

# WRONG: MERCIFUL HOMICIDE SURVIVORS for the MERCILESS

By Lester Jackson

*Despite the fact that most homicide survivors support capital punishment, the small percentage opposed receive vast publicity out of all proportion to their numbers. Accordingly, a [website](#) was established to emphasize this point. On November 19, 2016, there appeared on that site's Facebook page a [post critical](#) of anti-death penalty victims' families. I posted a response on the [Equal Justice for Victims](#) Facebook page.*

*(Currently, EJV is a group of individuals. If I can raise the relatively small amount of funds needed, I will turn it into a nationwide non-profit organization to FIGHT for justice for victims and safety for the public. A detailed description of the organization can be found on the right side of the EJV Facebook page. ANY CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD GETTING STARTED WOULD BE MOST APPRECIATED. If you wish to contribute, please contact me. Thank you.)*

In light of the November 19 post, I emphasize the following:

1. Like any large number of individuals, homicide survivors have their differences and disagreements. Previously, I listed and described at least [ten categories](#).

2. Death penalty opponents long have [benefitted from](#) the biased pro-murderer media (e.g., [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)). In any event, it is counterproductive [bad strategy to respond](#) to abolitionists. This lends them undeserved legitimacy and additional unwarranted attention.

3. The purpose of EJV is to [fight the powerful, not the pests](#). The most powerful are federal judges. It is essential to expose what all too many of them really are: not the romanticized and idolized high priests in black robes they pretend to be, but dishonest and arrogant defenders and promoters of evil, men and women truly unworthy of respect, whose power-abusing unconstitutional death sentence dictates should be disregarded.

4. As to the overpublicized tiny percentage of victims' families opposed to capital punishment, please look at the names of death penalty cases; e.g., *People v. Smith*; *State v. Jones*. There is a reason for that.

Civil law governs private wrongdoing (e.g., breach of contract, rent disputes, etc.). Correction of such wrongdoing is sought by one private individual or business against another. By contrast, a crime is considered an act against everyone. That is why state officials (district or state attorneys) are responsible for criminal cases. In old England, from where much American law is derived, a crime was an offense against one of the King's subjects and, hence, against the King himself. Even today, British Criminal prosecutions are brought [in the name of the Queen](#). In the United States, a crime is also an act against the sovereign: the People or the [State](#).

It is a staple of death penalty opposition propaganda to disparage capital punishment as no more than catering to victims' families "thirst" for blood and vengeance. Supporters' response has been that they only seek justice. But, more importantly, if we accept the abolitionist contention that victims' families should have no say in demanding just punishment, then why should victims' families have a say in demanding unjust – and dangerous – "mercy"? It is rank hypocrisy for the very same pro-murderer fanatics who want to [throw](#) pro-death penalty victim families out of court to relentlessly give maximum publicity to the few opposing families.

After years of thought, it is my considered conclusion that “punishment should fit the crime,” period. There has been entirely too much focus on factors irrelevant to the crime. If a person intentionally and unlawfully cuts short an innocent human life, that should be the end of the matter: capital punishment should be mandatory.

5. I am of a mixed mind about victim impact statements. Yes, they provide all too fleeting emotional satisfaction for victims’ loved ones – affording them a chance to have a sentencing say about their suffering and about the wonderful people whose lives were robbed by intentional murderers. Sometimes they get to confront the murderer face-to-face in open court.

However, consider:

**FIRST**, it is doubtful that open court confrontation would have an effect on most barbarians capable of committing murder.

**SECOND**, due to the procedural morass created by arrogant and dishonest judicial murderer protectors, most capital cases [last decades](#). Anti-victim justices and judges have grotesquely turned victim impact statements into [sheer torture](#) for survivors, who are forced to relive their traumas again and again and again for most of the rest of their lives.

**THIRD**, as important as the prior point is, another is decisive. If capital punishment is avoided to please survivors in a particular case, this subjects unknown future victims to murder at the hands of the spared murderers. This penalty provides not only justice for prior victims but protection against the entirely avoidable additional murders.

The most important reason for capital punishment is to protect society against duly convicted predators. That is why my proposal is very simple: punish crimes and not criminals; the punishment for intentionally and unlawfully robbing an innocent human life should be death, period. To do otherwise is to turn public safety into a crapshoot and needlessly cause the [avoidable murders](#) of decent and law-abiding human beings who have harmed no one. Again and again, [predictions](#) of “future dangerousness” have been [proven wrong](#) by such murders

**FOURTH**, on the surface, the harm suffered by murder victims and their victimized survivors seems relevant. However, this is not an argument for the death penalty but a concession to its opponents. The [November 19 response](#) to victims’ families opposed to the death penalty refers to imposing it only when “appropriate.” This is an unwarranted surrender to United States Supreme Court justices’ dishonest and unconstitutional invention of “[death eligibility](#).” As rogue justices themselves have boasted, that concoction has resulted in a death penalty so “narrowly constrained” as to allow close to 100 percent of all murderers to take the lives of others while keeping their own. For [reasons I have explained](#), the death penalty is “appropriate” for any and all convicted intentional murderers. Anything short of that GUARANTEES additional murders by convicted murderers.

---

**Copyright © 2016 by Lester Jackson, Ph.D., a former college Political Science teacher, who views mainstream media [suppression](#) of the truth as essential to harmful judicial activism. His recent articles are collected [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#). He is currently establishing a pro-death penalty advocacy and educational organization, Equal Justice for Victims. The foregoing views are his alone and are not expressed on behalf of Equal Justice for Victims.**