

Christian Ellsworth

Dr. Wattenbarger

ENGL 211C

03/26/2023

### Death Penalty Abolition

The capital punishment notion is not new; it has been around since the dawn of human civilization. The penalty for outright disobedience to any order the monarch issued in the ancient times was death (usually by beheading) (Adinkrah et al. 230). More than 30 jurisdictions allow the death sentence, but the practice has recently been under increasing criticism due to a number of botched executions. The capital punishment debate entails the most significant societal issue because of the changes the twenty-first century brought.

The death penalty proponents believe that the practice deters criminal behavior. Giving the worst sentence for the greatest offenses might deter their commitment in the future (Garrett 202). The psychological effects of this can be far-reaching. It might be obvious that a person can refrain from engaging in behavior because they would be severely punished since the cost of engaging in such behavior much outweighs the gain. Besides, death penalty supporters perceive that it guarantees justice. It might be quite important to figure out how to bring about such justice. They believe that it could be right that a person who has done the worst possible crimes, threatens the safety of everyone, and shows no signs of remorse or compassion be put to death. Human rights activists often raise the question related to the rights the criminals have and people's faith in the judicial system to mete out punishments that are commensurate with the

severity of the crime. The proponents perceive that the concerns raise serious doubts about the desirability of abolishing the death penalty.

The capital punishment utility might not be capricious. A person cannot be given the death penalty in the absence of proof or any kind of justification. Courts rarely use capital punishment (Niven and Ellen 97). A capital punishment might be commuted to life in prison attributable to inordinate delay, or a mercy plea can be filed by the prisoner even after execution. After receiving the compassion request, the executive might initiate a fresh inquiry and seek further evidence. The executive might grant the mercy plea and commute the capital punishment to life in prison if fresh evidence is presented that was not previously available to the court.

The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) maintains that the death sentence tends to be unconstitutional because it disregards fundamental legal principles such as due process and equal protection. The death penalty entails an extreme kind of cruelty (Rafiq 10). The practice might be barbaric because it dates back to the penology beginnings, when enslavement, branding, as well as diverse physical punishment forms were the norm. Executions, like those other savage customs, should never exist in a progressing society. This is an uncommon kind of punishment since only the American court does it, unlike other western developed countries. It seems to be particularly uncommon since just a small percentage of murderers in the United States actually get the death penalty.

An empathy inadequacy for murder victims might not always be indicative of opposition to the death sentence. Instead, murder reveals a callous disregard for human life. Murder appears to be reprehensible because human life is priceless, and death is final; a program of state-sanctioned murders can be unethical (Sigler 80). It exemplifies the catastrophic ineffectiveness and savagery of resorting to violence rather than reason to solve complex societal issues. Several

murder victims' families fail to agree with using state-sanctioned violence to get revenge.

Regrettably, legislators as well as prosecutors have frequently ignored the voices of these victims in favor of those of family members who support the death sentence.

It could be certain that innocent people might be murdered in the future, as they have been in the past. It does not matter how sophisticated a judicial framework can be, mistakes made by humans might always be a possibility. During 2000 as well as 2014, the Supreme Court diverse high courts overturned the death sentences of 20 percent of those who had originally been found guilty (Adinkrah 240). It amounts to 443 people who were given death sentences but were subsequently exonerated. It cannot be impossible that the death sentence might be used capriciously (Garrett 210). The underprivileged, minorities, as well as certain racial, cultural, political, as well as religious group's members might be disproportionately subjected to the death penalty. Most people from disadvantaged backgrounds make up the majority of those on death row.

The death sentence tends to be inconsistent with human entitlement as well as fundamental human decency. The entitlement to life comprises the most basic human right, and the death penalty entails its violation (Rafiq 15). Another fundamental human right that might be violated encompasses the one against torture and other forms of cruel and unusual punishment. The death sentence tends to be inhumane because it reduces people to animals. The death penalty might not be as effective as its proponents claim it to be as a deterrence. The United Nations General Assembly declared that there is no convincing evidence of the capital punishment's deterrent effect. In several retentionist nations, law enforcement professionals are beginning to doubt whether or not the death penalty really deters crime.

Even if the majority of citizens agree that capital punishment should be used, it does not give the government the right to execute an individual. In the past, there have been undeniable examples of majorities condoning horrendous violations of human rights, only to be universally condemned decades later (Rancourt 537). Political leaders and other influential persons have a moral obligation to speak out against the death penalty. It cannot be overstated how closely people's desire for a crime-free society can be linked to their backing for the death penalty. More efficient approaches to reducing criminal activity exist.

The capital penalty discussion has become the most pressing social problem as a result of the century's developments. The death penalty proponents believe that the practice deters criminal behavior. The capital punishment utility might not be capricious. The American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) maintains that the death sentence tends to be unconstitutional because it disregards fundamental legal principles. An empathy inadequacy for murder victims might not always be indicative of opposition to the death sentence. It could be certain that innocent people might be murdered in the future, as they have been in the past. The death sentence tends to be inconsistent with human entitlement as well as fundamental human decency. Even if the majority of citizens agree that capital punishment should be used, it does not give the government the right to execute an individual.

Work Cited

Adinkrah, Mensah, and William M. Clemens. "To reinstate or to not reinstate? An exploratory study of student perspectives on the death penalty in Michigan." *International journal of offender therapy and comparative criminology* 62.1 (2018): 229-252.

Garrett, Brandon L. "Innocence and the global death penalty." *Comparative Capital Punishment*. Edward Elgar Publishing, 2019. 201-215.

Niven, David, and Ellen A. Donnelly. "Who challenges disparities in capital punishment?: An analysis of state legislative floor debates on death penalty reform." *Journal of ethnicity in criminal justice* 18.2 (2020): 95-122.

Rafiq, Janees. "Death Penalty, whether justified or not: A critical Analysis." *Journal of Human Rights Law and Practice* 3.2 (2020): 1-25.

Rancourt, Marc-Antoine, Catherine Ouellet, and Yannick Dufresne. "Is the death penalty debate really dead? Contrasting capital punishment support in Canada and the United States." *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy* 20.1 (2020): 536-562.

Sigler, Mary. "Principle and Pragmatism in the Death Penalty Debate." *Criminal Justice Ethics* 37.1 (2018): 72-86.