

DE JURE NEXUS LAW JOURNAL

Author:

Smega Sony

Law Graduate, from VIPS Delhi.

EXECUTION OF DEATH PENALTY**INTRODUCTION**

All punishments are based on the same proposition, i.e. a penalty for misconduct has to be levied. There are two key explanations for the penalty being inflicted. One is the belief that it is both just and right that a person who has done wrong should suffer for it; the other is the belief that it discourages anyone from doing wrong by imposing punishment on wrongdoers. The death penalty still relies on the same concept as other penalties.

The debate on capital punishment is the most critical debate in general, bearing in mind the situation that has been brought about today. An integral part of the Indian system of criminal justice is capital punishment. The existence of capital punishment is challenged as unethical by the increasing intensity of the human rights movement in India. This is a peculiar claim, however, as it is incredible to keep one person alive at the expense of the lives of multiple members or possible victims of society and, in fact, that is morally wrong.

Every day, people are executed and sentenced to death by the state as punishment for a variety of crimes – sometimes for acts that should not be criminalized. In some countries, it can be for drug-related offences, in others it is reserved for terrorism-related acts and murder.

Some countries execute people who were under 18 years old when the crime was committed, others use the death penalty against people with mental and intellectual disabilities and several others apply the death penalty after unfair trials – in clear violation of international

law and standards. People can spend years on death row, not knowing when their time is up, or whether they will see their families one last time.

WHAT IS DEATH PENALTY?

The death penalty is a legal mechanism by which the state puts a person to death as a punishment for a crime. The judicial decree that someone is punished in this way is a sentence of death, while an execution is the actual process of killing the individual. There has been a global trend towards the abolition of capital punishment; this position has not, however, been adopted by India. The obvious aspect of irreversibility attached to it is what makes this type of punishment different from others. It is never possible to bring back to life a man once hanged for a crime. So this error cannot be rectified at a later point if any error has come in when deciding on a matter.

Since antiquity, the death penalty has existed. Anthropologists also contend that the drawings by prehistoric cave dwellers at Vallaloid indicate an execution. In human sacrifices, the death penalty may have its roots. As early as 1750 B.C, in the lex talionis of the Hammurabi Code, capital punishment can be traced back. For sins such as sorcery, breach of the Sabbath, heresy, adultery, abortion, bestiality, incest and rape, the Bible positions death as punishment. Plato also addressed the scope of the death penalty in his laws at length.

The death penalty was distinguished by specific cruelty during the middle ages. Popular thinkers such as Grotius, Thomas Hobbes, and John Locke advocated this type of punishment as well. A type of capital punishment can be said to be the trials of fire, water, etc. that followed during the 1600s.

The modern abolitionist movement began with the works of Cesare Beccaria, the great Italian criminologist, who persuaded many statesmen of capital punishment's uselessness and inhumanity. There was a lively debate during the discussions on the implementation of the French Penal Code in 1791 for the abolition of the death penalty.

In the 19th century, with eminent jurists such as Bentham and Romilly promoting such ideas, the abolitionist movement grew. In 1846, Michigan, followed by Venezuela and Portugal in 1867, became the first state to abolish capital punishment. The abolition of the death penalty

was promoted during the drafting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 as an aim for civilised nations.

In 58 countries, including the USA, Japan, Belarus, Cuba, and Singapore, Capital Punishment is currently practised. There will be 97 abolitionist states as of 2012. The worst criminals in 2012 were China (1000 + deaths), Iran (314 +) and Iraq (129 +), according to Amnesty International. In 2012, 1, 722 death sentences and 682 executions (excluding China) were confirmed by the organisation. However, in Europe, with the exception of the Republic of Belarus, it is now a nearly extinct phenomenon.

POSITION IN INDIA

A close review of the debates in the Legislative Assembly of British India shows that no question was posed in the Assembly regarding capital punishment until 1931, when one of the representatives of Bihar, Shri Gaya Prasad Singh, attempted to introduce a Bill to eliminate the death penalty for crimes under the Indian Penal Code. However, after the then Home Minister referred to the motion, the motion was negated.

The Stance of the Government on Capital Punishment in British India prior to Freedom in the debates of the Legislative Assembly was explicitly mentioned twice in 1946 by the then Home Minister, Sir John Thorne. "For any form of crime for which the penalty is now given, the Government does not think it wise to abolish capital punishment"

India retained many laws enacted by the British colonial government at independence, which included the 1898 Code of Criminal Procedure ('CrPC. 1898') and the 1860 Indian Penal Code ('IPC').

Article 21 of the Constitution of India, termed 'protection of life and personal liberty,' states:

"No person shall be deprived of his life or personal liberty except as according to procedure established by law. "

The right to life guaranteed to every person in India is enshrined in this article of the Constitution. In the Indian courts, the constitutional validity of capital punishment has been challenged many times.

The 1860 Indian Penal Code grants death sentences as a penalty for numerous offences. Punishment for criminal conspiracy (Section 120B), murder (Section 302), waging or attempting to wage war against the Government of India (Section 121), abetment of mutiny (Section 132), dacoity with murder (Section 396) and others are some of these capital offences under the IPC. In addition, in different statutes, such as the NDPS Act, anti-terrorism laws, etc., there are provisions for the death penalty.

The Indian Constitution allows for the President's clemency for capital punishment. Once a prisoner has been granted a death sentence by the Sessions Court in a case, the High Court must validate it. The prisoner may prefer an appeal to the Supreme Court, even after that. The defendant has the option of sending a 'mercy petition' to the President of India and the Governor of the State if this also fails. The Ministry of Home Affairs shall lay down specific guidelines concerning the procedure to be followed by the States to deal with pleas for mercy from or on behalf of convicts under sentence of death and with appeals to the Supreme Court and with requests for special leave to appeal to that court by such convicts.

In this regard, we may refer to Article 72 of the Indian Constitution, which states:

“Power of President to grant pardons, etc., and to suspend, remit or commute sentences in certain cases-

(1) The President shall have the power to grant pardons, reprieves, respites or remissions of punishment or to suspend, remit or commute the sentence of any person convicted of any offence;

(a) In all cases where the punishment or sentence is by a Court Martial;

(b) In all cases where the punishment or sentence is for an offence against any law relating to a matter to which the executive power of the Union extends;

(c) In all cases where the sentence is a sentence of death;

(2) nothing in sub-clause (a) of Clause (1) shall affect the power to suspend, remit or commute a sentence of death exercisable by the Governor of a State under any law for the time being in force.”¹

¹ <https://www.lawctopus.com/academike/death-penalty-an-overview-of-indian-cases/>
Dejurenexus.com

Similarly, in Article 161, the pardoning rights of the Governor of a State are alluded to. These laws mean that only after there is no room for error left is the accused sentenced to death. There are many options for the perpetrator to appeal and life imprisonment has now become the law, whilst the death penalty is the exception.

CASE STUDIES

Saved from death row: Hafez Ibrahim

Thanks to Amnesty's campaigning efforts, the execution of Hafez Ibrahim, from Yemen, was stopped not once, but twice. Hafez, who was accused of a crime he insists he didn't commit, first faced a firing squad in 2005. He was taken to a small yard in a Yemeni prison and brought before a row of officers with rifles in hand. He thought that moment would be his last. Just before he was about to be shot, he was taken back to his cell, with no explanation. "I was lost, I did not understand what was happening. I later learned that Amnesty International had called on the Yemeni President to stop my execution and the message was heard," Hafez said.

In 2007, Hafez was about to be executed again when he sent a mobile text message to Amnesty. "They are about to execute us," Hafez said. It was a message that saved his life. The message sparked an international campaign, persuading the President to stop the execution for a second time. Now Hafez is a lawyer helping juveniles who languish on death row corridors across Yemen. "I owe my life to Amnesty. Now I dedicate that life to campaigning against the death penalty."²

Activists on a mission: Souleymane Sow

Amnesty's work to abolish the death penalty is also bolstered by its incredible activists, who take it upon themselves to campaign against this abhorrent practice. Souleymane Sow, has been volunteering with Amnesty International since he was a student in France. Inspired to make a difference, he returned to Guinea, set up a local group of Amnesty International volunteers and got to work. Their aim is to promote the importance of human rights, educate

² <https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/death-penalty/>
Dejurenexus.com

people on these issues and abolish the death penalty. Along with 34 NGOs, they finally achieved their goal last year.

“My colleagues and I lobbied against the death penalty every day for five months. In 2016, Guinea’s National Assembly voted in favour of a new criminal code which removed the death sentence from the list of applicable penalties. Last year, they did the same in the military court, too,” said Souleymane. “It was such an incredible achievement – and it showed the importance of people power. It was the first time so many NGOs had come together to campaign on an issue. People said they were happy with our work and they could see that change is possible. Most of all, it inspired us to continue campaigning.”

INTERNATIONAL SCENARIO

The international death penalty landscape, both in terms of international law and state practice – has evolved in the past decades. Internationally, countries are classified on their death penalty status, based on the following categories:

- Abolitionist for all crimes
- Abolitionist for ordinary crimes
- Abolitionist de facto
- Retentionist

At the end of 2014, 98 countries were abolitionists for all crimes, 7 countries were abolitionists for all crimes, abolitionists for common crimes only, and in practice 35 were abolitionists, making 140 abolitionist nations in law or practice in the world. Fifty-eight countries are known as Retentionists, who still hold the death penalty on their book of laws and included it in the statute book Latest Past. Although the death penalty is maintained and used by only a handful of countries, this list this includes some of the world's most populated countries , including India, China, Indonesia, and the United States, eventually subjecting the bulk of the world 's population to such a penalty.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES

One of the main documents discussing the imposition of the death penalty under international human rights law is the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights ('ICCPR'). The use of the death penalty is not prohibited by the ICCPR, but Article 6 provides assurances of the right to life and offers essential protections to be adopted by signatories who maintain the death penalty.

The Second Optional Protocol to the ICCPR to eliminate the death penalty is the only treaty explicitly dealing with the abolition of the death penalty, open to signatures from all countries in the world. It entered into force in 1991, and has 81 States Parties and 3 Signatories, Article 37(a) of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, similar to the ICCPR,

The use of the death penalty against individuals under the age of 18 is expressly forbidden by ('CRC'). The CRC was ratified by 195 countries as of July 2015.

The Convention against Torture and Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment ('the Convention against Torture') and the United Nations Committee against Torture have been sources of jurisprudence and required protections for restrictions on the death penalty. The imposition of the death penalty per se as a form of torture or cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment ('CIDT') is not considered by the Torture Convention. However, some methods of execution and the death row phenomenon have been seen by UN bodies as examples of CIDT.

The death penalty was a permissible punishment in the Nuremberg and Tokyo tribunals in the evolution of international criminal law, both of which were formed after World War II. Since then, however, international criminal courts have rejected the death penalty as a permissible punishment.

Of the treaties listed above, India has ratified the ICCPR and the CRC and is a signatory to the Torture Convention but has not ratified it. Under international law, after they have ratified the treaty, treaty commitments are binding on nations. The state is obliged to "refrain from actions that would defeat the object and intent of a treaty" even though a treaty has been signed but not ratified.

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT: THE CURRENT STATUS

SUPREME COURT ON VALIDITY OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN INDIA

Article 21 of the Indian Constitution guarantees every person's constitutional right to life and liberty. It adds that no person shall, except in accordance with the procedure provided for by statute, be deprived of his life or personal liberty. This has been legally construed to mean that if there is a reasonable and legitimate process, then the state may deprive an individual of his existence by framing a rule. Although the central government has continuously maintained that the death penalty in the statute books must be maintained to serve as a deterrent, and for those who are a danger to society, in the "rarest of rare" cases, the Supreme Court has affirmed the constitutional validity of capital punishment. The Supreme Court upheld the constitutional validity of the death penalty in *Jagmohan Singh vs. Uttar Pradesh State* (1973), then in *Rajendra Prasad vs. Uttar Pradesh State* (1979), and finally in *Bachan Singh vs. Punjab State* (1980). It claimed that if the statute allows for capital punishment and the proceeding is fair, just and rational, a prisoner can be given the death penalty. However, this would only be in the "rarest of rare" cases, and when sending an individual to the gallows, the courts should provide "special reasons".

The Rarest Of Rare Criteria

In the landmark judgement in *Bachan Singh vs. State of Punjab* (1980), the top court laid down the principles as to what would constitute the "rarest of rare".

Some broad illustrative guidelines were developed by the Supreme Court and claimed that it should only be granted when "unquestionably foreclosed" is the option to grant the sentence of life imprisonment. It was left solely to the discretion of the court to draw this conclusion.

The apex court, however, also laid down the concept of situations being measured, exacerbated and mitigated. In a specific case, a balance sheet of aggravating and mitigating factors must be drawn up to decide whether justice will not be served if any penalty other than the death sentence is awarded. Two key questions, kept by the top court, can be posed and answered. Second, is there anything unique about the offence that makes the life imprisonment penalty ineffective and calls for a death sentence?

Second, there are conditions of the crime such that there is no choice but to impose the death penalty on the mitigating circumstances that speak in favour of the perpetrators, even after maximum weighting.

REASONS TO ABOLISH THE DEATH PENALTY

It is permanent and errors occur

The final, irrevocable punishment is execution: the possibility of killing an innocent individual can never be removed. For example, since 1973, more than 160 inmates sent to death row in the U.S. were later exonerated or released from death row on innocence grounds. Despite severe questions about their guilt, some have been executed.

It does not deter crime

Countries that execute sometimes cite the death penalty as a way to discourage crime from being committed by citizens. This argument has repeatedly been debunked, and there is no proof that the death penalty is any more effective than life imprisonment in reducing crime.

Under unequal justice structures, it is also used

In many of the cases reported by Amnesty International, after being convicted in grossly unjust courts, people were executed on the basis of proof of torture and with insufficient legal representation. Death sentences are enforced as a statutory penalty for some crimes in certain nations, which means that judges are unable to recognize the circumstances of the offence or the perpetrator prior to the sentencing of the prisoner.³

It is discriminatory

Many with less favourable socio-economic backgrounds or belonging to a racial, ethnic or religious group bear the weight of the death penalty overwhelmingly. This involves, for

³ <https://www.amnesty.org/en/what-we-do/death-penalty/>

instance, having insufficient access to legal counsel, or being at a greater disadvantage in their criminal justice system experience.

It is used as a political instrument

To execute political rivals, the authorities in some nations, such as Iran and Sudan, use the death penalty.

LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

1. The POCSO Act was amended in August 2019 to introduce the death penalty for the non-homicide offence of penetrative sexual assault on children.
2. The Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly passed amendments to Indian Penal Code introducing the death penalty for rape and sent it for approval of the President under Article 254(2) of the Constitution. This was in response to the outrage following a brutal gang rape and murder in Hyderabad in December 2019.⁴

LANDMARK JUDGEMENTS ON DEATH PENALTY

1. SHATRUGHAN CHAUHAN CASE, 2014

The government claimed that the reason for this delay is a series of guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court in its judgment in the Shatrughan Chauhan case in 2014. These guidelines had primarily held that unexplained delay in carrying out an execution would lead to commutation of death penalty to life imprisonment. The government called the 2014 verdict “accused-centric” and called for a change to appease the victims and society.

“We (Supreme Court) have always rendered judgments with the victims in our mind. Our decisions are for the victims. It is the law of the land,” Chief Justice S.A. Bobde reacted to Solicitor General Tushar Mehta, for the government.

⁴ <https://www.project39a.com/annual-statistics>

The three-judge Bench led by Chief Justice Bobde questioned the government's locus standi in filing the application. The CJI said both the review and curative petitions against the Chauhan verdict already stood dismissed.

The court asked how the government could file an application now, seeking to modify or add to the guidelines laid down by the Supreme Court in 2014 as part of a judgment. Undaunted, Mr. Mehta repeatedly expressed the government's concern for victims awaiting justice. He said the government was merely seeking some "additional" guidelines to the ones in the Chauhan verdict to balance the scale.

Finally, the court agreed to issue formal notice, but the CJI clarified in its written order that the court would not entertain any alteration in the conviction or sentence in the Chauhan case.

The Supreme Court had commuted the death penalty of 15 convicts to life sentence in the Chauhan case. In its application, the government has asked the court to set short deadlines for death row convicts to seek legal remedies. It wants the court to limit the time for filing curative petition. Mercy plea should be filed within a week of issuance of death warrant. If mercy plea has already been rejected, death warrant should be issued within the next seven days and execution carried out a week thereafter. The pendency of review or curative petitions of his co-convicts would be of no consequence for a man whose mercy plea has been rejected.

The application came in the aftermath of the four Nirbhaya convicts separately and repeatedly approaching the courts for one relief or the other.

2. BACHAN SINGH V STATE OF PUNJAB, (9 MAY, 1980)

The case of Bachan Singh v State of Punjab again brought up the question of the validity of capital punishment. This was the case that gave birth to the "rarest of the rare cases" doctrine and still remains one of the most important cases in this subject. The 5 judge bench said:

"A real and abiding concern for the dignity of human life postulates resistance to taking a life through law instrumentality. That ought not to be done except in rarest of rare cases where the alternative opinion is unquestionably foreclosed."

In this case, not only the constitutional validity of death penalty but also the validity of Section 354(3) on the grounds that it gives unguided discretion to the Court and allows the death sentence to be arbitrarily awarded was questioned. The majority were of the view that neither Article 19 nor 21 is violated by capital punishment. The fact that our Constitution makers were fully cognizant of the fact that death sentence may be given in certain extreme crimes is proven by the existence of provisions for appeal (Article 134) and Pardoning power of the President (Article 72).

It was also laid down that for ascertaining the existence or absence of “special reasons” in a case, the Court must pay due regard to both the criminal and the crime equally. The aggravating or mitigating factors need to be looked into. Things like age, mental condition, age of the accused and if the act was done under the command of a superior must be taken into consideration while deciding the punishment.

Justice Bhagwati alone dissented in this case but the issue was that his judgment came only 2 whole years after the verdict had been declared. So, some of the essential arguments that he made against the death penalty never came to the limelight.

According to him, “Unfettered and uncharted discretion conferred on any authority, even if it be the judiciary, throws the door open for arbitrariness, for after all a judge does not cease to be a human being subject to human limitations when he puts on the judicial robe and the nature of the judicial process being what it is, it cannot be entirely free from judicial subjectivism.”

And this very principle he believed clearly violates Article 14 which guarantees equality before the law. Also, it violates Article 19 and 21 as there are no procedural as to when the state has the power to take away the life and personal liberties of a person in such cases. Justice Bhagwati not only talks about the brutality and indiscretion that accompanies death penalty but also with logic and statistical data shows us how capital punishment doesn't succeed in attaining any of the three penological goals(Reformation, retribution, and deterrence).

It is obviously impossible to reform a person who is dead and the retribution theory also does not hold ground according to him such a punishment is based purely on emotions of vengeance and revenge which should be curtailed in a civilized society. Last is the Deterrence theory, which most retentionists assume is the most crucial reason for not

abolishing capital punishment. They believe that legally sanctioned death of the culprit would dissuade others from doing the same.

However, Justice Bhagwati cites various eminent criminologists and statistics of other countries which prove that there is no increase in the crime rate even when capital punishment is abolished and no decrease when the court awards death sentence for a crime.

3. JAGMOHAN SINGH V. STATE OF U.P., 3 OCTOBER, 1972

In the case of Jagmohan Singh v. State of U.P.[x] which was the first case dealing with the question of constitutional validity of capital punishment in India. The counsel for the appellant, in this case, put forward three arguments which invalidate section 302 of the IPC.

Firstly that execution takes away all the fundamental rights guaranteed under Clauses (a) to (g) of Sub-clause (1) of Article 19 and, therefore the law with regard to capital sentence is unreasonable and not in the interest of the general public.

Secondly that the discretion invested in the Judges to impose capital punishment is not based on any standards or policy required by the Legislature for imposing capital punishment in preference to imprisonment for life.

Thirdly, he contended, the uncontrolled and unguided discretion in the Judges to impose capital punishment or imprisonment for life is hit by Article 14 of the Constitution because two persons found guilty of murder on similar facts are liable to be treated differently one forfeiting his life and the other suffering merely a sentence of life imprisonment.

Lastly, it was contended that the provisions of the law do not provide a procedure for trial of factors and circumstances crucial for making the choice between the capital penalty and imprisonment for life. The trial under the Criminal Procedure Code is limited to the question of guilt. In the absence of any procedure established by law in the matter of sentence, the protection given by Article 21 of the Constitution was violated and hence for that reason also the sentence of death is unconstitutional.

After looking into the arguments the five-judge bench upheld the constitutionality of the death penalty and held that deprivation of life is constitutionally permissible for being recognized as a permissible punishment by the drafters of our Constitution.

Law Commission Report –

No discussion on the validity of capital punishment in India can be complete without going through the fine details of the Law Commission Report, which was relied upon by the judges in the case of Jagmohan too. The Law Commission of India, after making an intensive and extensive study of the subject of death penalty in India, published and submitted its 36th Report in 1967 to the Government. After examining, a wealth of evidential material and considering the arguments for and against its retention, that high-powered body summed up its conclusions at page 354 of its Report, as follows:

The issue of abolition or retention has to be decided on a balancing of the various arguments for and against retention. No single argument for abolition or retention can decide the issue. In arriving at any conclusion on the subject, the need for protecting society in general and individual human beings must be borne in mind.

It is difficult to rule out the validity of the strength behind many of the arguments for abolition nor does the Commission treat lightly the argument based on the irrevocability of the sentence of death, the need for a modern approach, the severity of capital punishment and the strong feeling shown by certain sections of public opinion in stressing deeper questions of human values.

Having regard, however, to the conditions in India, to the variety of the social upbringing of its inhabitants, to the disparity in the level of morality and education in the country, to the vastness of its area, to diversity of its population and to the paramount need for maintaining law and order in the country at the present juncture, India cannot risk the experiment of abolition of capital punishment.

4. EDIGA ANAMMA V. STATE OF ANDHRA PRADESH, 11 FEBRUARY, 1974

In the case of Ediga Anamma v. State of Andhra Pradesh which followed Justice Krishna Iyer commuted the death sentence to life imprisonment by citing factors like age, gender, socio-economic background and psychic compulsions of the accused. It was laid out in this case that apart from looking into the details of the crime and deciding based on the extent of violence committed the judges should also look into the criminal and his condition or haplessness while committing the crime. Justice Krishna Iyer in support of life imprisonment over capital punishment said:

“A legal policy on life or death cannot be left for ad hoc mood or individual predilection and so we have sought to objectify to the extent possible, abandoning retributive ruthlessness, amending the deterrent creed and accenting the trend against the extreme and irrevocable penalty of putting out life.”

These cases were followed by three important developments. Section 354 (3) was added to the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 which clearly laid down that in conviction for cases which are punishable either with death or life imprisonment, the judgment shall state the reasons for award of the punishment and in the event that it is death sentence mention the special reasons for that decision. This made the lesser punishment the rule and death penalty the exception as opposed to the previous situation. Also in 1979, India ratified the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR).

Article 6(2) of the ICCPR says: “In countries which have not abolished the death penalty, sentence of death may be imposed only for the most serious crimes in accordance with the law in force at the time of the commission of the crime and not contrary to the provisions of the present Covenant and to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.”

Subsection 5 of the same Article says that no sentence of death shall be imposed on anyone under the age of 18 years and none can be carried out on pregnant women. Thus, India was now committed to progressive abolition of the death penalty. Another major development was the Maneka Gandhi case^[xiv] which held that every law of punitive detention must pass the reasonability test obtained from the collective reading of the “Golden Triangle” i.e. Articles 14, 19 and 21.

CONCLUSION

We can see, in the light of the above debates, that India's thought on capital punishment is still very confused. It is not only a discussion on the validity and constitutionality of the death penalty, but also the moral and social issues relevant to this contentious issue that must lead in this regard to extensive misunderstanding.

The topic of the death penalty must take into account considerations such as public sentiments on the one hand and deal with the moral dilemma of the "eye for an eye" concept on the other, staying away from the question of law. It is also known to us that mistake is only humane in making decisions and sometimes giving someone a second chance is like giving them a bullet again because the first time they failed you.

In the end, I would like to end with two suitable quotes which would give the readers two divisive aspects of the death penalty to mull over. The first is one by Bernard Shaw, an Irish playwright and a co-founder of the London School of Economics:

“Criminals do not die by the hands of the law. They die by the hands of other men. Assassination on the scaffold is the worst form of assassination because there it is invested with the approval of the society.....Murder and capital punishment both are not opposites that cancel one another but is similar that breed their kind.”

And the second one is by Margaret Thatcher, Prime Minister of the UK (1979 -1990):

“If we execute murderers and there is, in fact, no deterrent effect, we have killed a bunch of murderers. If we fail to execute murderers, and doing so would, in fact, have deterred other murders, we have allowed the killing of innocent victims. I would much rather risk the former. This, to me, is not a tough call.....All over the country news stories bemoan and hype the countdown to execution number 1000, but where are the stories regarding the ripple effect of the heinous crimes that these murderers were executed for committing? ”



De Jure Nexus

LAW JOURNAL