whom I called often for assistance in typing and reproduction of the manuscript. She did this work for me promptly, well, and with good humor.

1. Copyright acknowledgements are separately listed.

I must also mention a few people who have helped me in very special ways. John Dolan and Lee Lamborn (Wayne State) are, quite simply, *mensches*. No matter how busy they were, their office doors were open to me when my work on the casebook—or life in general—temporarily got me down. They were and are true friends.

Nobody has provided me with greater support and love over the years than my partner in life, Dottie Kridler Dressler. I am not exaggerating when I say that this casebook would not have been born without her presence by my side.

Finally, I want to acknowledge two other persons who have influenced me. The first is David Dressler, who during his too-short life was Chief of Parole for New York State, a professor of both sociology and criminology, a scholar and talented writer (many of us are the former, but few are the latter), and, most importantly, my father. He never said, “Be as I am” or “Look at me,” but nobody has been a more powerful role model in my life than he.

The other person whose influence cannot be understated is Sandy Kadish, one of this country’s most thoughtful criminal law scholars and legal educators. Nobody can look at this casebook without realizing his influence on it. And, how could it be otherwise? I studied criminal law from his casebook (Paulsen and Kadish; and then Kadish and Paulsen) and, for fifteen years, I taught the subject from his book (now, Kadish and Schulhofer). With the publication of my own casebook comes my professional bar mitzvah, but I can think of no higher accolade than if someone were to say of this book, “Why, it is a son-of-Kadish (and Schulhofer).”

JOSHUA DRESSLER

April, 1994

*

Copyright Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the copyright holders for permission to reproduce portions of the following materials:

Susan Ager, "The Incident," *Detroit Free Press Magazine*, March 22, 1992, p. 17. Copyright © 1992, Susan Ager. Reprinted by permission of the author.

American Law Institute, Model Penal Code and Commentaries, copyright © 1962, 1980, and 1985 by The American Law Institute. Reprinted with permission.

Peter Arenella, *The Diminished Capacity and Diminished Responsibility Defenses: Two Children of a Doomed Marriage*, 77 Columbia Law Review 827 (1977). Copyright © 1977 by the Directors of the Columbia Law Review Association, Inc. All Rights Reserved. This article originally appeared at 77 Colum. L. Rev. 827 (1977). Reprinted by permission.

Jody D. Armour, *Race Ipsa Loquitur: Of Reasonable Racists, Intelligent Bayesians, and Involuntary Negrophobes*, 46 Stanford Law Review 781 (1994). Copyright © 1994 by the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. Reprinted by permission.

Andrew Ashworth, *Criminal Attempts and the Role of Resulting Harm Under the Code, and in the Common Law*, 19 Rutgers Law Journal 725 (1988). Copyright © 1988, Rutgers School of Law, Camden. Reprinted by permission of *Rutgers Law Journal* and the author.

Susan Bandes, *Empathy, Narrative, and Victim Impact Statements*, 63 University of Chicago Law Review 361 (1996). Copyright © 1996. The University of Chicago; Susan Bandes. Reprinted by permission.

Steve M. Bauer & Peter J. Eckerstrom, *The State Made Me Do It: The Applicability of the Necessity Defense to Civil Disobedience*, 39 Stanford Law Review 1173 (1987). Copyright © 1987 by the Board of Trustees of the Leland Stanford Junior University. Reprinted by permission of *Stanford Law Review* and Fred B. Rothman & Co.

Vivian Berger, *Not So Simple Rape*, Criminal Justice Ethics, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Winter/Spring 1988) pp. 75-77. Copyright © 1988, Criminal Justice Ethics. Reprinted by permission of the Institute for Criminal Justice Ethics and the author.

Rosemary L. Bray, *It's Ten O'Clock and I Worry About Where My Husband Is*, *Glamour*, April, 1990, at 302. Copyright © 1990 by Rosemary L. Bray. Reprinted by generous permission of the author.

- David P. Bruden & Sonja Lengnick, *Rape in the Criminal Justice System*, 87 *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 1194 (1997). Copyright © 1997, Northwestern University, School of Law. Reprinted by special permission of Northwestern University School of Law, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 87, issue 4, 1997.
- Pamela H. Bucy, *Corporate Ethos: A Standard for Imposing Corporate Criminal Liability*, 75 *Minnesota Law Review* 1095 (1991). Copyright © 1991, Minnesota Law Review Foundation. Reprinted by permission.
- D. Graham Burnett, *A Trial by Jury*. Copyright © 2001 by D. Graham Burnett. Used by permission of Alfred A. Knopf, a division of Random House, Inc.
- Peter Buscemi, Note, *Conspiracy: Statutory Reform Since the Model Penal Code*, 75 *Columbia Law Review* 1122 (1975). Copyright © 1975 by the Directors of the Columbia Law Review Association, Inc. All Rights Reserved. This article originally appeared at 75 *Colum. L. Rev.* 1122 (1975). Reprinted by permission.
- Paul D. Butler, *Race-Based Jury Nullification: Case-in-Chief*, 30 *John Marshall Law Review* 911 (1997). Copyright © 1997, John Marshall Law Review. Reprinted by permission.
- Stephen L. Carter, *When Victims Happen to be Black*, 97 *Yale Law Journal* 420 (1988). Copyright © 1988, Stephen L. Carter. Reprinted by permission.
- John C. Coffee, Jr., "No Soul to Damn: No Body to Kick": *An Unscandalized Inquiry Into the Problem of Corporate Punishment*, 79 *Michigan Law Review* 386 (1981). Copyright © 1981, John C. Coffee, Jr. Reprinted by permission.
- Richard Cohen, "Closing the Door on Crime," *Washington Post Magazine*, September 7, 1986, at W13. Copyright © 1986, Washington Post Writers Group. Reprinted with permission.
- Doriane Lambelet Coleman, *Individualizing Justice Through Multiculturalism: The Liberals' Dilemma*, 96 *Columbia Law Review* 1093 (1996). Copyright © 1996, Directors of the Columbia Law Review Association, Inc. All Rights Reserved. This article originally appeared at 96 *Colum.L.Rev.* 1093 (1996). Reprinted by permission.
- Anne M. Coughlin, *Sex and Guilt*, 84 *Virginia Law Review* 1 (1998). Copyright © 1998, Virginia Law Review Association. Reprinted with permission of the Virginia Law Review Association, William S. Hein, Co., successor to Fred B. Rothman & Co., and the author.
- David Crump & Susan Waite Crump, *In Defense of the Felony Murder Doctrine*, 8 *Harvard Journal of Law & Public Policy* 359 (1985). Copyright © 1985 by the Harvard Society for Law & Public Policy Inc. Reprinted with permission of the *Harvard Journal of Law and Public Policy*.

The Cultural Defense in the Criminal Law, 99 Harvard Law Review 1293 (1986). Copyright © 1986 by the Harvard Law Review Association. Reprinted by permission.

Richard Delgado, "*Rotten Social Background*": *Should the Criminal Law Recognize a Defense of Severe Environmental Deprivation?*, 3 Law & Inequality 9 (1985). Copyright © 1985, Law & Inequality: A Journal of Theory and Practice. Reprinted by permission.

Delilah, Words and Music by Les Reed and Barry Mason, Copyright © 1968 (Renewed 1996), DONNA MUSIC LTD., All Rights Controlled and Administered by GLENWOOD MUSIC CORP, All Rights Reserved, International Copyright Secured, Used by Permission.

Developments in the Law, *Criminal Conspiracy*, 72 Harvard Law Review 920 (1959). Copyright © 1959 by the Harvard Law Review Association. Reprinted by permission.

David Dolinko, Comment, *Intolerable Conditions as a Defense to Prison Escapes*, 26 UCLA Law Review 1126 (1979). Copyright © 1979, The Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission.

Joshua Dressler, *Why Keep the Provocation Defense?: Some Reflections on a Difficult Subject*, 86 Minnesota Law Review 959 (2002). Copyright © 2002 by Joshua Dressler and the Minnesota Law Review Foundation. Reprinted with permission.

Joshua Dressler, *Battered Women Who Kill Their Sleeping Tormenters: Reflections on Maintaining Respect for Human Life while Killing Moral Monsters* in *Criminal Law Theory: Doctrines of the General Part* 259 (S. Shute & A.P. Simester 2002). Copyright © 2002, S. Shute and A.P. Simester and Oxford University Press. Reprinted with permission.

Joshua Dressler, *Understanding Criminal Law* (3d ed. 2001). Reprinted with permission from *Understanding Criminal Law*, Third Edition, by Joshua Dressler, pps. 206-209, 407-408. Copyright © 2001 by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., one of the LEXIS Publishing companies. All Rights Reserved.

Joshua Dressler, *Some Brief Thoughts (Mostly Negative) About "Bad Samaritan" Laws*, 40 Santa Clara Law Review 971 (2000). Copyright © 2000, Santa Clara Law Review. Reprinted with permission.

Joshua Dressler, *Where We Have Been, and Where We Might Be Going: Some Cautionary Reflections on Rape Law Reform*, 46 Cleveland St. L. Rev. 409 (1998). Copyright © 1998, Cleveland State Law Review. Reprinted with permission.

Joshua Dressler, *When "Heterosexual" Men Kill "Homosexual" Men: Reflections on Provocation Law, Sexual Advances, and the "Reasonable Man" Standard*, 85 *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 726 (1995). Copyright © 1995, Northwestern University, School of Law. Reprinted by permission.

Joshua Dressler, *Exegesis of the Law of Duress: Justifying the Excuse and Searching for its Proper Limits*, 62 *Southern California Law Review* 1331-1386 (1989). Copyright © 1989, University of Southern California. Reprinted with the permission of the *Southern California Law Review*.

Joshua Dressler, *Justifications and Excuses: A Brief Review of the Concepts and the Literature*, 33 *Wayne Law Review* 1155 (1987). Copyright © 1987, Wayne State University. Reprinted by permission.

Joshua Dressler, *Reassessing the Theoretical Underpinnings of Accomplice Liability: New Solutions to an Old Problem*, 37 *Hastings Law Journal* 91 (1985). Copyright © 1985 Hastings College of the Law, reprinted from 37 *Hastings L.J.* 91 by permission.

Joshua Dressler, *Reaffirming the Moral Legitimacy of the Doctrine of Diminished Capacity: A Brief Reply to Professor Morse*, 75 *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 953 (1984). Copyright © 1984, Joshua Dressler.

Joshua Dressler, *Rethinking Heat of Passion: A Defense In Search of a Rationale*, 73 *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology* 421 (1982). Copyright © 1982, Northwestern University, School of Law. Reprinted by special permission of Northwestern University School of Law, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Volume 73, pp. 421 (1982).

Arnold N. Enker, *Impossibility in Criminal Attempts—Legality and the Legal Process*, 53 *Minnesota Law Review* 665 (1969). Copyright © 1969, Minnesota Law Review Foundation. Reprinted by permission.

Albin Eser, *The Principle of "Harm" in the Concept of Crime: A Comparative Analysis of the Criminally Protected Legal Interests*, 4 *Duquesne Law Review* 345 (1965). Copyright © 1965, Duquesne University. Reprinted by permission.

Susan Estrich, *Defending Women*, 88 *Michigan Law Review* 1430 (1990). Copyright © 1990 by The Michigan Law Review Association. Reprinted by permission of *Michigan Law Review* and the author.

Susan Estrich, *Rape*, 95 *Yale Law Journal* 1087 (1986). Copyright © 1986, by Susan Estrich. Reprinted by permission of the author.

George P. Fletcher, *Should Intolerable Prison Conditions Generate a Justification or an Excuse for Escape?*, originally published in 26 *UCLA L. Rev.* 1355 (1979). Copyright © 1979, The Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission.

- George P. Fletcher, *The Individualization of Excusing Conditions*, 47 Southern California Law Review 1269 (1974). Copyright © 1974, by George P. Fletcher. Reprinted by permission.
- George P. Fletcher, *The Theory of Criminal Negligence: A Comparative Analysis*, 119 University of Pennsylvania Law Review 401 (1971). Copyright © 1971, University of Pennsylvania. Reprinted with permission.
- Abraham S. Goldstein, *Conspiracy to Defraud the United States*, 68 Yale Law Journal 405 (1959). Copyright © 1959, Yale Law Journal Company, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the Yale Law Journal Company, Fred B. Rothman & Company, and the author, from *The Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 68, pp. 405-463.
- Deborah Gartzke Goolsby, Comment, *Using Mediation in Cases of Simple Rape*, 47 Washington and Lee Law Review 1183 (1990). Copyright © 1990, The School of Law, Washington and Lee University. Reprinted with the permission of *Washington and Lee Law Review*.
- Kent Greenawalt, *Punishment*. From *ENCYCLOPEDIA OF CRIME AND JUSTICE*, 2ND EDITION, by Kent Greenawalt, Vol. 3, Macmillan Reference USA., copyright © 2001 Macmillan Reference USA. Reprinted by permission of The Gale Group.
- Aya Gruber, *Pink Elephants in the Rape Trial: The Problem of Tort-Type Defenses in the Criminal Law of Rape*, 4 William and Mary Journal of Women and the Law 203 (1997). Copyright © 1997, William and Mary Journal of Women and the Law. Reprinted by permission.
- Jerome Hall, *Negligent Behavior Should Be Excluded From Penal Liability*, 63 Columbia Law Review 632 (1963). Copyright © 1963 by Directors of the Columbia Law Review Association, Inc. All rights reserved. This article originally appeared at 63 Colum. L. Rev. 632 (1963). Reprinted by permission.
- Henry M. Hart, Jr., *The Aims of the Criminal Law*, 23 Law & Contemporary Problems 401 (1958). Copyright © 1958, Duke University School of Law. Reprinted by permission.
- John Hasnas, *Once More unto the Breach: The Inherent Liberalism of the Criminal Law and Liability for Attempting the Impossible*, 54 Hastings Law Journal 1 (2002). Copyright © 2002, Hastings College of the Law. Reprinted with permission.
- Graham Hughes, *One Further Footnote on Attempting the Impossible*, 42 New York University Law Review 1005 (1967). Copyright © 1967, New York University. Reprinted by permission.
- Graham Hughes, *Criminal Omissions*, 67 Yale Law Journal 590 (1958). Copyright © 1958, Yale Law Journal Company, Inc. Reprinted by permission of the author and of The Yale Law Journal Company and Fred B. Rothman & Co., from *The Yale Law Journal*, Vol. 67, pp. 590-637.

- John C. Jeffries, Jr., *Legality, Vagueness, and the Construction of Penal Statutes*, 71 Virginia Law Review 189 (1985). Copyright © 1985, Virginia Law Review Association. Reprinted with permission of the Virginia Law Review Association and Fred B. Rothman & Co.
- Phillip E. Johnson, *The Unnecessary Crime of Conspiracy*, 61 California Law Review 1137 (1973). Copyright © 1973 by California Law Review, Inc. Reprinted by permission of University of California Press Journals and the author.
- Sanford H. Kadish, *The Criminal Law and the Luck of the Draw*, 84 Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 679 (1994). Copyright © 1994, Northwestern University, School of Law. Reprinted by special permission of Northwestern University School of Law, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, vol. 84, issue 4, 1994.
- Sanford H. Kadish, *Excusing Crime*, 75 California Law Review 257 (1987). Copyright © 1987 by California Law Review, Inc. Reprinted from *California Law Review*, Vol. 75, No. 1 (January 1987), pp. 263-65, by permission of the University of California Press Journals and the author.
- Sanford H. Kadish, *Complicity, Cause and Blame: A Study in the Interpretation of Doctrine*, 73 California Law Review 323 (1985). Copyright © 1985 by California Law Review, Inc. Reprinted from California Law Review, Vol. 73, No. 2, Mar. 1985, pp. 323-410, by permission of University of California Press Journals and the author.
- Dan M. Kahan, *Ignorance of the Law Is an Excuse—But Only for the Virtuous*, 96 Michigan Law Review 127 (1997). Reprinted from Michigan Law Review, October 1997, Vol. 96, no. 1. Copyright © 1997 by The Michigan Law Review Association. Reprinted by permission.
- Yale Kamisar, *Physician-Assisted Suicide: The Problems Presented by the Compelling, Heartwrenching Case*, 88 Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology 1121 (1998). Copyright © 1998, Yale Kamisar. Reprinted by permission.
- Yale Kamisar, *Some Non-Religious Views Against Proposed “Mercy-Killing” Legislation*, 42 Minnesota Law Review 969 (1958). Copyright © 1958, Minnesota Law Review Foundation. Reprinted by permission.
- John Kaplan, *The Problem of Capital Punishment*, 1983 University of Illinois Law Review 555. Copyright © 1983, by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois. Reprinted by permission.
- Deborah Kochan, *Beyond the Battered Woman Syndrome: An Argument for the Development of New Standards and the Incorporation of a Feminine Approach to Ethics*, 1 Hastings Women’s Law Journal 89 (1989). Copyright © 1989 by Deborah Kochan. Reprinted by permission of the author.