

search warrant. It was during this episode that Fuhrman discovered the now-famous bloody glove.

But as Philip H. Corboy notes in the *Chicago Tribune* (Oct. 10, 1995), had it ruled for the defense, the bigoted and corrupt Fuhrman never would have become the state's star witness.

Indeed, writes Matthew Cooper in *The New Republic* (Oct. 23, 1995), "the biggest reforms ought to be aimed at the police, not juries. That Mark Fuhrman should have been banished from the Los Angeles Police Department is, by now, a cliché; what's less remarked upon is that rogue cops seem to have insinuated themselves into too many American police forces."

And as Randall Kennedy points out in *California Lawyer* (Nov. 1994): "To more credibly condemn defense attorneys who opportunistically play 'the race card' on behalf of black clients, we must prevent law enforcement authorities from depriving anyone of equal protection under the law."

Kennedy, a professor at Harvard Law School, condemns as "dangerous" and "prevalent" the conduct of black-dominated juries who refuse on principle to send fellow African-Americans to jail. This practice—wherein jurors base their decisions on variables other than the evidence and instructions of the judge—is known as "jury nullification." But, as Kennedy observes, "it is crucial to recognize that at least part of the impulse behind jury nullification stems from legitimate grievances."

And not all experts believe that jury nullification is inherently bad. While conceding that the practice is often abused, Jeffrey Abramson—a professor of politics at Brandeis University and author of *We, the Jury* (BasicBooks, 1994)—points out that it is nonetheless a "time-honored way of permitting juries to leaven the law with leniency. Putting pressure on jurors to convict against their conscience would seem to threaten the integrity of law far more seriously."

Abramson, writing in the *Report from the Institute for Philosophy & Public Policy* (Summer/Fall 1994), concludes: "The distrust of jury nullification is a succinct expression of the collapsed faith in the virtue of jurors. . . . One is left to wonder whether the rejection of jury nullification is not a rejection of the idea of the jury altogether."

—Miles Harvey

HEROES AND HOLY INNOCENTS

In portraying disabled people, Hollywood hasn't got a clue



THE BLIND GIRL AS HEROIC WIFE: AUDREY HEPBURN IN *WAIT UNTIL DARK* (1967).

Thanks to audio description and closed-captioning, blind and deaf moviegoers now are able to "see" and "hear" films. After a long struggle, people using wheelchairs are finding it easier to get into movie theaters. But once they're at the movies, people with disabilities rarely see true-to-life images of themselves.

Of course, Hollywood has presented unrealistic images of disabled people since its movie moguls first set up shop. Martin E. Norden, author of *The Cinema of Isolation: A History of Physical Disability in the Movies* (Rutgers University Press), writes that "the movie industry has perpetuated . . . stereotypes . . . so durable and pervasive that they have become mainstream society's perception of disabled people." De-meaning, patronizing stereotypes have marched across the silver screen for decades, from that sweet innocent Tiny Tim in *A Christmas Carol* to Quasimodo, the villainous hunchback in *The Hunchback of Notre Dame*, to the embittered blind veteran in *Scent of a Woman*

(1992) and the idiot savant in *Rain Man* (1988). Disabled people aren't cheering as this parade of superheroes, venomous villains, and helpless victims goes by.

San Francisco State University history professor Paul Longmore says, "These stereotypes present disabled people as tragic, pathetic figures: Such films as *Whose Life Is It Anyway?* (in which a man who has become quadriplegic begs to be allowed to kill himself) leave the audience thinking it's better to be dead than disabled." But disabled people today don't see themselves as symbols of evil, inspirational superheroes, or holy innocents (like that wise fool Forrest Gump). Though the disease-of-the-week flick still moves audiences to tears, most disabled filmgoers no longer view their lives as a two-hankie movie.

In the recent movie *Living in Oblivion*, a comedy about the making of a small-budget picture, a dwarf named Mr. Tito complains about his role in a dream scene. He feels that he's only been