

THIRD EDITION

THE DEATH PENALTY

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES, COMMENTARIES,
AND CASE BRIEFS

SCOTT VOLLUM // ROLANDO V. DEL CARMEN
DURANT FRANTZEN // CLAUDIA SAN MIGUEL
KELLY CHEESEMAN



The Death Penalty

Constitutional Issues, Commentaries, and Case Briefs

This page intentionally left blank

The Death Penalty

Constitutional Issues, Commentaries, and Case Briefs

Third Edition

Scott Vollum

University of Minnesota, Duluth

Rolando V. del Carmen

Sam Houston State University

Durant Frantzen

Texas A&M University, San Antonio

Claudia San Miguel

Texas A&M International University

Kelly Cheeseman

Messiah College

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2005 by Anderson Publishing

Published 2015 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge

711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017, USA

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Acquiring Editor: Pam Chester

Editorial Project Manager: Ellen S. Boyne

Project Manager: Priya Kumaraguruparan

Designer: Russell Purdy

Third Edition: Copyright © 2015 Taylor & Francis. All rights reserved.

Second Edition: Copyright © 2008, 2005 Matthew Bender & Company Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group Newark, NJ

No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Notices

No responsibility is assumed by the publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use of operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein.

Practitioners and researchers must always rely on their own experience and knowledge in evaluating and using any information, methods, compounds, or experiments described herein. In using such information or methods they should be mindful of their own safety and the safety of others, including parties for whom they have a professional responsibility.

Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

This book and the individual contributions contained in it are protected under copyright by the Publisher (other than as may be noted herein).

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The death penalty / Scott Vollum, Rolando V. del Carmen, Durant Frantzen, Claudia San Miguel, Kelly Cheeseman.—Third edition. p. cm.

1. Capital punishment—United States. I. Vollum, Scott, 1970- author. II. Del Carmen, Rolando V. author. III. Frantzen, Durant, author.

KF9227.C2D4117 2014

345.73'0773—dc23

2014001186

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 978-1-4557-7633-7 (pbk)

We dedicate this edition to our co-author Kelly Cheeseman. We will remember her sense of humor, dedication to her students, and her passion for her profession. Kelly will be greatly missed.

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

Preface to the Third Edition	xvii
Preface to the Second Edition	xix
Preface and Introduction to the First Edition	xxi
About the Authors	xxiii
Acknowledgments	xxv
Online Resources	xxvii
Table of Cases	xxix
Top Ten Most Significant Death Penalty Cases	xxxv
 CHAPTER 1 The Death Penalty: Past and Present	1
I. Introduction	1
II. A Retrospective Analysis of the Death Penalty	2
A. The Colonial Period.....	2
B. The Age of Enlightenment and the Early Movement to Abolish the Death Penalty	3
1. From Europe to the Colonies: The Impact of Enlightenment.....	3
2. Changes in the Death Penalty from 1790–1950.....	4
III. Early Supreme Court Decisions on the Death Penalty	6
A. <i>Wilkerson v. Utah</i> : Death by Firing Squad.....	7
B. <i>In re Kemmler</i> : Death by Electrocution	8
C. <i>Louisiana ex rel. Francis v. Resweber</i> : The Constitutionality of Being Executed Twice	10
D. Additional Changes in the Death Penalty Prior to 1972	12
IV. The Current Status of the Death Penalty in the United States	13
A. Retentionist versus Abolitionist States.....	13
B. A Decline in Death Sentences and Executions	14
C. Recent Supreme Court and Circuit Court Rulings	16
V. In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	20
VI. Conclusion	21
Cases Briefed in Chapter 1	23
Case Briefs	23
<i>Wilkerson v. Utah</i> , 99 U.S. 130 (1878)	23
<i>In re Kemmler</i> , 136 U.S. 436 (1890).....	24
<i>Louisiana ex rel. Francis v. Resweber</i> , 329 U.S. 459 (1947).....	26
Key Terms.....	26
Critical Thinking Questions.....	27
Internet Resources.....	27

CHAPTER 2	The Foundation Cases: <i>Furman v. Georgia</i> and <i>Gregg v. Georgia</i>	29
I.	Introduction	29
II.	<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> (1972): The Death Penalty Is Unconstitutional	30
A.	The Background	30
B.	The Facts	30
C.	The Majority Opinions	30
D.	The Dissenting Opinions	32
III.	<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> (1976): The Death Penalty Is Constitutional in Some Cases	33
A.	The Background	33
B.	The Facts	34
C.	The Majority Opinions	34
D.	The Dissenting Opinions	36
IV.	In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	37
V.	Conclusion	37
	Cases Briefed in Chapter 2	38
	Case Briefs	38
	<i>Furman v. Georgia</i> , 408 U.S. 238 (1972)	38
	<i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> , 428 U.S. 153 (1976)	39
	Key Terms	41
	Critical Thinking Questions	41
	Internet Resources	42
CHAPTER 3	Race and the Death Penalty	43
I.	Introduction	43
II.	Bias in Death Penalty Cases and Jury Selection in Capital Proceedings	44
III.	Legislative Responses to Discrimination in Capital Proceedings	45
A.	Federal Response: The Proposed Racial Justice Act and Its Failure	45
B.	State Responses: Racial Justice Acts and Examination of Statistical Disparities	46
IV.	The Legal Community: An Assessment of Prosecutors and Defense Attorneys	51
A.	District Attorneys	51
B.	Defense Attorneys	55
V.	The Jury: A Biased Bunch or Victims of Misinformation?	57
A.	Jury Selection	58
B.	Peremptory Challenges	60
VI.	In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	63
VII.	Conclusion	64
	Cases Briefed in Chapter 3	65
	Case Briefs	65
	<i>Batson v. Kentucky</i> , 476 U.S. 79 (1986)	65
	<i>McCleskey v. Kemp</i> , 481 U.S. 279 (1987)	67

<i>Turner v. Murray</i> , 476 U.S. 28 (1986)	68
<i>Miller-El v. Dretke</i> , 545 U.S. 231 (2005).....	69
<i>Snyder v. Louisiana</i> , 552 U.S. 472 (2008)	71
Key Terms.....	72
Critical Thinking Questions.....	73
Internet Resources.....	73
CHAPTER 4 The Mentally Impaired and the Death Penalty	75
I. Introduction.....	75
II. Supreme Court Cases: Past and Present.....	76
A. A Starting Point: <i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> (1989)	76
B. Executing the Mentally Retarded Is Unconstitutional:	
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> (2002)	76
C. Cases After <i>Atkins</i>	77
III. Issues with Mental Impairment in Capital Cases	79
A. Definition of Mental Retardation/Developmental Disability	79
B. The Fear of Faking	86
C. Mental Retardation versus Mental Illness.....	87
IV. Insanity and the Death Penalty.....	88
A. Insanity: Different From Other Mental Impairments	88
B. Reasons for Not Executing the Insane	89
1. Failure to Achieve Penological Goals	89
a. Deterrence	89
b. Retribution	89
2. Theological	90
3. Humanity	90
C. Mental Competence and the Death Penalty.....	90
V. In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	92
VI. Conclusion	93
Cases Briefed in Chapter 4.....	94
Case Briefs.....	95
<i>Ford v. Wainwright</i> , 477 U.S. 399 (1986).....	95
<i>Penry v. Lynaugh</i> , 492 U.S. 302 (1989).....	96
<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> , 536 U.S. 304 (2002)	97
<i>Singleton v. Norris</i> , 319 F.3d 1018 (8TH CIR. 2003).....	99
<i>Tennard v. Dretke</i> , 542 U.S. 274 (2004)	100
<i>Panetti v. Quarterman</i> , 551 U.S. 930 (2007)	101
<i>Bobby v. Bies</i> , 556 U.S. 825 (2009)	102
<i>Ryan v. Gonzales/Tibbals v. Carter</i> , 568 U.S. ____ (2013)	103
Key Terms.....	104
Critical Thinking Questions.....	105
Internet Resources.....	105

CHAPTER 5	The Death Penalty for Juveniles.....	107
I.	Introduction.....	107
II.	<i>Thompson v. Oklahoma</i> : Executing Juveniles Age 15 and Younger Is Unconstitutional.....	108
	A. Facts	108
	B. The Court's Holding	109
	C. Reasoning.....	109
III.	<i>Stanford v. Kentucky</i> : Executing Juveniles Ages 16 to 17 Is Constitutional.....	110
	A. Facts	110
	B. The Court's Holding.....	110
	C. Reasoning.....	111
IV.	<i>Atkins v. Virginia</i> : A Case Involving the Mentally Retarded, But a Prelude to the Abolition of the Juvenile Death Penalty.....	111
	A. The Issue and Holding.....	111
	B. Significance of <i>Atkins</i> for the Juvenile Death Penalty: The Missouri Supreme Court's Decision in <i>Simmons v. Roper</i>	112
V.	<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> : The Supreme Court Declares the Execution of Juveniles Unconstitutional.....	113
	A. Facts	113
	B. The Holding	114
	C. Majority Opinion	114
	D. Dissenting Opinions.....	116
VI.	Evolving Standards and Future Issues Concerning the Sentencing of Juveniles..	118
VII.	In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	120
VIII.	Conclusion	122
	Cases Briefed in Chapter 5.....	123
	Case Briefs	123
	<i>Thompson v. Oklahoma</i> , 487 U.S. 815 (1988)	123
	<i>Stanford v. Kentucky</i> , 492 U.S. 361 (1989).....	124
	<i>Roper v. Simmons</i> , 543 U.S. 551 (2005)	125
	Key Terms.....	127
	Critical Thinking Questions.....	127
	Internet Resources.....	128
CHAPTER 6	Juries, Jurors, and the Death Penalty	129
I.	Introduction.....	129
II.	The Ultimate Responsibility: Bifurcated Trials and the Role of Capital Juries ...	130
	A. Jury Override: Judges Trumping Juries	131
	B. <i>Ring v. Arizona</i> (2002): The End of Judicial Sentencing in Capital Cases?	132
III.	Jury Instructions: Guided Discretion in Capital Cases	134
	A. Guilt Phase: Lesser Included Offenses	135
	B. Penalty Phase: Future Dangerousness and Parole Eligibility	136

IV. Jury Selection in Capital Cases: Death Qualification.....	138
V. In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	140
VI. Conclusion	141
Cases Briefed in Chapter 6.....	142
Case Briefs	143
<i>Witherspoon v. Illinois</i> , 391 U.S. 510 (1968).....	143
<i>Beck v. Alabama</i> , 447 U.S. 625 (1980)	144
<i>Lockhart v. McCree</i> , 476 U.S. 162 (1986)	145
<i>Mills v. Maryland</i> , 486 U.S. 367 (1988)	146
<i>Morgan v. Illinois</i> , 504 U.S. 719 (1992)	147
<i>Simmons v. South Carolina</i> , 512 U.S. 154 (1994)	148
<i>Weeks v. Angelone</i> , 528 U.S. 225 (2000).....	150
<i>Ring v. Arizona</i> , 536 U.S. 584 (2002)	151
<i>Uttecht v. Brown</i> , 551 U.S. 1 (2007).....	152
Key Terms.....	153
Critical Thinking Questions.....	154
Internet Resources.....	154
CHAPTER 7 The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel and the Death Penalty	155
I. Introduction	155
II. <i>Strickland</i> : A Two-Part Test for Deciding Ineffective Assistance Claims	156
III. Ineffective Assistance of Counsel and the AEDPA.....	157
IV. Representation for Indigent Capital Defendants	161
V. Defense Counsel's Duty to Investigate and Defend	162
A. ABA Guidelines: A New Model for Conducting Mitigation Investigations	164
B. Recent Cases Challenging the Adequacy of Mitigation Defense Work	165
VI. Attorney-Client Negotiations.....	169
VII. In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	174
VIII. Conclusion	175
Cases Briefed in Chapter 7	176
Case Briefs	178
<i>Strickland v. Washington</i> , 466 U.S. 688 (1984).....	178
<i>Lockhart v. Fretwell</i> , 506 U.S. 364 (1993)	179
<i>Mickens v. Taylor</i> , 535 U.S. 162 (2002)	180
<i>Bell v. Cone</i> , 535 U.S. 685 (2002)	181
<i>Wiggins v. Smith</i> , 539 U.S. 510 (2003)	182
<i>Florida v. Nixon</i> , 543 U.S. 175 (2004).....	183
<i>Rompilla v. Beard</i> , 545 U.S. 374 (2005)	184
<i>Schriro v. Landrigan</i> , 550 U.S. 465 (2007).....	186
<i>Wood v. Allen</i> , 558 U.S. 290 (2010).....	187
<i>Maples v. Thomas</i> , 565 U.S. ____ (2012).....	189

Key Terms.....	190
Critical Thinking Questions.....	191
Internet Resources.....	191
CHAPTER 8 Due Process and the Death Penalty	193
I. Introduction.....	193
II. Guided Discretion, Juries, and Due Process	194
A. Due Process Requires Consideration of Mitigating Evidence	194
B. Due Process Requires Opportunity to Rebut State's Evidence	195
C. Future Dangerousness and the Right to Due Process	196
D. Due Process and Third-Party Guilt	197
E. Due Process and the Issue of Shackling.....	198
F. Due Process and the Importance of the Jury Verdict.....	199
III. Admissibility of Psychiatric Examinations	200
IV. The <i>Brady</i> Rule and the Right to Due Process.....	202
A. The Disclosure Duty.....	203
B. Recent <i>Brady</i> Challenges in Death Penalty Cases.....	203
V. In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	206
VI. Conclusion	207
Cases Briefed in Chapter 8.....	207
Case Briefs	208
<i>Gardner v. Florida</i> , 430 U.S. 349 (1977)	208
<i>Estelle v. Smith</i> , 451 U.S. 454 (1981)	209
<i>Eddings v. Oklahoma</i> , 455 U.S. 104 (1982).....	210
<i>Gray v. Netherland</i> , 518 U.S. 152 (1996)	211
<i>Sattazahn v. Pennsylvania</i> , 537 U.S. 101 (2003)	212
<i>Deck v. Missouri</i> , 544 U.S. 622 (2005)	213
<i>Holmes v. South Carolina</i> , 547 U.S. 319 (2006)	215
<i>Cone v. Bell</i> , 556 U.S. 449 (2009)	216
<i>Connick v. Thompson</i> , 563 U.S. ____ (2011)	217
Key Terms.....	218
Critical Thinking Questions.....	219
Internet Resources.....	219
CHAPTER 9 Aggravating and Mitigating Factors in Death Penalty Cases	221
I. Introduction.....	221
II. <i>Gregg v. Georgia</i> and the Emerging Importance of Aggravating and Mitigating Factors.....	222
III. Aggravating Factors.....	229
A. General Procedural Requirements.....	229
B. Vagueness and Guided (or Unguided) Discretion	229

C. The Special Case of Victim Impact Evidence	231
D. The Special Case of Future Dangerousness.....	232
IV. Mitigating Factors.....	233
A. General Procedural Requirements.....	234
B. Evidence Allowed.....	235
C. Jury Instructions.....	236
V. In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	237
VI. Conclusion	238
Cases Briefed in Chapter 9.....	239
Case Briefs.....	240
<i>Woodson v. North Carolina</i> , 428 U.S. 280 (1976).....	240
<i>Presnell v. Georgia</i> , 439 U.S. 14 (1978).....	241
<i>Lockett v. Ohio</i> , 438 U.S. 586 (1978).....	242
<i>Barefoot v. Estelle</i> , 463 U.S. 880 (1983)	243
<i>Lewis v. Jeffers</i> , 497 U.S. 764 (1990)	244
<i>McKoy v. North Carolina</i> , 494 U.S. 433 (1990).....	245
<i>Payne v. Tennessee</i> , 501 U.S. 808 (1991).....	246
<i>Kansas v. Marsh</i> , 548 U.S. 163 (2006)	248
<i>Brewer v. Quarterman</i> , 550 U.S. 286 (2007).....	249
Key Terms.....	250
Critical Thinking Questions.....	250
Internet Resources.....	251

CHAPTER 10 Appeals, Habeas Corpus, and the Death Penalty..... 253

I. Introduction.....	253
II. The Appellate Process	254
III. The Great Writ.....	255
A. History.....	255
B. The Battle over Successive Petitions and the Road to the AEDPA.....	257
1. The Good Faith/Bad Faith Rule	257
2. New-Claim Successive Petitions Rule	258
3. The Impact of <i>Gregg</i> on Successive Petitions.....	258
C. The AEDPA	260
IV. Current Consequences of the AEDPA	262
A. Current Debate over Successive Petitions	262
B. Statute of Limitations and Actual Innocence.....	265
1. Statute of Limitations.....	265
2. Actual Innocence	267
V. Habeas Corpus and 42 U.S.C. §1983	270
VI. In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	273

VII. Conclusion	275
Cases Briefed in Chapter 10.....	276
Case Briefs	277
<i>Rose v. Lundy</i> , 455 U.S. 509 (1982).....	277
<i>McCleskey v. Zant</i> , 499 U.S. 467 (1991)	279
<i>Sawyer v. Whitley</i> , 505 U.S. 333 (1992)	280
<i>Herrera v. Collins</i> , 506 U.S. 390 (1993).....	281
<i>Stewart v. Martinez-Villareal</i> , 523 U.S. 637 (1998)	283
<i>Felker v. Turpin</i> , 518 U.S. 651 (1996)	284
<i>Nelson v. Campbell</i> , 541 U.S. 637 (2004).....	285
<i>House v. Bell</i> , 547 U.S. 518 (2006).....	287
<i>Lawrence v. Florida</i> , 549 U.S. 327 (2007)	288
<i>Skinner v. Switzer</i> , 562 U.S. ____ (2011)	289
Key Terms.....	290
Critical Thinking Questions.....	290
Internet Resources.....	291

CHAPTER 11 Evolving Standards of Decency and the Eighth Amendment's Ban on Cruel and Unusual Punishment..... 293

I. Introduction	293
II. Methods of Execution.....	294
A. Modern Execution Methods (Lethal Injection).....	295
B. Botched and Failed Executions	299
III. Proportionality of Punishment.....	300
A. Types of Crimes	301
B. Degree of Involvement in Killing	302
C. Proportionality Review	303
IV. The Role of Public Opinion	303
V. International Perspectives.....	306
VI. States Repealing Death Penalty Statutes.....	308
VII. In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	310
VIII. Conclusion	310
Cases Briefed in Chapter 11.....	311
Case Briefs	312
<i>Pulley v. Harris</i> , 465 U.S. 37 (1984)	312
<i>Tison v. Arizona</i> , 481 U.S. 137 (1987).....	313
<i>Baze v. Rees</i> , 553 U.S. 35 (2008)	314
<i>Kennedy v. Louisiana</i> , 554 U.S. 407 (2008)	316
Key Terms.....	318
Critical Thinking Questions.....	318
Internet Resources.....	319

CHAPTER 12 Other Issues, Trends, and the Future of the Death Penalty.....	321
I. Introduction.....	321
II. Penological Justifications for Punishment and the Death Penalty	323
A. Retribution and the Death Penalty	324
B. Deterrence and the Death Penalty	325
C. Incapacitation and the Death Penalty	327
D. Justifying the Death Penalty: The Supreme Court	328
III. Flaws in the Administration of the Death Penalty.....	330
IV. Current Death Penalty Trends in the United States.....	336
V. The Future of the Death Penalty in the United States	339
Key Terms.....	340
Critical Thinking Questions.....	340
Internet Resources.....	341
Index	343

This page intentionally left blank

Preface to the Third Edition

Much has changed in the legal world of the death penalty since this book was first conceived in 2003. Over this span of 10 years there have been more than 500 executions and 1,175 new death sentences. During this period the United States hit and surpassed the 1,000-execution post-*Furman* milestone (1,347 executions as of October 1, 2013). But during that same time, the rates of death sentences and executions have declined precipitously. Six states have abolished the death penalty—five since the last edition of this book—and several others are considering doing so. There also have been 42 exonerations of individuals on death row who were found to be innocent, including six due to DNA testing.

By all measures, the popularity and use of the death penalty is on the decline. Increasing awareness of the flaws and failures of the death penalty system, as well as increasing concerns about the financial costs of the death penalty, seem to have played a role in this decline, as has the now virtually universal availability of true life sentences. That being said, we still remain one of the most prolific nations in terms of executions and the only Western nation to carry out executions at all. Furthermore, though it seems to be occurring in only a shrinking minority of jurisdictions, the death penalty continues in earnest in some states and localities. Texas surpassed 500 executions this year; states such as North Carolina, which has had no executions since 2006, are taking measures to revitalize and expand the death penalty and speed up executions. The death penalty remains a criminal sanction that presents us with many contradictions and controversies and increasingly evokes ambivalence among lawmakers and the public alike.

Violence in the United States has also declined significantly over the last decade, though it may be hard to tell given that we are presented with increasingly stark images of violence on a seemingly daily basis. Highly publicized cases of extreme and mass violence seem to have proliferated in the last few years, often drawing attention as capital or potentially capital cases. Just in the last two years, there has been a terrorist bombing at the Boston Marathon as well as twelve mass shootings, including a particularly horrific massacre of young children in a grade school in Newtown, Connecticut. Though many of these violent acts end with the offender's suicide, in cases in which the offenders live, such as the man who opened fire in a Colorado theater killing 12 people and injuring another 58, or one of the men who set off the bombs in Boston, the death penalty enters the public consciousness almost immediately. Both of these cases are still in progress at the time of this writing, so it is unknown whether they will result in death sentences. But there is no denying that cases such as these challenge us to think very hard about violence and killing and, by extension, the death penalty. When we are faced with horrors such as these, it is easy to understand why the death penalty persists. It is also easy to understand why the death penalty often evokes great emotion and conflict in our society.

The death penalty remains a hotly debated topic in the United States and a potent public policy in certain locations. In much of the United States, the public continues to support it and, in some cases, demand it. However, it also continues to be a lightning rod of sorts, drawing attention to many of the problems and controversies within criminal justice. Issues of cost, public safety, deterrence, retribution, justice, wrongful conviction, rehabilitation, redemption, race, and discrimination are illuminated through the magnifying glass that is the death penalty. As such, we believe that an understanding and analysis of the legal and constitutional issues surrounding the death penalty serve the broader objective of better understanding the criminal justice system. It is our hope that, throughout this book,

we have served this objective and that we have provided insight into the often complex and confusing world of the U.S. Supreme Court and its death penalty jurisprudence.

In this revised third edition, we have again maintained the overall structure and much of the content from the prior two editions. But there is also much that is new and improved. We present eight new case briefs and discuss many more new cases throughout the book, recalibrating our commentary on the major constitutional issues in line with the ever-evolving jurisprudence. We also added to the coverage of important peripheral legal and social issues, such as racial disparities in the criminal justice system, life sentences for juveniles, public opinion, wrongful convictions, and state trends in abolition of the death penalty.

Over the last five years, Supreme Court activity in terms of death penalty cases did not take on the same pace or volume that it had in previous decades. However, the legal developments, issues, and challenges—many of which have stemmed from prior Supreme Court decisions—have flourished and will likely continue to spur further involvement by the Court for the foreseeable future.

Scott Vollum, Ph.D.
Duluth, MN
October 1, 2013

The case briefs added in the third edition are:

Chapter 4: The Mentally Impaired and the Death Penalty

Bobby v. Bies (2009): Reassessment of mental retardation for the determination of eligibility for the death penalty.

Ryan v. Gonzales/Tibbals v. Carter (2013): Competence to assist counsel during appellate processes.

Chapter 7: The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel and the Death Penalty

Wood v. Allen (2010): Counsel's failure to present evidence of mental retardation in capital mitigation.

Maples v. Thomas (2012): Counsel's failure to meet a filing deadline and "cause" to excuse a consequent procedural default.

Chapter 8: Due Process and the Death Penalty

Cone v. Bell (2009): Procedural default of habeas corpus claim following a lack of proper review by a state court; application of the *Brady* rule when evidence was suppressed.

Connick v. Thompson (2011): Section 1983 lawsuit based on wrongful conviction and establishing liability of state agents.

Chapter 10: Appeals, Habeas Corpus, and the Death Penalty

Stewart v. Martinez-Villareal (1998): The AEDPA's successive petition restriction and the filing of successive habeas corpus petitions when previous petitions were dismissed as premature.

Skinner v. Switzer (2011): The use of Section 1983 lawsuits to compel DNA testing in claims of actual innocence.

Preface to the Second Edition

The death penalty, in the context of the United States Constitution and the Supreme Court, is constantly evolving. In this, the second edition of *The Death Penalty: Constitutional Issues, Commentaries, and Case Briefs*, we try to reflect this evolution by presenting the most recent Supreme Court cases and the issues inherent in them that have occurred in the years since we published the first edition of this book. As I write this preface, we have just come off the longest hiatus in executions since the death penalty was reinstated following the Supreme Court decision in *Gregg v. Georgia*. This informal moratorium resulted from the Court's decision to consider the constitutionality of the execution method of lethal injection. The case was *Baze v. Rees*, one of the most recent among the new cases analyzed and discussed in this book, and the Court held that lethal injection is a constitutionally permissible method of execution. The first execution since September 25, 2007, was carried out on May 6, 2008, when William Earl Lynd was executed in Georgia by lethal injection at 7:51 P.M. As I write this, Mark Schwab is scheduled to be executed by lethal injection in Florida for the rape and murder of an 11-year-old boy; it will be the tenth execution of the year. There are more than 20 executions scheduled to take place over the coming months.

Over the last several years executions have slowed, but the Supreme Court's consideration of constitutional issues pertaining to them certainly has not. During the four years since the first edition of this book was published, the Supreme Court has made significant decisions about, among other things, racial disparity in capital jury selection, mental impairment as a mitigating factor in capital sentencing, standards of effectiveness of legal representation for capital defendants, jury instructions pertaining to aggravating and mitigating evidence, evidence of actual innocence in habeas corpus petitions, and, most recently, the constitutionality of lethal injection as a method of execution and the constitutionality of the death penalty in cases of the rape of a child when the victim is not murdered. The makeup of the Court has also changed in the years since this book was first published. Chief Justice William H. Rehnquist has been succeeded by new Chief Justice John G. Roberts, and Justice Sandra Day O'Connor has been succeeded by Justice Samuel Anthony Alito Jr. Justice Alito's first death penalty opinion was in *Holmes v. South Carolina* (briefed in Chapter 8), and Chief Justice Roberts has written several opinions in death penalty cases and penned the plurality opinion in *Baze v. Rees* (briefed in Chapter 11).

Although the structure and much of the content in this second edition remains the same as in the original edition, there is much that is new and revised. There are 17 new cases briefed and many more new cases discussed throughout the book. The added case briefs are:

Chapter 3: Racial Discrimination and the Death Penalty

Miller El v. Dretke (2005): Racially disparate questioning in jury selection

Snyder v. Louisiana (2008): Exclusion of prospective black jurors without racially neutral explanations

Chapter 4: The Mentally Impaired and the Death Penalty

Singleton v. Norris (2003): Forcefully medicating an inmate for competency in order to be executed

Tennard v. Dretke (2004): Mental retardation as mitigating factor when unrelated to crime

Panetti v. Quarterman (2007): Mental competency to be executed

Chapter 6: Juries, Jurors, and the Death Penalty

Uttecht v. Brown (2007): Trial court judge's role in death qualification

Chapter 7: The Right to Effective Assistance of Counsel and the Death Penalty

Rompilla v. Beard (2005): Counsel's failure to make a reasonable effort to contest evidence supporting a death sentence

Schiro v. Landrigan (2007): Defendant's interference with counsel's strategy and the presentation of mitigating evidence

Chapter 8: Due Process and the Death Penalty

Deck v. Missouri (2005): Shackling of a capital defendant during sentencing phase of trial

Holmes v. South Carolina (2006): Introduction of third-party guilt evidence

Chapter 9: Aggravating and Mitigating Factors in Death Penalty Cases

Kansas v. Marsh (2006): Death sentence when aggravating and mitigating factors are equal in weight

Brewer v. Quarterman (2007): Statutory restrictions on jury instructions regarding the consideration of mitigating factors

Chapter 10: Appeals, Habeas Corpus, and the Death Penalty

Nelson v. Campbell (2004): Right to bring a lawsuit challenging the method of execution

House v. Bell (2007): Habeas corpus appeals on the grounds of actual innocence

Lawrence v. Florida (2007): Suspension of AEDPA's statute of limitations while awaiting habeas corpus decision

Chapter 11: Evolving Standards of Decency and the Eighth Amendment's Ban on Cruel and Unusual Punishment

Baze v. Rees (2008): Constitutionality of lethal injection as a method of execution

Kennedy v. Louisiana (2008): Constitutionality of the death penalty for nonhomicide cases of sexual assault against a child

Only one case brief has been removed (the 2003 case of *Miller-El v. Cockrell* has been replaced by the more recent 2005 case of *Miller-El v. Dretke*). Discussion surrounding past cases and the rich history and lineage of Supreme Court decisions in capital cases has been preserved but has been supplemented by numerous new decisions and updated information on the many related death penalty issues. In the end, we believe that the second edition of this book significantly strengthens and bolsters what was already a valuable and unique book and offers the reader the most comprehensive and up-to-date collection and consideration of constitutional issues and Supreme Court decisions pertaining to the death penalty.

Scott Vollum, Ph.D.
Harrisonburg, Virginia
July 1, 2008

Preface and Introduction to the First Edition

Death as a form of punishment was used in the United States even before the American colonies became a republic. For a long time, the death penalty was—and still is—an option available to the state when dealing with serious offenders, and the public accepted it as such without many legal or political challenges. In recent times, however, issues have arisen concerning the constitutionality and wisdom of this ultimate sanction. This has spawned numerous court cases, decided over several decades, that have sought to declare this form of punishment unconstitutional, or that attempted to refine and polish some of its features. These cases and what they say are the focus of this book.

Constitutionality and the wisdom of imposing the death penalty are two separate issues, although they tend to be treated as one in some quarters. Constitutionality is an issue addressed and resolved by the courts, while the wisdom of imposing it is a political question to be resolved by political decision-makers who represent the public. This book focuses on the constitutionality issue. Whether the death penalty is wise or desirable as a form of punishment is for political entities to eventually determine and resolve.

Numerous books and articles have been written on the death penalty. This book seeks to add a legal dimension to existing literature by bringing together all the major cases decided by the United States Supreme Court on the death penalty. The first case decided by the Court on the death penalty was *Wilkerson v. Utah* in 1878. The cut-off date for the cases briefed in this book was July 1, 2013. A total of 72 cases are briefed here. As in any project in which choices are involved, subjectivity played a role in determining which cases from among the many decided by the Court are sufficiently important to justify inclusion among the briefed cases. That determination, including the “Top Ten Most Significant Death Penalty Cases,” was made by the authors based on their familiarity over the years with death penalty cases.

THE BOOK’S PURPOSE AND AUDIENCE

This text is written to fill a need for a book that gathers and synthesizes all the legal issues related to the death penalty, bringing together both fundamental presentation and discussion of these issues with short case briefs of key Supreme Court cases. There is no such book available to the general public at present, except perhaps those used in law schools and in full case form. It classifies the death penalty cases according to legal issues, provides a commentary on the various subtopics, and then presents legal materials in an easy-to-digest and understandable form. The main audiences of the book are undergraduates and criminal justice practitioners. The book should also prove useful, however, for anyone who has an interest in the legal issues surrounding the death penalty.

THE BOOK’S CONTENT

The book consists of 12 chapters, subclassified into four parts.

Part I (Chapters 1 and 2) introduces the history of the death penalty and then discusses the foundation cases of *Furman v. Georgia* and *Gregg v. Georgia*.

Part II (Chapters 3, 4, and 5) focuses on constitutional issues and specific groups. These groups are those discriminated against because of race, mental impairment, or due to their having committed serious crimes at a young age. These offenders are treated differently by the Court.

Part III (Chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11) constitutes the major thrust of the book. It addresses constitutional issues such as the role of juries and jurors, the right to effective assistance of counsel, the right to due process, aggravating and mitigating circumstances, appeals, habeas corpus, and the concept of evolving standards of decency.

Part IV (Chapter 12) addresses the current death penalty issues and trends in the United States, including the flaws in its administration of which awareness and acknowledgment seem to be growing rapidly. The trends of declining use of the death penalty are discussed, asking what they might foretell about where things are headed in regard to this controversial criminal sanction. We end with a consideration of this possible future of the death penalty in the United States.

FORMAT

Every chapter starts with commentaries on the general case law on a subtopic, followed by a chart of the cases briefed in the chapter, and then the case briefs. The case brief approach to the study of law is deemed more effective for undergraduates and field practitioners who do not have the time or the inclination to go into a prolonged reading of United States Supreme Court cases. A case brief acquaints the reader with the case by summarizing its facts, issues, reasons, and holding. This is done in the interest of brevity, but hopefully not at the expense of accuracy.

A WORD ON LEGAL REFERENCING AND ACCESS TO ORIGINAL CASES

Every case briefed in this book contains a case citation. For those who may need some guidance in understanding case citations, the legal citation used in this book is similar to those used in law books and articles. To illustrate, let us use the following citation: *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976). *Gregg v. Georgia* is the case title, 428 refers to the volume where the case starts, U.S. means the United States Reports (the official government publisher of United States Supreme Court cases), 153 refers to the page where the case starts, and 1976 refers to the year the case was decided.

Anyone who wants to read the case of *Gregg v. Georgia* as originally printed may therefore go to any law library, pull out Volume 428 of the United States Reports, then go to page 153, where the case starts. Some Supreme Court decisions are short, while others are very long.

The original decisions of the United States Supreme Court in these cases are readily available on the Internet. To find these cases, go to the Supreme Court's Website at www.supremecourtus.gov and click on "Opinions," then the year of the decision. If more research is desired on a case, perform an Internet search, then choose the U.S. Supreme Court decision from the many results. There will likely be many entries on that case, including the decisions of the lower courts that were appealed and commentaries on the case. Make sure the case is the U.S. Supreme Court decision and not that of the trial court, the court of appeals, or of a state supreme court.

About the Authors

Scott Vollum is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology-Anthropology at the University of Minnesota, Duluth, where he primarily teaches classes on violence, the death penalty, restorative justice, criminological theory, and research methods. He conducts research and writes on a variety of topics related to the death penalty, including attitudes about the death penalty and experiences of those impacted by it (e.g., condemned death row inmates, co-victims of capital murder, and death row exonerees). He also conducts research on and writes about moral disengagement, restorative justice, violence against animals, and crime and justice in popular culture.

Rolando V. del Carmen retired in May 2011 as Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice (Law) in the College of Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University. He has authored numerous books and articles in various areas of law related to criminal justice. His book, *Criminal Procedure: Law and Practice*, has been translated into Japanese, Korean, and Chinese and is used extensively in the United States and some Asian countries. He has won all three major awards given by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences. He has taught numerous graduate and undergraduate classes in law and has been a mentor and friend to many of his students.

Durant Frantzen is Associate Professor of Criminology in the College of Arts and Sciences at Texas A&M University, San Antonio. His research focuses on offender reentry and recidivism, domestic violence policy, and the death penalty. He teaches courses on forensic psychology, statistics, victimology, and comparative systems in criminal justice.

Claudia San Miguel is an Associate Professor of Criminal Justice within the Department of Public Affairs and Social Research at Texas A&M International University in Laredo, Texas. Her research focuses on the trafficking of women and children, dating violence, domestic violence, and various policing issues. She recently traveled to England, Poland, Sweden, Austria, and Spain to help form collaborative relationships with their antitrafficking task forces. She has also taught courses for the Department of State in Roswell, New Mexico, on global human trafficking at the International Law Enforcement Academy.

Kelly Cheeseman Dial was Associate Professor and Chair of the Criminal Justice Program at Messiah College in Grantham, Pennsylvania. Until her untimely death during the production of this book, her research interests included female offenders, prison deviance, correctional officer stress and job satisfaction, institutional corrections, the death penalty, ethics, and sexually deviant behavior.

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank their families, friends, colleagues, and students. The work required to bring this book to fruition quite simply would not have been possible if not for their support and encouragement. We also express gratitude to the staff at Elsevier Publishing, particularly Pam Chester and Ellen Boyne. Pam was an early advocate for the publication of this revised edition and worked with the authors through the early stages of its development. Ellen guided us and provided valuable feedback and assistance through the writing and revision process. We greatly appreciate their insight, guidance, and assistance, without which the third edition of this book would not have happened.

This page intentionally left blank

Online Resources

Thank you for selecting Anderson Publishing's *The Death Penalty: Constitutional Issues, Commentaries, and Case Briefs*, Third Edition. To complement the learning experience, we have provided online tools to accompany this edition.

Interactive resources can be accessed for free by registering at: www.routledge.com/cw/vollum

This page intentionally left blank

Table of Cases

Note: Page number followed by *b* indicates boxes, *t* indicates tables, and *np* indicates footnotes.

A

Abdul-Kabir v. Quarterman, 127 S. Ct. 1654 (2007), 119*np*, 119, 173–174, 174*np*, 228*np*, 228, 237*np*, 237, 249, 250
Adams v. Texas, 448 U.S. 38 (1980), 139*np*, 139
Alabama v. Miller, 183 L. Ed. 2d 407 (2012), 118–119, 119*np*
Andres v. United States, 333 U.S. 740 (1948), 294*np*, 294
Apprendi v. New Jersey, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), 58*np*, 58, 129*np*, 129, 132*np*, 132–133, 133*np*, 152, 152*np*
Arave v. Creech, 507 U.S. 463 (1993), 230*np*, 230, 245*np*, 245
Atkins v. Virginia, 536 U.S. 304 (2002), 76–80, 76*np*, 77*np*, 79*np*, 81, 86–87, 88, 88*np*, 92–95, 93*np*, 97, 97*b*, 102, 105, 108, 108*np*, 111–113, 111*np*, 112*np*, 114, 114*np*, 116, 116*np*, 119*np*, 119, 127, 293, 308*np*, 308, 309, 316, 317, 318
Ayers v. Belmontes, 549 U.S. 7 (2006), 236*np*, 236

B

Banks v. Dretke, 540 U.S. 668 (2004), 332–334, 333*np*, 333*b*
Barclay v. Florida, 463 U.S. 939 (1983), 229*np*, 229
Barefoot v. Estelle, 463 U.S. 880 (1983), 233, 233*np*, 238*np*, 238, 239–240, 243–244, 243*b*
Batson v. Kentucky, 476 U.S. 79 (1986), 59, 59*np*, 61–63, 61*np*, 63*np*, 65, 65*b*, 66, 69–70, 69*np*, 71*np*, 71
Baze v. Rees, 553 U.S. 35 (2008), 5*np*, 16–17, 19, 19*np*, 21, 22*np*, 22, 295*np*, 295–297, 299–300, 310, 311, 314*b*
Beck v. Alabama, 447 U.S. 625 (1980), 135, 135*np*, 142–143, 144*b*
Bell v. Cone, 535 U.S. 685 (2002), 157, 157*np*, 169*np*, 169, 170*np*, 170, 176–177, 181*b*, 203–204, 207–208, 216*b*
Bell v. Ohio, 438 U.S. 637 (1978), 234*np*, 234
Blair v. Armontrout, 916 F.2d 1310 (8th Cir. 1990), 54*np*, 54
Blystone v. Pennsylvania, 494 U.S. 299 (1990), 229*np*, 229
Bobby v. Bies, 556 U.S. 825 (2009), 78*np*, 78–79, 92–93, 93*np*
Bobby v. Van Hook, 130 S. Ct. 13, 15 (2009), 165*np*, 165, 166*np*, 166
Booth v. Maryland, 482 U.S. 496 (1987), 231*np*, 231, 247
Bradshaw v. Richey, 546 U.S. 74 (2005), 302*np*, 302–303
Brady v. Maryland, 373 U.S. 83, 87 (1963), 202*np*, 202–203, 218
Branch v. Texas (1972), 30
Brewer v. Landrigan, 131 S.Ct. 445 (2010), 297*np*, 297–298
Brewer v. Quarterman, 550 U.S. 233 (2007), 119*np*, 119, 228, 228*np*, 237*np*, 237, 239–240, 249*b*, 297*np*, 297
Brookhart v. Janis, 384 U.S. 1 (1966), 172*np*, 172
Brown v. State, 568 S.E.2d 62 (Ga. App. 2002), 70*np*, 70–71, 139–140, 139*np*, 142–143, 152*b*
Buchanan v. Angelone, 522 U.S. 269 (1998), 230–231, 231*np*, 236*np*, 236
Buchanan v. Kentucky, 483 U.S. 402 (1987), 201*np*, 201–202
Burger v. Kemp, 483 U.S. 776 (1987), 163*np*, 163
Burton v. Stewart, 127 S. Ct. 793 (2007), 263*np*, 263, 291

C

California v. Ramos, 463 U.S. 992 (1983), 47, 55*np*, 68–69, 136*np*, 136–138, 197*np*, 197
Coker v. Georgia, 433 U.S. 584 (1977), 117*np*, 117, 125, 301*np*, 301
Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722 (1991), 159*np*, 159–160
Collins v. Lockhart (1985), 179
Cone v. Bell, 556 U.S. 449 (2009), 203–204, 203*np*, 204*np*, 207–208, 216*b*

Connick v. Thompson, 131, 563, U.S. Ct. 1350 (2011), 194, 204np, 204, 207–208, 217b, 332–334
Crampton v. Ohio, 402 U.S. 183 (1971), 12np, 12–13
Cullen v. Pinholster, 131 S.Ct. 1388 (2011), 118–119, 119np, 165np, 165, 167np, 167

D

Darden v. Wainwright, 477 U.S. 168 (1986), 163np, 163, 181
Deck v. Missouri, 544 U.S. 622 (2005), 198, 198np, 207–208, 213b
Delo v. Lashley, 507 U.S. 272 (1993), 236np, 236
Dendy v. Wilson, 142 Tex. 460, 464 (1944), 107np, 107–108
Dobbs v. Zant, 963 F.2d at 1407 (1991), 56–57, 57np
Duncan v. Louisiana, 391 U.S. 145 (1968), 129np, 129, 131–132, 132np

E

Eberheart v. Georgia, 433 U.S. 917 (1977), 301np, 301
Eddings v. Oklahoma, 455 U.S. 104 (1982), 195, 195np, 207–208, 210b, 235np, 235, 246
Enmund v. Florida, 458 U.S. 782 (1982), 302np, 302, 313, 314, 316
Estelle v. Smith, 451 U.S. 454 (1981), 194, 194np, 200np, 200, 201–202, 207–208, 209b, 210
Estelle v. Williams (1976), 198–199, 214
Ex parte Royall, 117 U.S. 241 (1886), 256np, 256, 257, 259, 273np, 273

F

Farmer v. Brennan, 511 U.S. 825, 846 (1994), 314–315, 315np
Felker v. Turpin, 518 U.S. 651 (1996), 262, 262np, 276–277, 284b
Fierro v. Gomez, 77 F.3d 301 (9th Cir. 1996), 295np, 295
Florida v. Nixon, 543 U.S. 175 (2004), 172, 172np, 176–177, 183b
Ford v. Wainwright, 477 U.S. 399 (1986), 88–89, 88np, 89np, 90np, 90, 92np, 92–95, 95b, 105, 125, 262–263, 263np, 283
Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972), 6–7, 6np, 20, 21np, 21–22, 29, 30–33, 34, 36, 38, 38b, 39, 40–41, 44np, 44–45, 63np, 63, 73, 194np, 194–195, 209, 222np, 222, 293np, 293–294, 300np, 300, 301, 303–305, 304np, 317, 323np, 323, 324–325, 324np, 325np, 329np, 329, 330–331, 330np, 333np, 334–336, 334np, 338np

G

Gardner v. Florida, 430 U.S. 349 (1977), 149, 195–196, 195np, 206, 207–208, 208b
Gideon v. Wainwright, 372 U.S. 335 (1963), 155np, 155, 156, 161np, 161
Godfrey v. Georgia, 446 U.S. 420 (1980), 229–230, 230np, 245np, 245
Gonzalez v. Thaler, 132 S. Ct. 641 (2012), 264np, 264, 267, 273–274, 291
Graham v. Florida, 176 L. Ed. 2d 825 (2010), 119np, 119
Gray v. Netherland, 519 U.S. 1301 (1996), 196, 196np, 207–208, 211b
Gregg v. Georgia, 428 U.S. 153 (1976), 1, 1np, 2, 12np, 12–13, 20, 29, 33–37, 38, 39b, 40–41, 98, 130–131, 134, 134np, 135, 137–138, 140np, 140, 142, 221–228, 221np, 229np, 229, 230–231, 237np, 237, 241, 242, 242np, 243np, 243, 245np, 245, 258np, 258, 290, 293np, 293–294, 300–301, 300np, 303np, 303, 321, 321np, 325np, 325–326, 329, 329np

H

Harbison v. Bell, 556 U.S. 180 (2009), 162np, 162
Harrington v. Richter, 131 S. Ct. 770 (2011), 264np, 264–265
Heck v. Humphrey, 512 U.S. 477 (1994), 289
Herrera v. Collins, 506 U.S. 390 (1993), 256np, 262np, 268, 268np, 274np, 274–275, 276–277, 281b
Hill v. McDonough, 126 S. Ct. 1189 (2006), 270np, 270, 271–272, 275, 286, 291, 295np, 295, 297

Hill v. McDonough, 126 S. Ct. 2096 (2006), 295*np*, 295, 297
Hitchcock v. Dugger, 481 U.S. 393 (1987), 234*np*, 234
Holbrook v. Flynn (1986), 198–199, 214
Holland v. Florida, 130 S. Ct. 2549 (2010), 17–18, 18*np*, 159*np*, 159, 161, 266*np*, 266, 274, 291
Holland v. Florida, 560 U.S. 2549 (2010), 158*np*, 158–159
Holmes v. South Carolina, 547 U.S. 319 (2006), 194, 194*np*, 197*np*, 197, 207–208, 215*b*
Hopkins v. Reeves, 524 U.S. 88 (1998), 135*np*, 135–136
Hopper v. Evans, 456 U.S. 605 (1982), 135*np*, 135–136
House v. Bell, 547 U.S. 518 (2007), 268–269, 268*np*, 276–277, 287*b*
Huffman v. State, 450 S.W.2d 858 (Tex. Crim. App. 1970), 60–61, 61*np*

I

Illinois v. Allen (1970), 198–199, 214
In re Kemmler, 136 U.S. 436 (1890), 8*np*, 8–10, 23, 24*b*, 27, 294*np*, 294

J

Jackson v. Georgia (1972), 28, 30
Jefferson v. Upton, 130 S. Ct. 2217 (2010), 166*np*, 166, 168*np*, 168
Johnson v. Texas, 509 U.S. 350 (1993), 236*np*, 236
Johnson v. Williams, 133 S. Ct. 1088 (2013), 264*np*, 264–265
Johnston v. Zerbst, 304 U.S. 458 (1938), 173*np*, 173
Jurek v. Texas, 428 U.S. 262 (1976), 134*np*, 134, 136–138, 137*np*, 300*np*, 300

K

Kansas v. Cheever, 295 Kan. 229 (2012), 194*np*, 194, 201*np*, 201–202
Kansas v. Marsh, 548 U.S. 163 (2006), 228, 228*np*, 239–240, 248*b*
Kelly v. California, 555 U.S. 1020, 19024, 1026 (2008), 231–232, 232*np*
Kelly v. South Carolina, 534 U.S. 246 (2002), 137*np*, 137–138
Kennedy v. Louisiana, 554 U.S. 407 (2008), 119*np*, 119, 301–302, 301*np*, 311, 316*b*
Kotteakos v. United States, 323 U.S. 750 (1946), 255*np*, 255
Kyles v. Whitley, 514 U.S. 419 (1995), 203*np*, 203

L

Landrigan v. Schriro, 441 F.3d at 647 (9th Cir. 2006), 172–173, 173*np*
Lawrence v. Florida, 549 U.S. 327 (2007), 265–266, 265*np*, 266*np*, 276–277, 288*b*
Lewis v. Jeffers, 497 U.S. 764 (1990), 230, 230*np*, 239–240, 244*b*
Lockett v. Ohio, 438 U.S. 586 (1978), 98, 195*np*, 195, 234, 234*np*, 235, 239–240, 242*b*
Lockhart v. Fretwell, 506 U.S. 364 (1993), 176–177, 179*b*
Lockhart v. McCree, 476 U.S. 162 (1986), 139, 139*np*, 140*np*, 140, 142–143, 144, 144*np*, 145*b*, 148*np*, 148
Louisiana ex rel. Francis v. Resweber, 329 U.S. 459 (1947), 10–11, 10*np*, 20, 22*np*, 22, 23, 26*b*, 27, 286, 299*np*, 299, 314*np*, 314–315

M

Magwood v. Patterson, 130 S. Ct. 2788 (2010), 263–264, 264*np*, 275
Maples v. Thomas, 181 L. Ed. 2d 807 (2012), 118–119, 119*np*, 160*np*, 160, 174–175, 175*np*
Maples v. Thomas, 565 U.S. ____ (2012), 158–159, 158*np*, 176–177, 189*b*
Maples v. Thomas, 122 Yale L.J. 1328 (2013), 158*np*, 158–159
Martel v. Clair, 565 U.S. ____ (2012), 158*np*, 158–159

Martinez v. Ryan, 566 U.S. ____ (2012), 158*np*, 158–161, 160*np*
McCleskey v. Kemp, 481 U.S. 279 (1987), 43–46, 44*np*, 45*np*, 46*np*, 63–64, 63*np*, 64*np*, 65, 67*b*, 73
McCleskey v. Zant, 499 U.S. 467 (1991), 44–45, 45*np*, 259*np*, 259–260, 267–269, 268*np*, 273, 273*np*, 276–277, 279*b*, 285, 314–315, 315*np*
McGautha v. California, 402 U.S. 183 (1971), 12*np*, 12–13, 222*np*, 222
McKoy v. North Carolina, 494 U.S. 433 (1990), 234, 234*np*, 239–240, 245*b*
McMann v. Richardson, 397 U.S. 759 (1970), 156*np*, 156
McQuiggin v. Perkins, 133 S. Ct. 1924 (2013), 269*np*, 269–270, 274–275
Medellin v. Texas, 552 U.S. 491 (2008), 308*np*, 308
Mexico v. United States of America, International Court of Justice (March 31, 2004), 306–308, 308*np*
Mickens v. Taylor, 535 U.S. 172 (2002), 170–171, 170*np*, 171*np*, 176–177, 180*b*
Miller-El v. Dretke, 545 U.S. 231 (2005), 51–54, 53*np*, 54*np*, 60*np*, 60–61, 61*np*, 64*np*, 64, 65, 69*b*, 71
Miller v. Alabama, 183 L. Ed. 2d 407 (2012), 17*np*, 17, 119*np*, 119
Miller v. North Carolina, 583 F.2d 701 (4th Cir. 1978), 54*np*, 54
Mills v. Maryland, 486 U.S. 367 (1988), 142–143, 146*b*, 234*np*, 234, 239–240, 245–246, 246*np*
Minnesota v. McRae, 494 N.W.2d 252 (1992), 61*np*, 61–62, 70–71, 71*np*
Morgan v. Illinois, 504 U.S. 719 (1992), 139, 139*np*, 142–143, 147*b*
Moulton v. State, 199 Ala. 411 (1917), 54*np*, 54
Murray v. Carrier, 477 U.S. 478 (1986), 281*np*, 281

N

Nelson v. Campbell, 541 U.S. 637 (2004), 270, 270*np*, 271–272, 271*np*, 272*np*, 275, 276–277, 285*b*, 291
Netherland v. Gray, 519 U.S. 1301 (1996), 196*np*, 196

O

Oregon v. Guzek, 546 U.S. 517 (2006), 235*np*, 235

P

Pace v. DiGuglielmo, 544 U.S. 408, 418 (2005), 159*np*, 159
Panetti v. Quarterman, 448 F.3d 815 (2007), 77–78, 78*np*, 92*np*, 92–93, 93*np*, 94–95, 101*b*
Parker v. Dugger, 498 U.S. 308 (1991), 234*np*, 234
Patton v. Mississippi, 332 U.S. 463 (1947), 12*np*, 12, 20
Patton v. Mississippi, 498 U.S. 308 (1991), 234*np*, 234
Payne v. Tennessee, 501 U.S. 808 (1991), 231, 231*np*, 232*np*, 238*np*, 238, 239–240, 246*b*
Penry v. Lynaugh, 492 U.S. 302 (1989), 76, 76*np*, 77, 92*np*, 92–93, 94–95, 96*b*, 97–98, 98*np*, 105, 111–112, 112*np*, 235*np*, 235
Perry v. Lockhart, 871 F.2d 1384 (1989), 179
Porter v. McCollum, 130 S. Ct. 447 (2009), 166*np*, 166
Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45 (1932), 12*np*, 12, 20, 21*np*, 21–22, 155*np*, 155
Presnell v. Georgia, 439 U.S. 14 (1978), 229, 229*np*, 239–240, 241*b*, 243, 243*np*
Profitt v. Florida, 428 U.S. 242 (1976), 134*np*, 134, 300*np*, 300
Pulley v. Harris, 465 U.S. 37 (1984), 303, 303*np*, 311, 312*b*
Purkett v. Elem, 514 U.S. 765 (1995), 59*np*, 59, 63–64, 64*np*, 66*np*, 66

Q

Quoting Coleman v. Thompson, 501 U.S. 722 (1991), 160*np*, 160

R

Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269, 272 (2005), 261*np*, 261–262, 262*np*
Richardson v. Marsh, 481 U.S. 200, (1987), 150

Rico v. Leftridge-Byrd, 340 F.3d 178 (3d Cir. 2003), 61–62, 62np, 70–71, 71np
Ring v. Arizona, 536 U.S. 584 (2002), 57np, 57, 129–131, 130np, 131np, 132–133, 132np, 133np, 140np, 140–141, 142–143, 151b
Roberts v. Louisiana, 428 U.S. 325 (1976), 34, 135np, 135, 221np, 221–222, 229np, 300np, 300
Roberts v. Louisiana, 431 U.S. 633 (1977), 221np, 221–222, 229, 229np
Robinson v. California, 370 U.S. 666 (1962), 2np, 2, 24, 34, 39
Rompilla v. Beard, 545 U.S. 374 (2005), 163–164, 163np, 164np, 176–177, 184b
Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551 (2005), 108, 108np, 113np, 113–118, 119, 119np, 121, 122, 123, 125b, 127, 308, 309, 316, 317, 318, 340
Rose v. Lundy, 455 U.S. 509 (1982), 259, 259np, 261np, 261–262, 273np, 273, 276–277, 277b
Ross v. Moffitt, 417 U.S. 600 (1974), 267np, 267
Ryan v. Gonzales, 133 S. Ct. 696 (2013), 17–18, 18np, 79np, 79, 92–93, 93np

S

Salinger v. Loisel, 265 U.S. 224 (1924), 257np, 257–258, 273np, 273, 290
Sanders v. United States, 373 U.S. 1 (1963), 258np, 258, 273, 273np, 279, 290
Sattazahn v. Pennsylvania, 537 U.S. 101 (2003), 199–200, 199np, 207–208, 212b
Sawyer v. Whitley, 505 U.S. 333 (1992), 257np, 268, 268np, 274–275, 276–277, 280b, 282, 291
Schlup v. Delo, 513 U.S. 298 (1995), 268–269, 269np, 287
Schriro v. Landrigan, 127 S. Ct. 1947 (2007), 172–173, 173np, 176–177, 186b
Schriro v. Summerlin, 542 U.S. 348 (2004), 132–133, 133np
Sears v. Upton, 130 S.Ct. 3259 (2010), 166np, 166, 168np, 168
Shafer v. South Carolina, 532 U.S. 36 (2001), 137np, 137
Simmons v. Roper, 112 S.W.3d 397 (2003), 112np, 112–113, 116np, 116, 117np, 117, 121t, 127, 133np
Simmons v. South Carolina, 512 U.S. 154 (1994), 137, 137np, 142–143, 148b
Singleton v. Norris, 319 F.3d 10184 (2003), 77–78, 77np, 90–93, 92np, 93np, 94–95, 99b
Skinner v. Switzer, 131 S. Ct. 1289 (2011), 272np, 272–273, 291
Skinner v. Switzer, 562 U.S. ____ (2011), 276–277, 289b
Skipper v. South Carolina, 476 U.S. 1 (1986), 153, 196np, 196–197, 235np, 235, 238np, 238
Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473 (2000), 263np, 263–264, 291
Smith v. Cain, 132 S.Ct. 627 (2012), 194, 202, 202np, 205np, 205
Smith v. Murray, 477 U.S. 527 (1986), 281np, 281, 282
Smith v. Spisak, 130 S. Ct. 676 (2010), 165np, 165, 167np, 167
Smith v. Texas, 543 U.S. 37 (2004), 236–237, 237np
Smith v. Texas, 550 U.S. 297 (2007), 119np, 119, 236–237, 237np
Snyder v. Louisiana, 552 U.S. 472 (2008), 55, 55np, 62np, 62–63, 65, 71b
South Carolina v. Gathers, 490 U.S. 805 (1989), 231np, 231, 247
Spaziano v. Florida, 468 U.S. 447 (1984), 131np, 131–132, 327np, 327
Spisak v. Hudson, 512 F.3d 852 (2008), 167np, 167
Stanford v. Kentucky, 492 U.S. 361 (1989), 108, 108np, 110np, 110–111, 116, 116np, 121t, 123, 124, 124b, 126–127
State v. Gay, 541 S.E.2d 541 (S.C. 2001), 197np, 197–198, 198np
State v. Marshall, 613 A.2d 1059 (N.J. 1992), 47np, 47–48
State v. Washington, 67 So. 930 (La. Sup. Ct. 1915), 54np, 54
Stewart v. Martinez-Villareal, 523 U.S. 637 (1998), 262–264, 263np, 273–274, 274np, 276–277, 283b, 291
Strauder v. West Virginia, 100 U.S. 303 (1880), 58np, 58, 66
Strickland v. Washington, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), 156, 156np, 157, 176–177, 178b, 180, 184, 186, 187
Strickler v. Greene, 527 U.S. 263 (1999), 203np, 203
Swain v. Alabama, 380 U.S. 202 (1965), 59np, 60np, 60, 61–62, 66, 66np, 69np, 69–70

T

Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288 (1989), 132–133, 133np, 158np, 158, 179, 212, 261np, 261
Tennard v. Dretke, 542 U.S. 274 (2004), 45np, 78, 92–93, 93np, 94–95, 100b

Thompson v. Oklahoma, 487 U.S. 815 (1988), 108^{np}, 108–110, 109^{np}, 110^{np}, 116^{np}, 116, 120, 121^t, 123, 123^b, 125, 126–127
Tibbals v. Carter, 132 S. Ct. 1738 (2012), 17–18, 18^{np}, 79
Tison v. Arizona, 481 U.S. 137, 148 (1987), 301, 301^{np}, 302^{np}, 302–303, 311, 313^b
Trevino v. Thaler, 133 S. Ct. 1911 (2013), 118–119, 119^{np}, 158–159, 159^{np}, 160–161, 160^{np}
Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86 (1958), 31, 77^{np}, 77, 78, 98, 108^{np}, 108, 122, 122^{np}, 123–124, 125, 194^{np}, 194–195, 294^{np}, 294, 308^{np}, 308
Tuilaepa v. California, 512 U.S. 967 (1994), 230^{np}, 230–231
Turner v. Murray, 476 U.S. 28 (1986), 63–64, 63^{np}, 65, 67, 68^b
Tyler v. Cain, 533 U.S. 970 (2001), 261^{np}, 261, 273–274, 274^{np}

U

United States v. Agurs, 427 U.S. 97 (1976), 203^{np}, 203
United States v. Armstrong, 992 F.2d 171 (8th Cir. 1993), 55^{np}, 55
United States v. Bass, 536 U.S. 862 (2002), 55^{np}, 55
United States v. Cronin, 466 U.S. 654 (1984), 155^{np}, 155, 169–170, 169^{np}, 170^{np}, 180, 183, 184
United States v. Martinez-Salazar, 528 U.S. 304 (2000), 61–62, 62^{np}, 70–71, 71^{np}
United States v. Ovalle, 136 F.3d 1092 (1998), 60^{np}, 60
Uttecht v. Brown, 551 U.S. 1 (2007), 139^{np}, 139–140, 141, 142–143, 152^b

V

Valle v. Florida, 564 U.S. ____ 2011, 326^{np}, 326
Van de Kamp v. Goldstein, 129 S. Ct. 855 (2009), 204^{np}, 204, 218

W

Wade v. Calderon, 29 F.3d 1342 (1994), 56^{np}, 56
Wainwright v. Sykes, 433 U.S. 72 (1977), 259^{np}, 259, 279
Wainwright v. Witt, 469 U.S. 412 (1985), 60–61, 61^{np}, 70, 139^{np}, 139
Walton v. Arizona, 497 U.S. 639 (1990), 57^{np}, 57–58, 132^{np}, 132
Weeks v. Angelone, 528 U.S. 225 (2000), 142–143, 150^b, 230^{np}, 230–231
Weems v. United States, 217 U.S. 349 (1910), 300, 300^{np}, 303^{np}, 303–304
Wiggins v. Smith, 539 U.S. 510 (2003), 162–163, 162^{np}, 163^{np}, 173^{np}, 173, 176–177, 182^b, 187
Wilkerson v. Utah, 99 U.S. 130 (1878), 7^{np}, 7–8, 23, 23^b, 25, 27, 294^{np}, 294
Wilkins v. Missouri, 492 U.S. 361 (1989), 110^{np}, 110–111
Williams v. Taylor, 529 U.S. 362 (2000), 158^{np}, 158, 174^{np}, 174, 181, 261^{np}, 261, 273–274, 274^{np}
Witherspoon v. Illinois, 391 U.S. 510 (1968), 12^{np}, 12, 138–139, 138^{np}, 139^{np}, 142–143, 143^b, 146, 146^{np}, 148^{np}, 148
Withers v. United States, 602 F.2d 124 (6th Cir. 1976), 54^{np}, 54
Wong Doo v. United States, 265 U.S. 239 (1924), 166^{np}, 166–167, 257^{np}, 257–258, 273, 273^{np}, 290
Woodson v. North Carolina, 428 U.S. 280 (1976), 34, 135^{np}, 135, 166^{np}, 166, 194^{np}, 194–195, 221–222, 221^{np}, 229^{np}, 229, 239–240, 240^b, 300^{np}, 300
Wood v. Allen, 558 U.S. 290 (2010), 165, 165^{np}, 176–177, 187^b
Wood v. Georgia, 450 U.S. 261 (1981), 171^{np}, 171

Top Ten Most Significant Death Penalty Cases

10. *Lockett v. Ohio*, 438 U.S. 586 (1978). Death penalty statutes must allow for consideration of mitigating factors regarding the character or history of a defendant as well as the circumstances of the offense.
9. *Payne v. Tennessee*, 495 U.S. 149 (1990). Victim impact statements pertaining to characteristics of the victim and the emotional impact of the crime on the victim's family do not violate the Eighth Amendment and are admissible in the sentencing phase of a trial.
8. *Baze v. Rees*, 553 U.S. 35 (2008). Lethal injection does not violate the Eighth Amendment's prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment and is thus a constitutionally permissible method of execution.
7. *Lockhart v. McCree*, 476 U.S. 162 (1986). Prospective jurors whose opposition to the death penalty is so strong as to prevent or impair the performance of their duties as jurors at the sentencing phase of a trial may be removed for cause from jury membership.
6. *McCleskey v. Kemp*, 481 U.S. 279 (1987). A statistical study suggesting racial discrimination in the imposition of death sentences does not make the death penalty unconstitutional. What is needed is that "petitioner must prove that decision-makers in his case acted with discriminatory purpose."
5. *Ring v. Arizona*, 536 U.S. 584 (2002). "The decision whether or not to execute a defendant must be made by a jury. A judge may not alone make a determination of aggravating circumstances and thus elevate a punishment to death. Such aggravating circumstances are 'the functional equivalent of an element of a greater offense' and therefore must be determined by a jury as required by the Sixth Amendment."
4. *Atkins v. Virginia*, 536 U.S. 304 (2002). "The execution of mentally retarded defendants is a violation of the Eighth Amendment's prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment."
3. *Roper v. Simmons*, 543 U.S. 551 (2005). Imposing the death penalty on juveniles who commit crimes at age 16 or 17 constitutes cruel and unusual punishment prohibited by the Eighth Amendment.
2. *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238 (1972). The death penalty is unconstitutional; it violates the Constitution's equal protection clause and the prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment.
1. *Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976). Death penalty statutes that contain sufficient safeguards against arbitrary and capricious imposition are constitutional.

This page intentionally left blank

The Death Penalty: Past and Present

1

CHAPTER OUTLINE

I Introduction	1
II A Retrospective Analysis of the Death Penalty	2
A The Colonial Period.....	2
B The Age of Enlightenment and the Early Movement to Abolish the Death Penalty	3
1 <i>From Europe to the Colonies: The Impact of Enlightenment</i>	3
2 <i>Changes in the Death Penalty from 1790–1950</i>	4
III Early Supreme Court Decisions on the Death Penalty	6
A <i>Wilkerson v. Utah</i> : Death by Firing Squad	7
B <i>In re Kemmler</i> : Death by Electrocution	8
C <i>Louisiana ex rel. Francis v. Resweber</i> : The Constitutionality of Being Executed Twice	10
D Additional Changes in the Death Penalty Prior to 1972.....	12
IV The Current Status of the Death Penalty in the United States	13
A Retentionist versus Abolitionist States.....	13
B A Decline in Death Sentences and Executions.....	14
C Recent Supreme Court and Circuit Court Rulings.....	16
V In Summary, What Do These Cases Say?	20
VI Conclusion	21
Cases Briefed in Chapter 1	23
Case Briefs	23
Key Terms	26
Critical Thinking Questions	27
Internet Resources	27

I INTRODUCTION

The history of the death penalty in the United States may be divided into two historical periods: the period prior to the 1976 seminal decision in *Gregg v. Georgia* (1976)¹ and the period after *Gregg*. This chronological division, based on the two historical periods of the death penalty, reflects the most significant change made by the Supreme Court regarding the constitutionality of the death penalty. However, to fully appreciate the profoundness of the Court's decision in *Gregg* and to understand why *Gregg* is the point at which to differentiate between the two periods, an analysis of the historical roots of the death penalty must be undertaken.

¹*Gregg v. Georgia*, 428 U.S. 153 (1976).

This chapter first presents a brief overview of the history of the death penalty from colonial times to 1971. Specifically, it first explores the virtual importation of the death penalty from England to the colonies and examines the early justifications for the death penalty. It also discusses early movements to abolish the death penalty that were inherently influenced by the Age of Enlightenment. Parts of this chapter examine the constitutional issues that were important prior to *Gregg*. Additionally, because of the Court's repeated use of the Eighth Amendment's proscription against cruel and unusual punishment in determining the constitutionality of state death penalty sentences, this chapter discusses the high court's early interpretation of the Eighth Amendment. The chapter also briefly explores the Court's decision to use the Eighth Amendment despite the fact that it was not made applicable to the states until 1962.² Finally, the chapter also explores the current state of the death penalty. Although it will be covered in more depth later in the book, this chapter provides an overview of recent state decisions to abolish or repeal the death penalty as well as recent Court and circuit court decisions.

II A RETROSPECTIVE ANALYSIS OF THE DEATH PENALTY

A The Colonial Period

The first recorded execution in America occurred in 1608,³ but the death penalty's formal and legal foundations were not firmly established until later in the seventeenth century, when European settlers formed permanent colonies in the New World after the 1620 s. In colonial America, the penalty of death was typically imposed on those who engaged in crimes such as murder, adultery, bestiality, witchcraft, and blasphemy. Although the colonies' codifications of laws and accompanying penalties differed, most state codes were reflective of religious beliefs, and thus the death penalty was justified on religious grounds. For instance, biblical arguments in favor of the death penalty were evident in the capital laws of the Massachusetts Bay Colony. Strongly influenced by the Mosaic Code of the Old Testament, known for the retributionist doctrine "an eye for an eye," the Bay Colony's 1641 *Body of Liberties* (the penal code) prescribed the penalty of death for violation of 13 laws: idolatry, witchcraft, blasphemy, murder, manslaughter, poisoning, bestiality, sodomy, adultery, man-stealing,⁴ false witness in capital cases, conspiracy, and rebellion. Interestingly, the crimes listed in the *Body of Liberties* were accompanied by their biblical references in the Old Testament.⁵

The harshness that characterized the penal code of the Massachusetts Bay Colony was relatively lenient in comparison to the many crimes (more than 50) punishable by death in England during the same period. In addition, compared to the other colonies such as Virginia, Maryland, Georgia, and Carolina, which imposed the death penalty for crimes committed only by indentured slaves, the Bay Colony's capital laws were quite lax. However, by the eighteenth century, support for the death penalty in all of the colonies grew as immigration to the New World increased substantially and public order was threatened. The death penalty grew almost by necessity because the colonies lacked adequate

²The Eighth Amendment was incorporated to the states in the 1962 case of *Robinson v. California*, 370 U.S. 666 (1962).

³This was the execution of George Kendall, a European colonist who was hanged for the crime of "spying for the Spanish." In Hugo Bedau and Paul Cassell (eds.), *DEBATING THE DEATH PENALTY* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, Inc., 2004).

⁴Man-stealing is akin to kidnapping.

⁵Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris (eds.), *CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE UNITED STATES* (1997), pp. 8–9.

long-term facilities to incarcerate offenders.⁶ Despite such issues, the number of capital crimes increased because of the demands of the English Crown, which had renewed its control over the colonies during this time. The English Crown insisted that the colonies follow its example and revise their penal codes to include 200 crimes punishable by death.

B The Age of Enlightenment and the Early Movement to Abolish the Death Penalty

1 From Europe to the Colonies: The Impact of Enlightenment

While the colonists were struggling to control the massive immigration movement to the New World during the eighteenth century, Europe was at the height of a philosophical and intellectual movement known as the Enlightenment. The Age of Enlightenment, which began a century before, was spurred by the writings of naturalistic philosophers who were instrumental in dispelling spiritualistic or religious notions that human beings were born with fixed or innate personality traits.⁷ For example, John Locke, one of the most influential philosophers of the time, articulated the notion of sensationalism, which claimed that humans were shaped not by the spiritual world but rather by their sensory reactions to the external environment. In his book *Two Treatises on Government* (1690), Locke also rejected the idea that government was the creation of God and instead supported the principle that the government derived its authority from the people.⁸

Locke's writings, and those of other philosophers such as Montesquieu and Voltaire, generated great changes in intellectual and philosophical thinking in Europe by introducing the notion that humans had the mental capacity, or the *rationality*, to create a form of government that protected the rights of the people. The writings of these Enlightenment philosophers eventually generated changes in the administration of justice, particularly with regard to the death penalty. Their writings influenced Italian philosopher Cesare Beccaria to advocate for the abolition of the death penalty.⁹ Beccaria, who wrote *An Essay On Crimes and Punishment* (1764), believed that a punishment should be proportionate to the crime committed or to the harm that was inflicted on society. He also believed that too severe a penalty, such as death, may provoke an individual to engage in lesser forms of crime simply to avoid capital punishment. Thus, rather than deterring crime, the death penalty, according to Beccaria, may encourage lesser forms of crimes. In addition, he argued that "the death penalty served as an example of barbarity rather than a deterrent to it, because it sanctioned the taking of human life—the very act it was intended to deter."¹⁰ As alternatives to the death penalty, Beccaria proposed incarceration among several humane and proportionate forms of punishment.

In the colonies, the Age of Enlightenment served as an impetus for revolution and independence. Influenced greatly by Locke's notion that a government should be altered or abolished by the people if it was not fulfilling its duty to protect natural rights such as life, liberty, and property, the colonists expressed their displeasure with the English Crown in the Declaration of Independence and subsequently declared war. However, with much concern about the beginning of the Revolutionary War,

⁶*Id.*

⁷Mark Lanier and Stuart Henry, *ESSENTIAL CRIMINOLOGY* (2d ed. 2004).

⁸J.W. Peltason and Sue Davis, *UNDERSTANDING THE CONSTITUTION* (15th ed. 2000).

⁹Beccaria did believe that the death penalty was useful in some situations, such as when there was a need to protect the security of a nation or government. In Piers Beirne, *Inventing Criminology: The "Science of Man" in Cesare Beccaria's Dei delitti e delle pene*, *CRIMINOLOGY*, Vol. 29(4):777–820, 1991.

¹⁰Bryan Vila and Cynthia Morris (eds.), *CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE UNITED STATES* (1997), p. 16.