

The zimmerman case



The Zimmerman Case has had its verdict yesterday and I would have written then, but I was busy building my thoughts. What I should cover first is why the Zimmerman Case is significant. It is not significant because of race, or the right to defend one's self. In defense of my position on the race aspect, the media has tried to portray Zimmerman as white, when, in fact he is Hispanic or as my wife is adamant about, Latino. Apparently, you can't call Hispanics Hispanics any more and you have to call them Latino.

Ok, sure fine I don't really care what people want to be called; it has no bearing to me on the individual other than personal preference. So, if the media is not really sure what race Zimmerman is, the issue of race becomes moot, but it does show that there are other motivations in doing so as someone's race is a pretty big way of describing an individual to the public. I suspect that this has more to do with the Immigration Issue than race despite the media is trying to make be seen that way. Showing Latinos as white would go a long way toward naturalizing immigrants in the public's mind.

The right to defend one's self, is not an issue either, in that it is a personal responsibility to do so. Following someone does not justify aggression if that person is acting within a prescribed and legal role, in this case, as a member of the community watch. They say Martin was just going out for Skittles and some sort of drink and that was all he had on him when he was being followed out of the area by Zimmerman. If he was going out to get these items, then why did he have these items on him when he was leaving. This seems suspect to me, but actually has little bearing on the point I am trying to make with this.

The issue here isn't if Zimmerman should have been arrested, he should not have. It is also not if Zimmerman had the legal right to shoot and kill Martin; he did. Martin acted as the aggressor and forced Zimmerman in to a physical battle, and Zimmerman, in reacting to the battle, did not go for the gun first. He used the gun after Martin used weapon on him (banging his head on to the ground; I have had this happen to me and I have had to do it to others; The ground is most definitely something that can be used as a weapon). The shot was fired, upwards and in to the front of Martin, therefore, the killing was justified.

The only real issue that I had with this was if Zimmerman waited too long, but to that end, I wasn't there and so I have no right to an opinion on the judgement concerning the time frame between actual use of the ground as a weapon and the use of a gun. The issue here isn't, as many people want to believe, if the trial was justified. This should have had an investigation in to the shooting, and of that, there is no question, but it was only to justify if the shooting was legal or not, not to determine guilt of Zimmerman or Martin which the media seems to have confused, but the real issue here is if it was a fair trial.

The concept of justice is that justice be fair and impartial. The Executive Branch of the government represents the justice system within the United States. The Executive Branch, when considering the implications of justice, has to see things from all points of view and recognize the rights of all parties concerned with the verdict, ie the prosecutor and the defendant, while ignoring all unaffected parties even if they feel they are a stakeholder

(parents, relatives and friends). The actual verdict has to be fair within a reasonable consideration of peers.

Those peers form the basis for the jury and the jury is chosen by the prosecution, therefore controlling, to some degree the legitimacy of the defense as well as the impartiality of the verdict as the intent of the jurors are to put themselves within the mindset of the defense, but from what is considered a reasonable state of mind. The biggest consideration here has to be that the argument must be presented in such a way as though neither race nor gender should have any consideration on the defense at the time of the crime. If that there is, in fact, a finding that race or gender is a factor, considerations should be made.

In the argument of self-defense, the first consideration that should be made is was the defense actually in sort of danger and that danger being loss of life or permanent injury. In choosing women, the prosecution was seeking the sympathy angle for the minor who died as a result of the action resulting in the trial. The biggest factor that is being ignored with the media is that the jurors had to put themselves in, not the position of Martin, but of Zimmerman and therefore Zimmerman acting within his role of public defender (the Community Watch, in this case).

This reversal of roles from what the public considers as fair is what, ultimately, destroyed the prosecution's case. Arguing the case without considerations of race or gender forced the women to wonder what they would have been forced to do in Zimmerman's role within that of public defender. To that end, they had to ask themselves, would they have been

afraid and would they have had the responsibility to defend themselves, not necessarily with lethal force, but by any means necessary.

That they would not have necessarily put themselves in to that position had no actual bearing on the subject as that personal choice was removed for them, hence impartiality. The factor of this being a fair trial, is decreed by a panel of peers, initially chosen at random, but decided by the very people trying to prosecute the case. That they choose women, become immaterial as the prosecution has its own agenda from that of the defense. The issue with this wasn't if the case was not fair, or that the verdict was unfair as the situation presented, described a reasonable justification of fear in the situation of Zimmerman.

It showed that an assault with deadly force was committed by the documentation collaborated by witnesses. It showed that the use of deadly force was legal and it showed that Zimmerman showed restraint in using that deadly force by the action of deadly weapon (the ground) putting Zimmerman's life in actual danger as well as the fact that Martin did not disengage his ' supposed attacker' but actually escalated the fight and did not seek to flee.

In the end, this was a fair verdict, in that anyone in Zimmerman's position would have used deadly force as long as you do not make any considerations toward race or gender, ie, had it been a woman in Zimmerman's place, she would have done the same exact thing, but again, this is not the real issue. With this case, the head of the Executive Branch, the head of the justice system within the country, is seeking to show personal bias, and is basing

that bias upon race and not reasonable actions within the situation itself as shown by the trial itself.