

Should The Death Penalty Be Allowed?

Posted on October 2, 2019

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/should-the-death-penalty-be-allowed/>

Introduction

The death penalty is the most severe punishment available in the American criminal-justice system and remains one of the country's most contested public policies. Supporters defend capital punishment through retribution, incapacitation, deterrence, and the belief that some murders are so grave that execution is a proportionate response. Opponents emphasize wrongful conviction, unequal administration, cost, delay, racial and geographic disparity, and the availability of life imprisonment. The legal picture is also uneven. Twenty-seven states currently retain the death penalty, along with the federal government and military, but executions are concentrated in a much smaller group of jurisdictions; the Death Penalty Information Center reported in 2026 that two-thirds of states had either abolished the punishment or gone at least ten years without carrying out an execution (Death Penalty Information Center, 2026a). A neutral analysis should therefore distinguish legal retention from actual use and should examine both the moral theories behind punishment and the institutional processes required to produce a death sentence. For a separate abolitionist discussion, see [arguments for abolishing the death penalty](#).

Constitutional Framework and Capital Eligibility

Modern American death-penalty law was reshaped by *Furman v. Georgia* (1972), which invalidated then-existing capital statutes because their administration produced arbitrary results. States responded by adopting procedures intended to guide jury discretion, separate guilt from sentencing, and require review. In *Gregg v. Georgia* (1976), the Supreme Court permitted capital punishment under revised systems that narrowed eligibility and considered aggravating and mitigating evidence. Later decisions imposed categorical limits, including *Atkins v. Virginia* (2002), which prohibited execution of people with intellectual disability, and *Roper v. Simmons* (2005), which barred execution for crimes committed before age eighteen. Contemporary capital cases generally involve aggravated murder, although statutory aggravating factors and procedural rules vary among jurisdictions. Prosecutors decide whether to seek death in eligible cases, juries often determine sentence, and appellate and post-conviction review can continue for many years. The Constitution therefore permits capital punishment within defined limits but does not require any jurisdiction to authorize or use it.

Retribution, Deterrence, and Incapacitation

Retribution provides the strongest philosophical argument for capital punishment because it focuses on moral desert rather than uncertain predictions about future crime. Supporters argue that intentional murder can be so serious that execution uniquely expresses the gravity of the offense and society's condemnation. Critics accept that punishment can be severe while disputing whether proportionality requires death rather than life imprisonment. Deterrence produces a different empirical debate. Researchers face difficulty isolating the effect of executions because they are rare, jurisdictions differ in many ways, homicide rates change for numerous reasons, and death sentences are followed by lengthy delays. Studies have therefore produced contested results rather than a settled finding that execution deters murder more effectively than long imprisonment. Incapacitation is more straightforward: execution permanently prevents release, but life imprisonment without parole can also keep a person from returning to the community. These arguments demonstrate why the death-penalty debate cannot be resolved by a single theory. Retribution asks what punishment is deserved, deterrence asks what behavior it prevents, and incapacitation asks what future risk confinement can control.

Wrongful Conviction, Discretion, and Unequal Administration

Capital punishment places unusually high demands on accuracy because an execution cannot be reversed after new evidence emerges. Documented death-row exonerations show that serious errors can result from mistaken identification, false testimony, official misconduct, unreliable forensic evidence, inadequate defense, or withheld information. Supporters of retention point to specialized procedures, automatic review in many jurisdictions, and clemency as safeguards; opponents argue that the existence of exonerations demonstrates that even heightened review cannot eliminate error. Discretion creates a second concern. Prosecutors decide whether to seek death, defense resources vary by county, and jury composition can shape sentencing, producing geographic differences that are not explained entirely by offense severity. Research has also examined racial disparities, particularly the association between victim race and capital charging or sentencing in some jurisdictions. These findings do not establish that every capital case involves conscious discrimination, but they raise questions about whether a punishment reserved for the "worst" crimes is applied consistently. Evaluating fairness therefore requires examining charging, counsel, jury selection, mitigation, appellate review, and local resources together.

Victims' Families, Cost, Delay, and Execution

Practices

Families of murder victims hold diverse views about capital punishment. Some seek execution as a form of accountability, some oppose it, and others change their position over time. It is therefore misleading to assume that one sentence reliably produces “closure.” Capital litigation can involve repeated hearings and decades of appeals, while a noncapital sentence may reach finality sooner. The same procedural protections that lengthen cases also exist because mistakes in a death sentence have irreversible consequences. Cost studies in several jurisdictions have generally found capital cases more expensive than comparable noncapital prosecutions because they require specialized counsel, extended jury selection, expert investigation, separate penalty proceedings, heightened security, and multiple levels of review. Execution methods create additional disputes involving drug availability, secrecy, failed procedures, medical participation, and whether a particular protocol creates an unconstitutional risk of suffering. These institutional questions are distinct from the moral judgment about the crime. A person can support severe punishment while questioning execution procedures, just as an opponent of capital punishment can still recognize the interests of victims in accountability and public safety.

Retention, Abolition, and the Current U.S. Landscape

American jurisdictions have moved in different directions rather than following one national trajectory. Some states have abolished the death penalty legislatively or judicially, some retain statutes but rarely or never execute, and a smaller group carries out most executions. Death Penalty Information Center data from 2026 show that execution activity remains concentrated even though twenty-seven states formally retain capital punishment (Death Penalty Information Center, 2026a; 2026b). Retention proposals generally focus on narrowing eligibility, strengthening defense, improving forensic reliability, reducing delay, or revising execution protocols. Abolition proposals replace death sentences with imprisonment, though the details of parole eligibility and prison conditions vary and create their own ethical questions. Internationally, many democratic states have abolished capital punishment, while several countries continue to impose it. Comparative practice does not decide what U.S. law should be, but it demonstrates that severe punishment can be structured in different ways. The relevant domestic policy choice concerns whether the goals of retribution and safety justify maintaining a uniquely irreversible sanction within institutions known to produce some errors and disparities.

Conclusion

The death penalty debate combines constitutional doctrine, moral philosophy, empirical claims, and institutional performance. Supreme Court precedent permits capital punishment for a narrowed

category of cases while excluding certain defendants and requiring heightened procedures. Supporters emphasize proportional retribution, permanent incapacitation, and the symbolic seriousness of the most aggravated murders. Opponents emphasize fallibility, unequal administration, cost, delay, and the possibility of achieving public safety through imprisonment. Current practice adds another layer: although twenty-seven states retain capital punishment, most states either do not authorize it or have not executed anyone for many years, and contemporary executions are concentrated in a small number of jurisdictions. These facts do not themselves determine whether retention or abolition is the preferable political choice. They identify the questions that any position must address: how eligibility is defined, how error and bias are controlled, whether deterrence exceeds that of alternatives, how victims are supported, what the system costs, and whether an irreversible punishment can be administered consistently enough to satisfy constitutional and ethical standards.

References

Death Penalty Information Center. (2026a). *State by State*.

Death Penalty Information Center. (2026b). *States With No Recent Executions*.

Atkins v. Virginia, 536 U.S. 304 (2002).

Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238 (1972).

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

Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551 (2005).