

October 1968

The Death Penalty Cases

California Law Review
Berkeley Law

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview>

Recommended Citation

California Law Review, *The Death Penalty Cases*, 56 CAL. L. REV. 1268 (1968).
Available at: <http://scholarship.law.berkeley.edu/californialawreview/vol56/iss5/3>

Link to publisher version (DOI)

<http://dx.doi.org/https://doi.org/10.15779/Z384B58>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the California Law Review at Berkeley Law Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in California Law Review by an authorized administrator of Berkeley Law Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact jcera@law.berkeley.edu.

. THE DEATH PENALTY CASES

I.	THE STATE'S INTEREST IN THE DEATH PENALTY	1271
A.	PENAL OBJECTIVES AND THE DEATH PENALTY	1273
	1. <i>Deterrence</i>	1275
	2. <i>Recidivism</i>	1292
	3. <i>Retribution</i>	1297
	4. <i>Summary</i>	1302
B.	NONPENAL OBJECTIVES AND THE DEATH PENALTY	1302
	1. <i>Capital Punishment as a Source of Guilty Pleas and Confessions</i>	1303
	2. <i>Capital Punishment as a Source of State Witnesses</i>	1308
	3. <i>Capital Punishment and the State's Interest in Economy</i>	1311
	4. <i>Summary</i>	1313
C.	CALIFORNIA'S OFFICIAL POSITION ON THE DEATH PENALTY	1314
	1. <i>California's Reasons for Retaining Capital Punishment</i>	1316
D.	SUMMARY	1322
II.	THE INDIVIDUAL'S INTEREST IN LIFE	1324
A.	THE DEATH PENALTY AS CRUEL AND UNUSUAL PUNISHMENT	1326
	1. <i>Cruelty Regardless of the Crime: The Case Law</i>	1327
	2. <i>Cruelty Regardless of the Crime: The Evidence</i>	1337
	3. <i>Cruelty as a Relative Concept: A Proposed Test</i>	1343
B.	THE DEATH PENALTY AS EXTINCTION OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS	1354
	1. <i>Hope of Restoration to Full Citizenship</i>	1355
	2. <i>Fundamental Rights of Prison Inmates</i>	1360
C.	SUMMARY	1363
III.	CALIFORNIA DEATH PENALTY TRIALS AND APPEALS	1364
A.	OUTLINE OF CALIFORNIA PROCEDURE IN CAPITAL CASES	1366
B.	THE SCRUPLED EXCLUSION AND WITHERSPOON V. ILLINOIS	1369
	1. <i>The Immediate Impact of Witherspoon in California</i>	1371
	2. <i>The Validity of Convictions Returned by Unscrupled Juries and the Problem of the Juror Who Will Not Convict in a Capital Case</i>	1378
	3. <i>The Juror Who Will Convict but Not Condemn</i>	1386
	4. <i>Death Sentences Imposed Without a Jury</i>	1392
	5. <i>Summary</i>	1402
C.	THE PENALTY TRIAL	1404
	1. <i>Evidence and Argument at the Penalty Trial</i>	1406
	2. <i>Standards at the Penalty Trial</i>	1415
	3. <i>Summary</i>	1423

D.	TRIAL JUDGE AND APPELLATE COURT POWERS	1424
	1. <i>The Power to Reduce a Death Sentence</i>	1424
	2. <i>The Power to Reduce the Degree of the Crime</i>	1428
	3. <i>The Harmless Error Rule</i>	1434
E.	SUMMARY	1441
IV.	RIGHT TO COUNSEL AFTER THE FIRST APPEAL IN CAPITAL CASES	1443
A.	THE SIXTH AMENDMENT REQUIREMENT	1446
	1. <i>The Right to Counsel at Every Critical Stage</i>	1446
	2. <i>Postconviction Procedures: Civil or Criminal?</i>	1451
B.	THE DUE PROCESS REQUIREMENT	1453
C.	THE EQUAL PROTECTION REQUIREMENT	1459
	1. <i>The Concept of Invidious Discrimination</i>	1460
	2. <i>The Initial Showing of Merit</i>	1463
D.	THE RIGHT TO PETITION FOR REDRESS OF GRIEVANCES . .	1465
E.	SOME PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS	1469
	1. <i>The Allocation of Legal Resources</i>	1469
	2. <i>Benefits of Appointing Counsel</i>	1477
F.	OTHER STAGES OF THE POST-CONVICTION PERIOD	1479
	1. <i>Preparation of Petitions to the United States Supreme Court</i>	1479
	2. <i>Petitions for a Sanity Hearing After Appeal and Prior to Execution</i>	1482
	3. <i>Petitions for Executive Clemency</i>	1485
	CONCLUSION	1487