

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910451877003321
Autore	Ancheta Angelo N. <1960->
Titolo	Scientific evidence and equal protection of the law [[electronic resource] /] / Angelo N. Ancheta
Pubbl/distr/stampa	New Brunswick, N.J., : Rutgers University Press, c2006
ISBN	1-283-59870-1 9786613911155 0-8135-3931-5
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (208 p.)
Disciplina	342.7308/7
Soggetti	Discrimination - Law and legislation - United States Equality before the law - United States Discrimination - Research - United States Equality before the law - Research - United States Science and law Electronic books.
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references (p. 179-183) and index.
Nota di contenuto	Science and law, ideology, and inequality -- Desegregation and "modern authority" -- Science and equal protection -- Proving discrimination -- Science, advocacy, and fact finding -- Directions and conclusions.
Sommario/riassunto	Scientific and social scientific evidence has informed judicial decisions and the making of constitutional law for decades, but for much of U.S. history it has also served as a rhetorical device to justify inequality. It is only in recent years that scientific and statistical research has helped redress discrimination—but not without controversy. Scientific Evidence and Equal Protection of the Law provides unique insights into the judicial process and scientific inquiry by examining major decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court, civil rights advocacy, and the nature of science itself. Angelo Ancheta discusses leading equal protection cases such as Brown v. Board of Education and recent litigation involving race-related affirmative action, gender inequality, and discrimination based on sexual orientation. He also examines less prominent, but equally

compelling cases, including *McCleskey v. Kemp*, which involved statistical evidence that a state's death penalty was disproportionately used when victims were white and defendants were black, and *Castaneda v. Partida*, which established key standards of evidence in addressing the exclusion of Latinos from grand jury service. For each case, Ancheta explores the tensions between scientific findings and constitutional values.
