

5-1995

Pistol Packing Passerby: A Description and Comparison of Justifiable Homocides in Los Angeles County

Aimee Nagles

Follow this and additional works at: http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/uhp_theses

Recommended Citation

Nagles, Aimee, "Pistol Packing Passerby: A Description and Comparison of Justifiable Homocides in Los Angeles County" (1995).
Honors Theses. Paper 194.

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the University Honors Program at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

PISTOL PACKING PASSERSBY:
A DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES IN LOS
ANGELES COUNTY*

Aimée Nagles
Center For The Study Of Crime, Delinquency, and Corrections
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

2814 Woodhill Drive
Rockford, Illinois 61114

* An honors paper completed May, 1995.

PISTOL PACKING PASSERSBY:

A DESCRIPTION AND COMPARISON OF JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDES IN LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Late on the evening of January 31, 1995, William Masters left his Los Angeles home for a late night walk around the neighborhood, an activity which had become somewhat routine for the thirty-five year old man (Dellios, 1995). In the name of tradition, Masters packed his unlicensed .38 caliber semi-automatic handgun and started upon his stroll near a Hollywood Freeway underpass (Dellios, 1995). It was here Masters encountered two Hispanic graffiti artists or taggers, eighteen year old Cesar Rene Arce and twenty year old David Hillo (Wilson, 1995). Caught in the act of defacing Los Angeles public property, Masters claimed the two youths threatened him with a screwdriver and attempted to rob him. Thus, Masters, a man with a gun, who was fed up with the taggers disregard for public property and the Los Angeles police departments inability to control such youthful criminals, felt it was his duty to take the law into his own hands. At one o'clock in the morning Cesar Rene Arce was shot dead and David Hillo seriously wounded by bullets from an unlicensed .38 semi-automatic handgun. After an investigation of the facts and circumstances surrounding the deaths of these two youths, Los Angeles County District Attorney, Gil Garcetti, released William Masters (Dellios, 1995). Masters was free--he had committed justifiable homicide.

The relative recency of Masters eventful evening stroll, is in itself indicative of a current citizen based approach to law enforcement. Bypassing traditional methods, many citizens have fully supported Masters actions as a Los Angeles vigilante, and are promoting other disillusioned citizens "to take the law into their own hands" (Dellios, 1995 p. 15). Such sentiments are further reflected in an examination of the increasingly lenient approach many states are taking towards the licensing of weapons to citizens (Van Biema, 1995). While it is estimated that there are currently 60-70 million handguns possessed by citizens in the United States these numbers are clearly growing (Sheley, 1995). It seems that "an increase in random violence and understaffed police forces" has served as an impetus to gun purchases as citizens have decided to pack their own guns in the name of self-defense and crime control (Van Biema, 1995 p. 28). The feelings of many gun-purchasing citizens are aptly conveyed by a recent .44 Magnum applicant when he stated, "it's a jungle, and it's spreading. I don't want to become a victim." (Van Biema, 1995 p. 29).

This paper examines patterns of justifiable homicides in Los Angeles county by civilians and police officers from 1987 through 1992. The following section will compare those justifiable homicides involving police to those involving civilians. The final section examines hypotheses that explain the findings from this data, including the suggestion that citizen participation in combating crime is the product of Good Samaritans, who have access to and carry handguns, and act in

response to their fear of violence and a growing discontent with current police enforcement.

THE LAW OF JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDE IN CALIFORNIA

Justifiable homicide is termed as those homicides which are done "under circumstances of duty or necessity" (Riedel, 1995 p. 2). In the state of California, sections 196 and 197 of the California Penal Code have been specifically designated to deal with these types of homicides (Pantaleoni and Bigler, 1969). These two sections of the penal code acknowledge those justifiable homicides committed by peace officers and those committed by members of the public. Under section 196, one finds justification for those homicides by officials: which are state executions, killings committed during the course of duty when met with "actual resistance as to require the act", and when arresting or "retaking" a felon when "such force appears reasonably necessary to accomplish the arrest" (Pantaleoni and Bigler, 1969 p. 176).

Under section 197, homicides are found justifiable when: a felon is attempting murder, bodily harm, or the commission of a felony, in defense of ones home or property when "there appears no other reasonable way to stop the perpetrator" who intends to commit violence therein, and in defense of persons who are observed in "imminent danger" of bodily harm or the commission of a felony against them (Pantaleoni and Bigler 1969, p. 176). The provisions found in both sections 196 and 197

are significant in that they constitute the codified legal justifications which allow police officers or civilians to commit nonfelonious homicides within California.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

Information on homicides in California is collected and disseminated by a statewide reporting agency, the Law Enforcement Information Center. The Center collects information on "willful homicides," i.e., those in which the offender will be charged with murder. Under separate headings, it collects detailed information on manslaughter by negligence, justifiable homicides by civilians, and justifiable homicides by peace officers. The data for this study were made available by Professor Marc Riedel who also supervised the preparation of this paper.

From 1987 through 1992 there were 20,393 homicides which occurred in the state of California. During that same period, there were 10,553 total homicides in Los Angeles county. Of those homicides which occurred in Los Angeles county, justifiable homicides committed by both peace officers and civilians accounted for 586 or 6% of the total number committed. Of the 586 cases, 44 of them were excluded from the analysis because they involved a felon who resisted arrest or took flight from the scene of the crime. For the remaining 542 cases used in this study, 53.7% involved peace officers and 46.3% involved civilians (California Data Set, 1995).

For purposes of analysis, the 542 justifiable homicides

were divided into four distinct groups:

1. Homicides committed by civilians as a result of a personal attack upon them. (Civilian Attack)
2. Homicides committed by civilians which occurred during the commission of a crime. (Civilian Crime)
3. Homicides committed by police in response to an attack on the police or civilians. (Police Attack)
4. Homicides committed by police which occurred during the commission of a crime. (Police Crime)

The above groups will be compared using the following variables:

1. Age, race, and gender of the victims
2. Victim and offender relationships
3. Weapon used in commission of the homicide
4. Location of the homicide

Although it will not be analyzed in this report, information is also available regarding: the year, month, and day of the death, as well as the age, race, and gender of the offender. In those cases where more than one victim and/or offender was involved information is also available regarding the age, race, and gender of additional offenders as well as the victim and offender relationships. The variables examined in this analysis focus on victim characteristics that involved only one victim or offender. No analysis of offender characteristics was done. The offender file, while unavailable for this study, consisted of the offenders age, race, and gender characteristics.

RESULTS

Age of the Victims: The age of the victims ranged from thirteen to eighty, although these numbers represent extremes and are associated with a notably small amount of the victims. Table 1 presents the means, medians and standard deviations for the four groups.

Table 1 about here

Comparing civilian and police attacks, the age of victims is very similar (31.3 vs. 30.0). For commission of crimes, civilian victims were older (27.1) than police victims (25.6). As a rule, victims of civilians were older than the victims of police. The youngest victims were those killed by the police and civilians in the commission of a crime which is consistent with research indicating a high level of felony involvement for young people.

Race of victims: The findings on the race of the victims is consistent with other research on homicides. In general, homicide "is the most common cause of death for African American males and females" (Riedel, 1995 p. 14). For all justifiable homicides, Black victims accounted for 43.6%, Hispanic victims for 35.3%, White victims for 17.0%, and other for 4.2% (Table 2). The category of "other" consists of a small number of other races: American Indians, Chinese, Filipinos.

Table 2 about here

Contrary to what might be expected, more Black victims are killed by civilians than police, while the reverse is true for White victims. As seen in Table 2, Blacks represented 42.7% of all victims killed by civilians while attacking another person and 58.4% of all victims killed by civilians while committing a crime. In relation to police homicides, however, Blacks represented only 32.8% of all victims killed while attacking another person, and only 41.9% of all victims killed while committing a crime (Table 2). It seems of all Black victims, a disproportionate amount were killed by civilians and not by police officers. White victims, on the other hand, were more likely to be killed by police officers while attacking another, 24.2%, or while committing a crime, 17.2%, then by civilians for either circumstance (Table 2).

Hispanics accounted for the next highest percentage of victims after Blacks. Hispanics were likely to be killed by police while attacking another, 38.9%, and by civilians, 40.4%, relatively similar percentages. However, Hispanic victims were much more likely to be killed by police during the commission of a crime, 35.5%, then by civilians, 28.0%.

Gender of the Victims: Justifiable homicides are a predominantly male event. This is not surprising in light of the prevailing facts, in which homicide is found to be a male based phenomena

(Riedel, 1995). Out of the total amount of justifiable homicides committed by both civilians and police 97.6% of the victims were male while only 2.4% were female (Table 3).

Table 3 about here

There was little gender variation found between civilian homicides committed due to an attack or crime and police homicides committed due to an attack or a crime. As the data in Table 3 indicates, male victims were overrepresented in all of these categories.

Victim/Offender Relationship: The victim/offender relationship is significant in that the relationship, or lack of as in the case of strangers, may be indicative of the circumstances surrounding the homicide. For purposes of analysis the specific types of victim/offender relationships were collapsed into categories which included: family, friends or acquaintances, strangers, and unknown to victim.

Table 4 about here

Table 4 indicates, of the 542 justifiable homicides, 86.0% were committed against strangers. Specifically looking at police homicides, 99.5% were committed against strangers during an attack, and all were committed during the commission of a crime (Table 4). These high percentages indicate most police homicides

are committed in the course of duty.

Table 4 shows that civilians were most likely to kill strangers while caught committing a crime, 82.7%, or while attacking another person, 47.2% (Table 4). These percentages negate the common assumption that when faced with a criminal actor, civilians will uniformly rely upon police intervention. When a civilian encounters a criminal during the commission of a crime, 82.7% of the time the civilian chose to bypass formal enforcement and handle the situation on their own! The same is true for civilians when encountering an attack on another person, as 47.2% of the time civilian committed homicide against strangers in response to just such an attack. Clearly, it seems civilians are willing to use violence against offenders on their own accord.

Weapon Used: An examination of the weapons frequencies provides evidence which is in agreement with the increasing availability of handguns in our society (Van Biema, 1995).

Table 5 about here

Handguns, as shown in Table 5, accounted for 433, or 79.9% of weapons used in all of the 542 recorded homicides. The remaining weapons were collapsed into the variables of: rifle/firearm/long guns, knives, and other. The variable of other, which accounted for only 2.2% of the homicides, included the use of hands, feet and teeth, blunt objects, ropes, and

pellet guns.

A closer examination of Table 5 shows police to have used handguns 83.3% of the time in response to an attack and 84.9% of the time when responding to the commission of a crime. This is to be expected because police are armed and will respond, when necessary, with their licensed handguns. Consistent with the prevalence of handguns in the possession of the public, handguns were used by attacked civilians 64.0% of the time, and 80.9% of the time in response to the commission of a crime (Table 5). These percentages not only suggest that the number of handguns among civilians is widespread, but confirm that civilians are willing to use them against other persons to combat crime.

Location of Homicide: The specific locations were collapsed into four variables which included: public areas inside such as businesses and commercial areas; public area outside such as streets, sidewalks, fields, and highways; private residences; and other, a category inclusive of vehicles and missing areas. Outdoor public areas were overrepresented and accounted for 51.9% of all homicides committed by both police and civilians (Table 6).

Table 6 about here

Police homicides occurred in public areas outside in response to an attack 66.1% of the time and in response to a

crime 65.7% of the time (Table 6). Specifically, for both of these circumstances, the public location outside which was highest for police justifiable homicides was streets or sidewalks. The relationship between public outdoor areas and homicide remains true for civilians as well. Civilian homicides were committed in outdoor public areas 41.3% of the time in response to an attack and 32.1% of the time in response to a crime (Table 6). Similar to police homicides, streets and sidewalks served as the predominate location for civilian homicides as well.

For civilian homicides, home and private residence was an important location for homicide. In fact more homicides were committed by civilians at a home in response to a crime, 38.3%, then were committed by civilians at a public outdoor area in response to a crime, 32.1% (Table 6). While the difference between these two categories is small, the high percentages for both locations is important. One may postulate that the large number of civilian homicides, in response to a crime, located at residences, is a reaction to burglaries or thefts within the civilians home or home of another. The similarly large percent of civilian homicides, in response to crime, located at outdoor public areas, may be indicative of civilians willingness to become involved in combating crime within the community.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The following empirical generalizations appear to be supported by the preceding analysis.

1. Civilian justifiable homicides involve older victims than those police justifiable homicides. Victims killed in the commission of a crime are younger than those killed in attacks.
2. Justifiable homicides with civilian offenders more frequently involve African-American victims than those involving police. Police, on the other hand, kill more White victims.
3. While civilians and police kill about the same proportion of Hispanic victims in response to an attack, police kill a substantially larger proportion of Hispanic victims during commission of a crime in comparison to civilians.
4. Male victims are predominant victims in the four types of justifiable homicides with percentages ranging from 95.5% to 98.9%.
5. Strangers are the single largest category of victim/offender relationships. Nearly all the victims of police homicides involve strangers. For civilians, over 80% of the killings during the commission of a crime involve strangers while nearly half of the victims in an attack are strangers.
6. Handguns are the preferred weapon of destruction.

About two-thirds of the attacks on civilians were met with armed resistance using a handgun. For the other three categories, handguns were used in over 80% of the events.

7. For police justifiable homicides, the preferred locations are public outside areas including streets and alleyways. For civilians, the preferred locations were more evenly divided between public outside areas and private residences.

In this section, utilizing the empirical generalizations listed above, we will consider the hypotheses that civilian justifiable homicides in response to an attack on another person or the commission of a crime may be interpreted as the actions of a Good Samaritan.

In 1965, California became the first state to legislate a Good Samaritan law (Huston, Geis, and Wright, 1976). This law is unique in that it serves to compensate, "private citizens for injuries suffered trying to prevent a crime, catch a criminal, or help out in some other emergency" (Huston, Geis, and Wright, 1976 p. 61). The term Good Samaritan remains somewhat ambiguous since the exact actions which constitute the behavior of a Good Samaritan remain open for interpretation. However, for purposes of analysis, based on the California law, we will assume that those citizens who on their own have attempted to prevent a crime and or apprehend a criminal have displayed behavior appropriate to the role of a Good Samaritan.

The Good Samaritan, when associated with civilian intervention in crime, is often compared to a vigilante, although the latter term usually carries with it a more radical and somewhat negative connotation. While vigilante groups are most often referred to, individual vigilantes do exist and are defined as those who feel the "end justifies the means" and "employ the most effective method" to reach those means (Madison, 1973 p. 2). Often times this entails breaking the law, although the vigilante does not see his or her actions as a crime, but as a response to a perceived or actual injustice (Tucker, 1985). A common misconception of vigilantes regards their actions as the product of some type of social or political movement (Burrows, 1979). This misconception is most probably the result of stereotypes surrounding vigilante groups, when in reality, most vigilantes are "lone individuals who are suddenly taking the law into their own hands" (Tucker, 1985 p. 29). Vigilantes do not necessarily become involved in social or political movements, but act more in reaction to specific immediate circumstances (Burrows, 1976). By regarding the behaviors of vigilantes as reactive it becomes easier to understand "the sudden, relatively isolated and combustible nature of the vigilant phenomena" (Burrows, 1976 p. 7).

An examination of the characteristics of both Good Samaritans and vigilantes suggest that a Good Samaritan may be interpreted as a type of vigilante. A relevant factor in distinguishing between the two seems to be that it is the vigilante who is willing to break the law in order to achieve

a purpose or goal. However, it seems that if the vigilantes purpose or goal is one which society as deemed acceptable, the vigilante may actually "settle a score or do justice" (Tucker, 1985 p. 27). The more pervasive an injustice, the easier it becomes for the vigilantes actions to be accepted. When this acceptance occurs the vigilante may be rewarded, and his or her actions against the injustices of society will no longer be an object of persecution, but of praise. Once the vigilante is accepted, and thus seen as a individual acting on behalf of society and its fight against crime, the vigilante will be credited with the label of Good Samaritan.

Vigilantes or Good Samaritans have been a prevalent source of informal law enforcement throughout history (Culberson, 1990). The presence of such enforcers is not based upon individual determinations but upon larger societal conditions. Vigilantes or Good Samaritans appear, "when people finally give up all hope that the courts and the state apparatus can deliver what they expect of it" (Tucker, 1985 p. 31). Such is the case in today's society where for the past twenty-five years the level of violent crime has increased in the United States (Skogan, 1989). Urban areas are notable susceptible to the marked increases in violence and have responded with an increase in vigilantism as well (Madison, 1973). Police are clearly ill-equipped to deal with the rising crime levels and have been unable to provide the protection which citizens demand. Thus it seems, "fear is slowly blending with the feeling that our interests are being ignored or, at best, not served well"

(Madison, 1973 p. 2). This dangerous blend of fear and anger has prompted citizens to rely upon informal enforcement, a task which requires protective preparation--the purchase of a handgun.

In a study designed to determine the characteristics of gun owners, it was found that fear served as a significant determinant in the gun ownership equation (Williams and McGrath, 1976). With fear serving as a predictor of gun ownership, one may assume those civilians who purchase handguns do so based upon intentions of self-defense or defense of another. This assumption is confirmed by a survey conducted in 1978, which revealed around "15 percent of the population claimed to have used a gun for self-defense", a percentage which accounts for nearly 30 percent of all gun owners (Sheley, 1995 p. 509). Based upon this information it seems a significant amount of gun owners purchase handguns with the intentions of protecting themselves and others. The effectiveness of civilian handgun purchases in the name of self defense is furthered by data collected which has shown civilian owned handguns to be "used as or more frequently in repelling crime as in attempting it" (Kates, 1989 p. 207). Similarly, Kleck has estimated some 1,500-2,800 felons are "killed in the act of committing a crime annually by gun-using civilians, far more than are killed by the police" (Sheley, 1995 p. 509). These conclusions, pertaining to the prevalent use of handguns by civilians, is not inconsistent with the results which have been presented here.

From this point on Good Samaritans will be analyzed

exclusively, as in regard to the Los Angeles data one may assume those civilians involved, from this perspective, may be labeled as Good Samaritans and not vigilantes. That is to say, the civilians who committed justifiable homicide acted in compliance with the California law and were removed from any criminal charges or persecution. From the onset, those California citizens involved in justifiable homicides may have possessed the motives of a vigilante: a lost faith in the criminal justice system prompting a willingness to break the law despite the consequences (Tucker, 1985). However, it is the term **justifiable** which indicates that the California civilian homicides have been deemed necessary responses to threatening situations in which the appropriate actions were taken. Therefore, the California civilians who committed justifiable homicides have done a service to society and may be labeled appropriately as Good Samaritans. Thus, if the proverbial Good Samaritan is a vigilante operating under the protection of the law, we should find some similarities between the available research of Good Samaritans and the results presented in this paper.

A study conducted by Huston, Geis, and Wright in California, in 1976, was based upon the implementation of the California Good Samaritan law designed to compensate Good Samaritans for their actions. Specifically the study looked to interview those seventy-one persons, who had received monetary compensation from the state for their actions, and determine the characteristics of those persons. Not surprisingly, the researchers found that an overwhelming 90 percent of the Good

Samaritans lived in the Los Angeles, San Francisco, Sacramento, and San Diego areas (Huston, Geis, and Wright, 1976). This is consistent with our findings that a large number of justifiable homicides were committed in Los Angeles county.

The study by Huston, Geis and Wright determined that the motives behind Good Samaritans and their decision to intervene was the product of several factors. Foremost, it seems that the Good Samaritans decision to intervene was not based upon an immediate concern for the victim, but more upon an anger directed at the criminal. The researchers determined that the Good Samaritan saw their intervention "as a contest between them and the criminal with the victim almost a side issue--the occasion rather than the reason for action" (Huston, Geis and Wright, 1976 p. 64). In turn, these feelings of anger toward the criminal were combined with an overwhelming "disenchantment" with state law enforcement. This sentiment was conveyed by the Good Samaritans as only 25 percent indicated a "great" amount of respect for the police (Huston, Geis and Wright, 1976 p. 64). Such feelings of anger and disenchantment are recognizably similar to the emotions discussed earlier which serve as stimulus to citizen handgun purchases used in community crime control.

The personal characteristics of the 71 Good Samaritans studied, revealed only one female in the entire group (Huston, Geis, and Wright, 1976). Clearly, in those cases examined, Good Samaritanism is a male-based phenomena. Furthermore, looking at the ages of those same group of Good Samaritans, fifty percent were found to be under the age of thirty-five,

while the remaining fifty percent were located between the ages of 35 and 54 (Huston, Geis, and Wright, 1976). This suggests that Good Samaritans are not representative of the young or old, but are found in age groups similar to our study.

A final area of interest which was examined in the study, evaluated the relationship between gun ownership and Good Samaritans. It seems that the Good Samaritans studied were extremely familiar with gun possession, as 81 percent owned some type of gun (Huston, Geis, and Wright, 1976). Along with ownership, the Good Samaritans also expressed a high level of competency in relation to the use of guns and felt they were a necessary variable in the fight against violence and crime (Huston, Geis, and Wright, 1976). In turn, many Good Samaritans were found to carry their guns in their vehicles, an action indicative of the function of necessity which the Samaritans attributed to their weapons. This notable correlation between Good Samaritans and gun ownership serves as an important relationship when examining the Los Angeles homicide data. Clearly, for Los Angeles civilians, handguns served as the weapon of choice when acting out against crime, a decision consistent with that of the Good Samaritan.

Based upon the information discussed it may be hypothesized that a large amount of civilian justifiable homicides, overt acts of intervention, are the product of Good Samaritans acting out against crime. Certainly, the consistency in levels of police disenchantment, anger against the criminal element, and handgun possession is not contradicted by the results presented

here.

While it is not known to what extent the results of this study are generalizable, it seems in Los Angeles and elsewhere the phenomena of Good Samaritanism may be interpreted as a reflection of not only individual concerns, but a larger societal discontent. While action against crime clearly has been taken by civilians in Los Angeles county, the ramifications of increasing civilian intervention raises general concerns particularly pertaining to the state. Specifically, one must contemplate the "appropriate role of individual action in a society increasingly committed to the minimizing of personal responsibility and the enlargement of the sphere of agencies of the state and other mass organizations" (Ratcliffe, 1966 p. xv). It seems that the Good Samaritan, while labeled a hero, may actually serve as a threat to state based law enforcement as we now know it.

Table 1

Age of Victims by Type of Justifiable Homicide

| | <u>Civilian</u> | | <u>Police</u> | |
|---------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|
| | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> |
| mean | 31.1 | 27.1 | 31.0 | 25.6 |
| median | 30.0 | 25.0 | 29.0 | 24.0 |
| st.dev. | 9.9 | 9.3 | 10.3 | 8.9 |
| N | 89 | 162 | 198 | 93 |

Table 2

Race of Victims by Type of Justifiable Homicide (Percents)

| | <u>Civilian</u> | | <u>Police</u> | | <u>Total</u> |
|----------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | |
| White | 11.2 | 11.2 | 24.2 | 17.2 | 17.0 |
| Hispanic | 40.4 | 28.0 | 38.9 | 35.5 | 35.3 |
| Black | 42.7 | 58.4 | 32.8 | 41.9 | 43.6 |
| Other | 5.6 | 2.4 | 4.0 | 5.4 | 4.2 |
| N | 89 | 161 | 198 | 93 | 541 |

Missing= 1

Table 3

Gender of Victims by Type of Justifiable Homicide (Percents)

| | <u>Civilian</u> | | <u>Police</u> | | <u>Total</u> |
|--------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | |
| Male | 95.5 | 98.8 | 97.0 | 98.9 | 97.6 |
| Female | 4.5 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.4 |
| N | 89 | 162 | 198 | 93 | 542 |

Table 4

Victim/Offender Relationship By Type of Justifiable Homicide
(Percents)

| | <u>Civilian</u> | | <u>Police</u> | | <u>Total</u> |
|------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | |
| Family | 12.3 | 2.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.8 |
| Friend/ | | | | | |
| Acq. | 33.6 | 10.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 8.6 |
| Stranger | 47.2 | 82.7 | 99.5 | 100 | 86.0 |
| Unknown | | | | | |
| <u>To Victim</u> | <u>4.5</u> | <u>2.5</u> | <u>0.5</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>2.6</u> |
| N. | 89 | 162 | 198 | 93 | 542 |

Table 5

Weapon Used By Type Of Justifiable Homicide (Percents)

| | <u>Civilian</u> | | <u>Police</u> | | <u>Total</u> |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | |
| Handgun | 64.0 | 80.9 | 83.3 | 84.9 | 79.9 |
| Rifle/ Firearm | 13.5 | 14.2 | 13.6 | 14.0 | 13.8 |
| Knives | 13.5 | 4.3 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 4.1 |
| <u>Other</u> | <u>9.0</u> | <u>0.6</u> | <u>1.5</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>2.2</u> |
| N | 89 | 162 | 198 | 93 | 542 |

Table 6

Locations By Type Of Justifiable Homicide (Percents)

| | <u>Civilian</u> | | <u>Police</u> | | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | <u>Attack</u> | <u>Crime</u> | |
| Public | | | | | |
| Inside | 16.0 | 26.1 | 3.0 | 10.2 | 12.9 |
| Public | | | | | |
| Outside | 41.3 | 32.1 | 66.1 | 65.7 | 51.9 |
| Home/ | | | | | |
| Residence | 37.8 | 38.3 | 24.7 | 20.5 | 30.2 |
| Other | 4.6 | 3.8 | 6.0 | 5.4 | 3.0 |
| N | 87 | 162 | 198 | 93 | 540 |

Missing= 2

REFERENCES

- Burrows, W. (1976). Vigilante!. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Culberson, W. (1990). Vigilantism: Political History of Private Power in America. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Dellios, H. (1995 February 12). L.A. In An Uproar Over Vigilantism. Chicago Tribune, p. 15 sec.1.
- Huston, T., Geis, G., & Wright, R. (1976). The Angry Samaritans. Psychology Today, 61-85.
- Kates, D. (1989). Firearms and Violence: Old Premises and Current Evidence. In T. Gurr (Ed.), Violence In America (pp.197-215). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Madison, A. (1973). Vigilantism In America. New York: Seabury Press.
- McGrath, H. & Williams, S. (1976). Why People Own Guns. Journal of Communication, 56-65.
- Pantaleoni, C. & Bigler, J. (1969). California Criminal Law. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Ratcliffe, J. (1966). The Good Samaritan And The Law. New York: Doubleday and Company.
- Riedel, M. (1995). California Homicide Data Set.
- Riedel, M. (1995). Questions And Answers About Murder. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Sheley, J. (1995). Criminology. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Skogan, W. (1989). Social Change And The Future Of Violent Crime. In T. Gurr (Ed.), Violence In America (pp.235-250).

Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Tucker, W. (1985). Vigilante: The Backlash Against Crime In America. New York: Stein and Day.

Van Beima, (1995, March 27). License To Conceal. Time, 27-29.

Wilson, B. (Producer). (1995, March 3). 20/20. New York: ABC.