

SENTENCING

Policy:

Marc Mauer

Sentencing Project

514 10th St NW Ste 1000

Washington, District of Columbia 20004-1407

202-628-0871

Email: mauer@sentencingproject.org

Practice:

Nancy L. McGunn

Legal Aid and Defender Association of Detroit

613 Abbott St Fl 5

Detroit, Michigan 48226-1348

313-967-5846

Email: nancy_mcgunn@fd.org

Telling the Client's Story

Bringing Issues Related to Race and Justice to Life at Sentencing

Nancy L. McGunn, September 2017

“Stories are the communal currency of humanity”

Tahir Shah, *In Arabian Nights*

How do we bring these issues to life at sentencing? Our obligation is to tell our client's story in a way that illustrates the devastating impact that race-based discrimination has had on their lives, and how that history necessarily impacts the outcome of their case. Our responsibility is to humanize our client, provide a context for their offense, and a plan for the future.

- I. Challenges to Raising Race Related Issues at Sentencing
 - A. Personal discomfort
 - B. Our audience – how will the judge receive this information?
 - C. Awareness of our own issues – the bias that we bring to the table
 1. Andrea D. Lyon, *Race Bias and the Importance of Consciousness for Criminal Defense Attorneys*, 35 Seattle U.L. Rev. 755 (2012)
 2. L. Song Richardson & Phillip Atiba Goffrace, *Implicit Racial Bias in Public Defender Triage*, 122 Yale Law Journal 2626 (2013).
 - D. We overcome these challenges by educating ourselves and our audience
- II. First Step – Learning the Client's Story – Investigation and Preparation
 - A. Our first meeting sets the tone
 1. Ideally, we have the opportunity for a thorough interview designed to elicit background information unique to our client, including background information specific to race, culture, and ethnicity.
 2. This provides an opportunity to talk to client and family, to generate a “to do” list for records and investigation. We can also begin to map a family tree – use to address family history related to physical health, mental health, substance abuse, physical/sexual/emotional abuse, incarceration.
 - a) *Example - Genopro software*
 - B. Follow-up Investigation – anticipating issues and developing the facts
 1. It is critical to gather records to support our theory. We may need school, medical, mental health, adoption, child protective services, juvenile records, police reports, and documents from prior cases, including prior presentence reports.

- C. Remaining Cognizant of issues related to race throughout the case
 - 1. For our incarcerated clients, remaining mindful of the conditions of confinement and the impact.
 - 2. For our clients on bond, remaining mindful of restrictions of release – access to family, impact on employment, etc.
 - 3. For all clients, remaining mindful of microaggressions in the courthouse – shackling, defense counsel interactions with prosecutor, walking with/sitting with client and family, assumptions, race of key players in the system.
 - 4. For ourselves, remaining mindful of the need to guard against becoming numb, overwhelmed, desensitized.
 - 5. A theme may start to emerge regarding impact of issues related to race in client’s life. The investment of time now will save hours when it comes to preparation for sentencing.
- D. By the time we begin sentencing preparations, we are well-versed in our client’s life story, have a clear picture of issues related to the instant case, have a solid plan for sentencing and the documentation we need.

III. Second Step – Telling the Client’s Story

- A. Presentence Interview and Report
 - 1. May be the first real opportunity to tell the client’s story to the sentencing judge.
 - 2. Our stories and theories may be met with skepticism, but that same information is accepted when set forth in a presentence report.
 - 3. We know our client’s story heading into the interview, and we have to develop and present the information that we need to be included in the report to support that story.
 - a) *Preparing paperwork ahead of time – clients may be terrible historians due to stress, anxiety, trauma, etc.*
 - b) *Supplying our own records and documents*
 - c) *Securing family and friends to confirm the information we present*
 - 4. We cannot ignore the “bad” information – we must turn it into mitigation, not aggravation.
 - a) *Example – Client has a number of prior arrests. Provide a context – same officer? Same neighborhood?*

5. Circumstances of prior police contacts/convictions
 - a) *Dissect police reports*
 - (1) Example – Client charged with home invasion
 - b) *Provide competing narrative through witnesses*
 - (1) Example - Domestic violence arrest involving current partner

B. Sentencing

1. Start with a plan, know the message you want to convey, the story you want to tell. Weave everything into that story. Focus on educating and informing the court, while drawing judge in with client’s specific circumstances.
2. Humanize clients in memo through use of photos, videos, audio clips, excerpts of letters inserted directly into the memo. Make this information impossible to ignore.
3. Thorough discussion of client’s social history in a compelling way that draws in the audience, backed up by data from reliable sources.
4. Language matters – for example, calling our client “the defendant” instead of “Mr. Jones.”
5. Client’s story begins well before the offense conduct. Goes back years and generations. It is impacted heavily by environment, geography familial circumstances.
 - a) *Neighborhood/Community*
 - (1) *United States v. Bannister*, 786 F.Supp.2d 617 (EDNY 2011)
 - (2) NPR.org – interactive map on life expectancy (<https://vizhub.healthdata.org/subnational/usa>)
 - (3) Crime reporting for cities – UCR (<https://ucr.fbi.gov/ucr>)
 - (4) Criminal justice data, state by state available at <http://www.sentencingproject.org/the-facts/#map>
 - (5) Pleading Example
 - b) *Education*
 - (1) Economic disparities and gaps in access to education, funding, teacher equity
 - (a) Example – DPS passing client who could not read, mom’s heartbreak, frustration, helplessness.
 - (b) Specific information on per pupil spending across districts throughout the U.S. is available at: <http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/map-how-per-pupil-spending-compares-across-us.html>.

(c) Annie E. Casey Foundation issues a yearly Kids Count Data Book addressing state trends in child well-being, great resource, breaks down key indicators (economic well-being, education, health, etc.) by race/ethnicity.
<http://www.aecf.org/m/resourcedoc/aecf-2017kidscountdatabook.pdf>

c) *School to prison pipeline*

(1) Example - School discipline policy, anecdotes from client and parents

(2) “Black students are suspended and expelled at rate three times greater than white students. On average, 5% of white students are suspended, compared to 16% of black students . . .” U.S. Dep’t of Educ. Office for Civil Rights, *Civil Rights Data Collection, Data Snapshot: School Discipline 1* (Mar. 2014),
<http://ocrdata.ed.gov/downloads/CRDC-School-Discipline-Snapshot.pdf>

(3) View information for individual schools or districts at Ocrdata.ed.gov. Breaks down gender, race/ethnicity, can examine race/ethnicity and a range of disciplinary actions ranging from in school suspensions to referrals to law enforcement.

(4) Sources for additional information:

(a) <http://neatoday.org/2015/01/05/school-prison-pipeline-time-shut/>

(b) <http://www.justicepolicy.org/news/8775>

d) *Impact of incarceration on family*

(1) Example - Genopro

e) *Discriminatory police practices – client subjected to repeated stops?*

(1) Minneapolis Police Department unveiled a tool on August 9, 2017, to allow the public to examine the frequency with which officers stop individuals of particular race, ethnicity, or gender. Data to be refreshed every morning. <https://insideMPD.com/dashboard>.

f) *Prior convictions – why clients who aren’t guilty may plead guilty*

(1) Emily Yoffe, *Innocence is Irrelevant*, The Atlantic, September 2017.

(2) U.S. District Judge Jed S. Rakoff, *Why Innocent People Plead Guilty*,” New York Book Review, November 20, 2014, available at <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2014/11/20/why-innocent-people-plead-guilty/>

g) *Prior convictions/police contacts*

(1) Provide alternate version – passengers in cars during stops, neighbors describing tone in community

(a) Example – Client living in southwest Detroit, neighborhood terrorized by group of officers. Impact on client’s life, but also his view of law enforcement, children’s view of safety

(2) Driving While License Suspended, Revoked

(3) Fugitive Status – “On The Run,” Alice Goffman

(4) “Outstanding warrants are surprisingly common. When a person with a traffic ticket misses a fine payment or court appearance, a court will issue a warrant . . . When a person on probation drinks alcohol or breaks curfew, a court will issue a warrant. . .”

Justice Sotomaor’s dissent in *Utah v. Strieff*, 136 S.Ct. 2056, 2068, discussing use of an outstanding warrant to justify an earlier unconstitutional detention and subsequent search under the attenuation doctrine.

b) *Political Evolution*

(1) War on Drugs

(a) “Human Rights Watch analysis of prison admission data for 2003 revealed that relative to population, blacks are 10.1 times more likely than whites to be sent to prison for drug offenses.”

Fellner, Jamie, “Decades of Disparity: Drug Arrests and Race in the United States, Human Rights Watch (New York, NY: March 2009), p. 16.

(b) “The racially disproportionate nature of the war on drugs is not just devastating to black Americans. It contradicts faith in the principles of justice and equal protection of the laws that should be the bedrock of any constitutional democracy; it exposes and deepens the racial fault lines that continue to weaken the country and belies its promise as a land of equal opportunity; and it undermines faith among all races in the fairness and efficacy of the criminal justice system.”

Summary and Recommendations from “Punishment and Prejudice: Racial Disparities in the War on Drugs.” (Washington DC: Human Rights Watch, June 2000).

(2) Firearm cases

6. Anticipate the Government’s narrative and crush it

a) *We have the tremendous advantage of knowing our client’s background, circumstances of priors, context of offense, struggles.*

(1) Example – Felon in Possession case, Government use of social media postings, including photos and rap lyrics, to establish defendant as angry, prone to violence.

7. Use of Social Science Articles

8. Explore impact of racially discriminatory decisions at all stages

a) *Charging decisions – enhancements*

(1) Example – Mona Lynch, Ph.D., “Selective Enforcement of Drug Laws in Cuyahoga County, Ohio: A Report on the Racial Effects of Geographic Disparities in Arrest Patterns,” available at <http://www.acluohio.org/assets/issues/DrugPolicy/LynchCuyahogaReport.pdf>

(2) Example – Katherine Beckett, Ph.D., “Race and Drug Law Enforcement in Seattle,” Report for the American Civil Liberties Union and The Defender Association (September 2008)

b) *Bond determinations, conditions*

c) *Race and sentencing practices*

(1) United States Sentencing Commission – www.ussc.gov

(2) Bureau of Justice Statistics - www.bjs.gov

(3) Example – Career Offender

(a) “From 1992 through 2014, black defendants comprised 30.9 percent of defendants convicted of the eight most common instant offense types eligible for career offender status, but they were 61.6 percent of such defendants sentenced as career offenders, and they are 65.8 percent of those defendants who likely remain in prison.”

See, Amicus Brief of Federal Public and Community Defenders in *Beckles v. United States*, No. 15-8544, available at <http://www.scotusblog.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/15-8544-petitioner-amicus-FPCD.pdf>

(b) Black defendants are disproportionately affected by Career Offender Guideline in part because of disparate state and local policing practices that include racial profiling and other practices associated with the “war on drugs”, this in turn leads to prior convictions of a nature and frequency that wouldn’t otherwise exist. *Id.* at 19-26.

(4) Access to Alternative Programs

(a) “[S]ystemic differences in plea-bargaining, charging or sentencing practices might be having the practical effect of denying Drug Court and other community-based dispositions to otherwise needy and eligible minority citizens.”

West Huddleston and Douglas B. Marlowe, “Painting the Current Picture: A National Report in Drug Courts and Other Problem Solving Court Programs in the United States.” (Alexandria, VA: National Drug Court Institute, July 2011), NCJ 235776, p. 29.

(b) Eligibility for diversionary programs.

d) *Race and Incarceration*

(1) Statistics – www.bjs.gov

(2) “The spectacular growth in the American penal system over the last three decades was concentrated in a small segment of the population, among young minorities men with very low levels of education. By the early 2000s, prison time was a common life event for this group, and today more than two-thirds of African American male dropouts are expected to serve time in state or federal prison. These demographic contours of mass imprisonment have created a new class of social outsiders whose relationship to the state and society is wholly different from the rest of the population.

Western, Bruce; Pettit, Becky, “*Incarceration & Social Inequality*,” Daedalus (Cambridge, MA: American Academy of Arts & Sciences, Summer 2010), p. 16.

9. Set forth issues client has faced during pendency of case.
 - a) *While incarcerated – lockdowns, access to programming*
 - b) *While on bond – tether limitations, etc.*
 - c) *While in court – example, language barrier*
10. Educate the bench about the real impact of a conviction, imprisonment
 - a) *On the individual – Felony disenfranchisement including loss of federal benefits, right to vote, barriers to employment, jury service,*
 - b) *On the family – parental loss, residential disruption*
 - c) *Collateral consequences – United States v. Nesbeth, 15-00018 (EDNY 2015). Judge Block’s Opinion describing decision to impose a one-year probationary sentence in drug distribution case despite advisory guidelines of 33 to 41 months. Sentence justified in part by the numerous statutory and regulatory collateral consequences defendant would face as a convicted felon.*
11. Allocution
 - a) *Importance of client preparation*
 - (1) Mark W. Bennett, Ira P. Robbins, *Last Words: A Survey and Analysis of Federal Judges’ Views on Allocution in Sentencing*, 65 Alabama Law Review 735 (2014)

ADDRESSING RACIAL DISPARITIES IN INCARCERATION

Marc Mauer

The Sentencing Project

While the nation has recognized the significance of having the first African American man as President, clearly issues of race in society are still very prevalent in America in the 21st century. What is striking about the discussion of race is how frequently national attention to these issues is focused on race and the criminal justice system. Consider some of the key instances in this regard: the 1992 police beating of motorist Rodney King in Los Angeles; the high profile criminal trial of O.J. Simpson; and the arrest and charges of racial profiling of Harvard professor Henry Louis Gates in 2009.

However people may view the justice issues involved in these situations, clearly they represent moments in our national life in which it becomes clear that longstanding differences in how we perceive the criminal justice system are still very present today, and in many ways continue to define the racial divide in the country. For these reasons, as well as ongoing concerns regarding public safety and the impact of incarceration on communities of color, it is critical to examine the contours of imprisonment trends of recent decades and their widespread effects.

This essay will provide an overview of the following:

- Current trends and experience of mass incarceration regarding communities of color
- Policy and practice contributors to racial disparities in the criminal justice system

- Impact of disproportionate rates of incarceration on public safety, offenders, and communities
- Recommendations for reform to reduce unwarranted racial disparities

Overview of Racial Disparity in the Criminal Justice System

In 1954, the year of the historic *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, about 100,000 African Americans were incarcerated in America's prisons and jails. Following that decision there has been a half century of enhanced opportunity for many people for whom that had previously been denied, and significant numbers of people of color have gained leadership positions in society. Yet despite this sustained progress, within the criminal justice system the figure of 100,000 incarcerated African Americans has now escalated to nearly 900,000.

The scale of these developments can be seen most vividly in research findings from the Department of Justice. If current trends continue, one of every three African American males born today can expect to go to prison in his lifetime, as can one of every six Latino males, compared to 1 in 17 white males. For women, the overall figures are considerably lower, but the racial/ethnic disparities are similar: 1 of every 18 African American females, 1 of every 45 Hispanic females, and 1 of every 111 white females can expect to spend time in prison (Bonczar, 2003). [Note: Criminal justice data on other racial groups, including Native Americans and Asians/Pacific Islanders, is generally very scarce, and therefore this analysis generally focuses on trends regarding African Americans and Latinos. Available data, though, documents that Native Americans are incarcerated at more than twice the rate of whites, while Asian Americans/Pacific

Islanders have the lowest incarceration rate of any racial/ethnic group (Hartney & Vuong, 2009).]

High rates of criminal justice control can be seen not only by racial/ethnic group, but even more so in combination with age, since younger people have higher rates of involvement in the justice system. Thus, 1 in 13 African American males in the age group 30 to 39 is incarcerated in a state or federal prison on any given day, and additional numbers are in local jails (Cooper, Sabol, & West, 2009).

Communities of color are disproportionately affected not only by incarceration, but through higher rates of victimization as well. Data for 2009 (most recent available) show that African Americans are considerably more likely than whites to be victims of violent crime. This includes rates of victimization for robbery more than three times those of whites, as well as more than double the rate of aggravated assault. Hispanics are victimized at a rate about 15% higher than whites, but less than African American (Rand & Truman, 2010).

In theory a variety of factors may be responsible for the high rates of incarceration of minority groups in the United States. These might include the relative degree of involvement in crime, disparate law enforcement practices, sentencing and parole policies and practices, and biased decisionmaking. Below I assess the relative contributions of each of these factors.

Crime and Arrest Rates

Measuring relative rates of involvement in criminal activity is a complicated task. Since most crimes are either unreported or do not result in an arrest, there is no overall measurement of the number of crimes committed or the demographics of those engaged

in criminal behavior. This is even more significant in “victimless” crimes such as a drug selling transaction between consenting adults.

In order to develop a rough estimate of these dynamics we can begin by examining arrest rates. The main drawback of this method is that arrests may reflect law enforcement behavior in addition to involvement in crime. Particularly in the case of drug offenses, this may not represent an accurate measure of the criminally-involved population. Nevertheless, an examination of arrest data compiled by the FBI in its annual Uniform Crime Reports (categorized by race, but not ethnicity) reveals that African Americans constituted 30% of persons arrested for a property offense in 2009 and 39% of those arrested for a violent offense (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2009), clearly disproportionate to the 12% black share of the overall national population.

Further analysis of these data indicates that what may appear to be at first a racial effect is in fact much more so a question of social class. In one study of “extremely disadvantaged” neighborhoods, for example, researchers at Ohio State University found that rates of violence were considerably higher in such neighborhoods, regardless of race. The authors concluded that “it is these differences in disadvantage that explain the overwhelming portion of the difference in crime, especially criminal violence, between white and African American communities” (Krivo & Peterson, 1995:642).

Looking at rates of incarceration overall, a series of studies by leading criminologists have attempted to quantify the degree to which disparities in imprisonment reflect involvement in crime, as measured by arrest rates. An early study by Alfred Blumstein examined the prison population in 1979, which he followed with the same methodology for the 1991 inmate population (Blumstein, 1993). More recently, an

analysis of these issues has been produced by Michael Tonry and Matthew Melewski for the 2004 population (Tonry & Melewski, 2008). What we see over time in these studies is a steadily declining proportion of the prison population that can be explained by disproportionate arrests. Blumstein's study of the 1979 population concluded that 80% of the racial disparity was accounted for by greater involvement in crime, as measured by arrest rates, a figure that was reduced to 76% for the 1991 population, and then significantly declined to 61% in the Tonry and Melewski study. Much of the change noted in these studies appears to be an effect of the growing proportion of offenders incarcerated for a drug offense since the 1970s, and in turn reflects disproportionate law enforcement and sentencing practices that adversely affect African Americans.

While these national studies are instructive, they nevertheless represent the cumulative experience of 50 states and the District of Columbia. Research has demonstrated that there may be great variation in how crimes are prosecuted across jurisdictions, and the degree to which this affects racial disparities. A study of incarceration disparities in the 1980s found broad variation in the degree to which racial disparities in arrest explained disparities in incarceration. While national data showed that arrest rates accounted for 89.5% of the racial disparity in imprisonment in one study, in the northeast states this only explained 69% of the disparity while in other states fewer African Americans were incarcerated than would have been predicted by using arrest data (Crutchfield, Bridges & Pitchford, 1994). Even within states, county-level data may prove similarly broad-ranging.

While this essay focuses on disparities in the adult criminal justice system, it should be noted that similar, and often more extreme, racial/ethnic disparities pertain in

the juvenile justice system as well. A comprehensive review of data on race and ethnicity in the juvenile system concluded that “disparity is most pronounced at the beginning stages of involvement with the juvenile justice system. When racial/ethnic differences are found, they tend to accumulate as youth are processed through the system” (Poe-Yamagata & Jones, 2000:1).

Racial Disparity as a Function of Criminal Justice Decisionmaking

While differential involvement in crime (as measured by arrests) explains a significant portion of high rates of African American imprisonment, so too do policy and practice decisions contribute to these outcomes. This does not suggest that such decisions are necessarily a function of conscious racism by actors in the system, but they frequently may include unconscious bias in the use of discretion, allocation of resources, or public policy decisionmaking.

Examinations of case processing over time also demonstrate that racial disparities in the justice system are cumulative. That is, disproportionate processing at one stage often contributes to widening disparities at succeeding points. For example, defendants who are detained in jail prior to trial are more likely to be convicted and receive lengthier prison terms than defendants released on bond (Schnake, Jones, & Brooker, 2010). Following is an overview of ways in which racial disparity has been documented at various stages of the criminal justice system.

Law Enforcement Practices

In recent years considerable media and policymaker attention has been focused on law enforcement practices and their possible contributions to racial disparity. Beginning with high profile media accounts of racial profiling by state troopers on the New Jersey

Turnpike in the 1990s, much public discussion has ensued regarding the extent to which individual officers or agencies systematically detain or arrest persons of color on the basis of race. Litigation in a variety of jurisdictions has resulted in court orders for law enforcement agencies to engage in oversight and data collection of traffic stops and other police activity to ensure that police officers are not engaging in unwarranted profiling.

Data from the Bureau of Justice Statistics demonstrate that it is not necessarily traffic or pedestrian stops in themselves that are the focal point for disparate practices. As of 2005, national data indicate that white, black, and Hispanic drivers were stopped by police at similar rates. But of those drivers who were stopped, African American motorists were more than 2.5 times as likely as whites to be searched by police, and Hispanics more than double the rate (Durose, Smith & Langan, 2007).

Prosecution

There is no stage of the criminal justice system at which there is so little data on case processing outcomes as at the prosecutorial level. Because prosecutors operate at a city or county level and generally have no obligation to report data to a statewide agency, there is broad variation in the manner, comprehensiveness, and efficiency by which data are compiled. This is particularly critical to an examination of racial disparity for two reasons. First, since more than 90% of guilty verdicts are a result of a negotiated plea rather than a trial, the influence of the prosecutor on ultimate case outcomes is often far more significant than that of the judge. Second, because these negotiations essentially take place “behind closed doors,” there is little means by which to evaluate the fairness or effectiveness of this decisionmaking. To say this is not to suggest that most prosecutors engage in biased behavior, whether conscious or not, but it does mean that it is very

difficult to assess the degree to which such practices exist or to make comparisons across prosecutors' offices regarding such issues. And as such notorious cases as the Tulia, Texas, drug prosecutions of the late 1990s show – a case in which nearly a third of the African American male population in a small town was charged with drug selling, only to see many of the convictions later reversed – this discretion can have disastrous consequences.

At the extremes, prosecutorial misconduct, even extending to death penalty cases, can produce disturbing miscarriages of justice. An investigation by *Chicago Tribune* reporters (Armstrong & Possley, 1999) concluded that: "...prosecutors across the country have violated their oaths and the law, committing the worse kinds of deception in the most serious of cases... They have prosecuted black men, hiding evidence the real killers were white... They do it to win" (Armstrong & Possley, 1999:C1).

While relatively few studies have been conducted on prosecutorial decisionmaking, there is evidence that such practices may contribute to racial disparities within the justice system. A 1991 study of federal mandatory sentencing conducted by the U.S. Sentencing Commission, for example, found that for cases in which case factors suggested that a charge could be brought that carried a mandatory penalty, prosecutors were more likely to offer white defendants a negotiated plea below the mandatory minimum than African American or Latino defendants (United States Sentencing Commission, 1991).

Sentencing

In contrast to the prosecution function, a broad range of scholarship has examined the intersection of race and sentencing over several decades. In broad terms, the evidence indicates the following:

- There is strong evidence that race plays a role in the determination of which homicide cases result in a death sentence, whereby cases with white victims are considerably more likely to receive a death sentence (Baldus and Woodworth, 2004).
- In non-capital cases, race is often found to contribute to disparities in sentencing, but most often in combination with variables such as gender and employment (Spohn, 2000).
- Racial disparities at the sentencing stage are not necessarily a function of judicial bias, but can often result from “race neutral” sentencing policies with skewed racial effects. This can be seen in the experience with many drug policies and habitual offender statutes (Crow & Johnson, 2008).

Research since the 1980s has demonstrated that offender/victim dynamics produce strong racially-based outcomes in death penalty cases. Beginning with a study by David Baldus, the focus of the *McCleskey* case before the U.S. Supreme Court in 1987 (*McCleskey v. Kemp*, 1987), these studies have consistently shown that persons who kill whites are about four times as likely to receive a death sentence as those who kill African Americans. These findings are not necessarily a function only of the sentencing decision, but may also reflect prosecutorial discretion in how cases are charged. Notably, the Supreme Court has generally rejected claims of racial bias in such cases, ruling that while

the data may show overall patterns of racial effects, that such findings do not necessarily demonstrate racial bias in an individual case.

In non-capital cases, a comprehensive review of current research by sentencing scholar Cassia Spohn finds that "... race and ethnicity do play an important role in contemporary sentencing decisions. Black and Hispanic offenders sentenced in State and Federal courts face significantly greater odds of incarceration than similarly situated white offenders. In some jurisdictions, they also may receive longer sentences or differential benefits from guideline departures than their white counterparts" (Spohn: 458).

In recent decades a significant contributor to racial disparities has been the set of policies adopted under the framework of the "war on drugs." Such sentencing policies as mandatory minimums and school zone drug enhancements, while theoretically race neutral, in practice have significant racial effects. This is a combined function of law enforcement and prosecutorial practices. Since the escalation of the war on drugs in the mid-1980s, there has been a trend of both increased drug arrests and prosecutions accompanied by significant racial and ethnic disparities. At the stage of law enforcement the number of drug arrests nearly tripled from a level of 581,000 in 1980 to 1,663,000 by 2009. Along with that came a dramatic escalation in the number of incarcerated drug offenders, rising from about 41,000 persons in prison or jail in 1980 to nearly 500,000 by 2003 (Mauer & King, 2007).

Racial disparities in the prosecution of the drug war can be seen initially in arrest rates. African Americans constituted 21% of drug arrests in 1980, then rose to 36% in 1992 (Mauer, 2006), before declining to 34% by 2009 (Federal Bureau of Investigation,

2009), but still disproportionate to their share of the national population. While there are no comprehensive data on the number of people committing drug offenses, government surveys have consistently shown that African Americans use drugs at roughly the same proportions as whites and Latinos. Therefore, all things being equal, one would expect that arrest rates for drug possession would reflect these trends. But since many drug arrests are for sales offenses, it is also necessary to investigate potential racial disparities in this area. There is little data on drug selling activity by race, but at least one study of drug selling behavior in six cities published by the National Institute of Justice indicates that “respondents were most likely to report using a main source who was of their own racial or ethnic background” (Riley, 1997:1).

Racial disparities in drug arrests then translate into disparities in sentencing that are exacerbated by the proliferation of mandatory sentencing policies adopted since the 1980s, laws that are frequently applied to drug offenses. Overall, this has resulted in African Americans and Latinos constituting 71% of drug offenders in state prisons in 2008 (Cooper, Sabol & West, 2009).

Among the sentencing policies that most dramatically reveal the dynamics of these developments are the federal policies adopted by Congress in 1986 and 1988 governing two forms of cocaine, powder and crack. Under these statutes a 100:1 drug quantity disparity was established between offenses of powder cocaine and crack cocaine. Thus, selling 500 grams of powder cocaine triggered a mandatory five-year prison term, while for crack cocaine, sale or possession of just 5 grams resulted in the same five-year sentence. The racial impact of these laws was a function of the vast disparity in arrests, with African Americans constituting about 80% of persons charged with a crack cocaine

offense, while powder cocaine offenders were much more likely to be white or Latino. The sentencing disparity was reduced by Congress in 2010, raising the threshold for crack cocaine to 28 grams, while leaving the powder cocaine quantity at 500 grams.

Other sentencing policies have been observed to produce unwarranted racial disparities as well. School zone drug laws adopted by many states have as their stated objective the goal of deterring drug selling to school children, and aim to do so by applying enhanced penalties to offenses committed within a certain geographical range – often 500 or 1,000 feet -- of a school. As written, though, many of these statutes apply much more broadly, such as including drug sales between two adults during non-school hours.

The racial effects of these policies result from the implications of housing patterns. Since urban areas are much more densely populated than rural or suburban areas, it is more likely that any given drug offense will take place within a school zone district. And since persons of color disproportionately reside in urban areas, a drug offense committed by an African American or Latino person will be more likely to incur these enhanced penalties. In New Jersey, for example, 96% of all persons incarcerated under these laws in 2005 were African American or Latino (New Jersey Commission to Review Criminal Sentencing, 2007). Recognizing this disparity, the state legislature restored sentencing discretion to judges in such cases in 2010.

Sentencing policies that enhance penalties based on an offender's prior record likewise produce disproportionate racial effects even though they are race neutral on the surface. This is a result of minorities being more likely to have a prior record, whether due to greater involvement in criminal behavior or disparate processing by the justice

system. While such enhancements have long been a consideration at sentencing, the recent proliferation of “three strikes” and habitual offender laws that greatly enhance such punishments has magnified the impact of such considerations.

In the case of Alexander Leviner in 1998, (*U.S. v. Leviner*, 1998) Federal District Judge Nancy Gertner imposed a below-guideline sentence for an African American man convicted of being a felon in possession of a firearm. Under federal sentencing guidelines, Leviner’s sentencing range was 4-6 years in prison, based on the offense conviction and his prior record. But Judge Gertner noted that most of his prior convictions were the result of traffic stops by Boston police. Given the history of racial profiling by law enforcement agencies, Judge Gertner reasoned that such practices essentially contributed to Leviner’s prior record, and as a result she imposed a lesser sentence of 2 ½ years.

Implications of racial disparity in incarceration

While it may seem obvious to many that disproportionate rates of incarceration of minorities are problematic, others may believe that such outcomes are merely the result of criminal activity and are therefore necessary to promote public safety. But given the current scale of incarceration, there are several reasons why these issues should be of concern to all Americans.

First, there is a growing consensus that the extreme rate of incarceration in the United States is unsustainable. Across the country political leaders concerned with severe fiscal constraints are recognizing that the cost of corrections is impinging on state support for higher education and other vital services. In California, for example, in 2010 Governor Schwarzenegger announced that he would advocate for a constitutional

amendment prohibiting the percentage of the state budget earmarked for prisons from exceeding what is set aside for the public university system (Steinhauer, 2010).

One presumed goal of mass incarceration, to reduce crime, is increasingly subject to diminishing returns. With a surge of incarcerated drug offenders since the mid-1980s, there is now a growing population in prison for which there is little effect on public safety due to the fact that incarcerated low-level drug sellers are routinely replaced on the street.

Extreme racial disparities in the use of imprisonment result in communities of color being disproportionately affected by the collateral effects of incarceration. These include family stress and dissolution, neighborhoods experiencing high mobility of residents cycling in and out of prison, and growing numbers of people with limited employment prospects. Incarceration has been demonstrated to reduce African American male wage earnings by 44% by the age of 48 (The Pew Charitable Trusts, 2010).

Emerging research also suggests that highly disproportionate rates of incarceration contribute to concerns regarding the perceived legitimacy of the criminal justice system. Research by Lawrence D. Bobo and Victor Thompson shows that perceived bias in the criminal justice system translates into a “crisis of legitimacy” (Bobo & Thompson, 2006:463). When asked whether drug laws are “enforced fairly on all would be drug users,” 79.4% of white respondents answered affirmatively, but only 33.7% of African American respondents did so. As a result of such perceptions, when asked whether they believed that the police would take seriously a complaint about a home burglary, only 35% of blacks expected such a response, compared to 60% of whites. Such an outcome should be of concern to all since law enforcement agencies can

only operate successfully if they have the cooperation and support of the community. If such trust erodes, then public safety is inevitably compromised.

Recommendations

Highly disproportionate rates of imprisonment have produced significant social strains on communities of color, and have been of questionable benefit in enhancing public safety. Policymakers should consider adopting policies and practices that can reduce unnecessarily high rates of incarceration while also helping to promote public safety. These include the following:

“Level the playing field” – The overlap between issues of race and class is profound in the criminal justice system, and lack of access to resources is a significant contributor to disproportionate rates of incarceration. This includes such disadvantages as inadequate defense services for indigent defendants and limited access to treatment programs. By providing credible sentencing options for the courts, greater numbers of defendants could be sentenced to community supervision, thereby avoiding costly incarceration while permitting offenders to maintain ties with family and community.

Invest in high school completion – A growing body of evidence demonstrates that there is a dramatic difference in the risk of incarceration for persons who do not complete high school. Research by Bruce Western and Becky Pettit shows that 68% of African American male high school dropouts had served time in prison by the age of 34 (Western & Pettit, 2010). Thus, along with other societal interests in promoting high school completion is the significant impact such outcomes can produce in helping to reduce disproportionate rates of imprisonment is critical as well.

Adopt racial impact statement legislation – Similar to fiscal or environmental impact statements, racial impact statement policies require consideration of any undue racial effects of sentencing or other criminal justice legislation prior to adoption. As utilized in Connecticut and Iowa, legislators are provided with an assessment of the racial/ethnic impact of proposed sentencing legislation (Mauer, 2009a). If the analysis indicates that the policy would produce a disproportionate effect policymakers are not precluded from adopting the legislation, but have the opportunity to consider alternative means of achieving public safety goals without exacerbating racial disparities in imprisonment.

Reorient the “war on drugs” – Despite a notable shift in the public climate toward support for treatment and prevention for substance abuse, along with the expansion of drug courts and similar measures, the number of drug offenders in prison has not declined, and dramatic racial disparities persist. This is due to a combination of circumstances: limited community-based options for treatment; mandatory sentencing laws that result in excessive prison terms for lower-level cases; and the failure of some drug court programs to target prison-bound offenders. Reversing these policies and adopting harm reduction models would produce more compassionate, and less costly, outcomes.

Adopt and implement racial fairness policy goals and commissions – Several states have adopted racial equity goals and structures that recognize the interrelated set of decisions that cumulatively produce racial disparities in imprisonment. In Wisconsin, Governor Jim Doyle established a commission in 2007 (Mauer, 2009a) that produced a comprehensive assessment of racial disparities in the criminal justice system, and in 2010 the state of Delaware issued a declaration to “promote racial and ethnic fairness in the criminal justice system” (Delaware Criminal Justice Council, 2010), including providing

grant incentives for applicants in compliance with the declaration. Such practices convey high-level support for constructive change at the state and local level.

Examine policy and practice decisions for undue racial impact – Through its Juvenile Detention and Alternatives Initiative, the Annie E. Casey Foundation incorporates a requirement that participating jurisdictions strive to not only reduce their detained population, but to do so in a way that reduces racial disparity as well. In Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon, for example, the establishment of alternatives to detention achieved both these objectives. In the adult system, local officials in Hennepin County, Minnesota, recognized that several of the risk factors used to develop recommendations for pretrial release of defendants were highly correlated with race but had no predictive value regarding failure to appear in court. As a result, the scoring system was revised to reflect evidence-based analysis that would not produce unwarranted racial disparities (The Sentencing Project, 2008).

Conclusion

In examining the policies and practices that have produced a world-record level of incarceration, along with a dramatic scale of imprisonment for African Americans in particular, it is now clear that these outcomes are a result of a complex set of factors. Most significantly, policy decisions over the past four decades have created a severe imbalance in the national approach to public safety. While crime control initiatives have traditionally incorporated a mix of criminal justice responses along with preventive measures, the national approach to these issues is now weighted heavily toward the criminal justice system at the expense of policies that could help strengthen the capacity of families and communities to establish behavioral norms and enhance opportunity.

Within the criminal justice system the most significant change in recent decades was the inception of the war on drugs in the 1980s. The set of policies and practices enshrined within that initiative contributed substantially to the burgeoning prison population, accompanied by dramatic racial and ethnic disparities. These disparities are not a function of greater involvement in drug use or the drug trade, but rather resulted from discretionary decisionmaking by law enforcement agencies, as well as enactment of harsh sentencing policies by both state and federal lawmakers.

Reversing these trends is not a simple matter, and will require a shift in the political environment on two levels. In regard to criminal justice policy, this will necessitate a reconsideration of the value of mass incarceration in producing public safety, and developing means of strengthening the capacity of community-based corrections systems to supervise offenders and provide comprehensive services. The broader agenda for reform will require a public policy climate that recognizes the need for a comprehensive approach to public safety, one that is not overly reliant on criminal justice sanctions.

Despite the rather grim data reported in this analysis, there are some reasons for cautious optimism. In recent years policymakers across the political spectrum have become increasingly receptive to a range of sentencing and drug policy reform measures that hold the promise of producing greater public safety benefits at less cost. In regard to racial disparity in the criminal justice system there are some signs of possible change as well. A recent analysis of persons incarcerated for drug offenses demonstrates a significant decline in the number of African Americans in the first decade of the 21st century (Mauer, 2009b). While it is too early to assess all the contributing factors to this

trend, it does suggest that there may be constructive responses to the problems identified in this essay. The challenge for both policymakers and the public is to build upon these developments and to think creatively about ways of enhancing both public safety and racial justice.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, K. & Possley, M. (1999, January 10). Verdict: Dishonor. *Chicago Tribune*, C1.
- Baldus, David C., & Woodworth, C. (2004). Race Discrimination and the Legitimacy of Capital Punishment: Reflections on the Interaction of Fact and Perception. *DePaul Law Review*, 53, 1411-1495.
- Blumstein, A. (1993). On the Racial Disproportionality of United States' Prison Populations. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 73, 743-60.
- Bobo, L. D., & Thompson, V. (2006). Unfair by Design: The War on Drugs, Race, and the Legitimacy of the Criminal Justice System. *Social Research: An International Quarterly*, 73, 445-471.
- Bonczar, Thomas. (2003, August). *Prevalence of Imprisonment in the U.S. Population, 1974-2001*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Cooper, M., Sabol, W. J., & West, H. C. (2009, December). *Prisoners in 2008*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Crow, M. & Johnson, K. (2008). Race, Ethnicity, and Habitual-Offender Sentencing. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 19, 63-83.
- Crutchfield, R. D., Bridges, G. S., & Pitchford, S. R. (1994, May). Analytical and Aggregation Biases in Analyses of Imprisonment: Reconciling Discrepancies in Studies of Racial Disparity. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 31, 166-82.
- Delaware Criminal Justice Council. (2010, April). Declaration of Leading Practices to Protect Civil Rights and Promote Racial and Ethnic Fairness in the Criminal Justice System.
- Durose, M. R., Smith, E. L., & Langan, P. A. (2007, April). *Contacts between Police and the Public, 2005*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2009). *Uniform Crime Reports: Crime in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: Federal Bureau of Investigation.
- Hartney, C., & Vuong, L. (2009, March). *Created Equal: Racial and Ethnic Disparities in the U.S. Criminal Justice System*. Oakland, CA: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.
- Krivo, L. J., & Peterson, R. D. (1995). Extremely Disadvantaged Neighborhoods and

- Urban Crime. *Social Forces*, 75, 619-648.
- Mauer, M. (2006). *Race to Incarcerate*. New York: The New Press.
- Mauer, M. (2009a). Racial Impact Statements: Changing Policies to Address Disparities. *Criminal Justice*, 23, 16-20.
- Mauer, M. (2009b). *The Changing Racial Dynamics of the War on Drugs*. Washington, D.C.: The Sentencing Project.
- Mauer, M. and King, R. S. (2007, September). *A 25-Year Quagmire: The War on Drugs and Its Impact on American Society*. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project
- McCleskey v. Kemp*, (1987) 481 U.S. 279, 107 S. Ct. 1756.
- New Jersey Commission to Review Criminal Sentencing. (2007). Supplemental Report on New Jersey's Drug Free Zone Crimes & Proposal for Reform.
- Poe-Yamagata, E., & Jones, M. A. (2000). *And Justice for Some*. Washington, DC: Building Blocks for Youth Initiative.
- Rand, M. R., & Truman, J. L. (2010). *Criminal Victimization, 2009*. U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Riley, K. (1997). *Crack, Powder Cocaine, and Heroin: Drug Purchase and Drug Use Patterns in Six Cities*. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.
- Schnake, T., Jones, M., & Brooker, C. (2010). *The History of Bail and Pretrial Release*. Washington, D.C.: Pretrial Justice Institute.
- The Pew Charitable Trusts. (2010). *Collateral Costs: Incarceration's Effects on Economic Mobility*. Washington DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts.
- The Sentencing Project. (2008). *Reducing Racial Disparity in the Criminal Justice System*. Washington, DC: The Sentencing Project.
- Spohn, C. (2000). Thirty years of sentencing reform: The Quest for a Racially Neutral Sentencing Process. In J. Horney (Ed.), *Criminal Justice*, 427-501. Washington DC: US Department of Justice.
- Steinhauer, J. (2010, January 6). Schwarzenegger Seeks Shift From Prisons to Schools. *New York Times*, A21.
- Tonry, M. & Melewski, M. (2008). The Malign Effects of Drug and Crime Control Policy on Black Americans. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* (pp. 1-44). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

U.S. v. LeViner. (D. Mass. 1998). 31 F. Supp. 2d 23.

United States Sentencing Commission. (1991, August). *Special Report to the Congress: Mandatory Minimum Penalties in the Federal Criminal Justice System*.

Western, B. & Pettit, B. (2010). Incarceration & Social Inequality. *Daedalus*, 139, 8-19.

Marc Mauer is the Executive Director of The Sentencing Project. He is the author of *Race to Incarcerate* and the co-editor of *Invisible Punishment: The Collateral Consequences of Mass Imprisonment*.