Decency Comes Full Circle: The Constitutional Demand to End Permanent Solitary Confinement on Death Row
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Many of the two thousand Americans living under a sentence of death spend twenty-three hours a day in a concrete box the size of a parking space. Often the only human touch they feel is being handcuffed and the only natural light comes from a small grill at the top of an exercise cell. However, change is at hand. The Supreme Court has emphasized that the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition of cruel and unusual punishments draws its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society. To date, there has been a dearth of information available regarding the historical and modern conditions on death row.

This Note addresses this gap. Part I provides, for the first time, a complete historical narrative of the development of the American death row from the Colonial Era to the Twenty-First Century. Part II reviews the findings of a survey of every jurisdiction with capital punishment to capture a national snapshot of conditions on America’s death rows. The findings in both Parts suggest that the system of permanent solitary confinement on death row has neither the weight of history nor the support of the majority in either contemporary practice or social values. Indeed, there is an accelerating trend away from the practice. Part III places this evidence in constitutional context and argues that the twelve states that retain permanent solitary death rows are out of pace with America’s evolving standards of decency and violate the Eighth Amendment.

* Leonard H. Sandler Fellow, Human Rights Watch, International Justice Program. J.D. 2022, Columbia Law School. The author would like to thank Bernard Harcourt and Alexis Hoag for their guidance, and the staff of the Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems for their editorial assistance, insightful feedback, and ability to find even the most obscure sources.
INTRODUCTION

I have cried and cried real tears from my soul out of remorse for the things I have done. . . . I even felt that I would end my appeals if [my victims’ families] wanted me to die to make amends for killing their loved ones. All of that is still there. But again I am exhausted by remorse. I am exhausted by everything involving those crimes. I don’t have anything left to give. My tears, my grief, my sorrow, my dignity, my very spirit . . . this ongoing torment has taken it all.

— Alim Braxton, on North Carolina Death Row since 1996

The Constitution prohibits cruel and unusual punishments. Yet, without a judge, jury, or legislature ordering it, many of the nearly two and a half thousand people on America’s death rows will spend an average of seven thousand days sealed for twenty-three hours behind a solid steel door, inside a windowless cell the size of a parking space. Since the 1970s, the United States carceral system has combined the ever-present threat of execution hanging over people sentenced to die with the crushing isolation of permanent solitary confinement—regardless of their behavior or individual circumstances. Many people on death row

1. Letter from Alim [(also known as Michael Braxton)] to Tessie Castillo (Oct. 7, 2017), in CRIMSON LETTERS: VOICES FROM DEATH ROW, 151, 154 (Tessie Castillo ed., 2020).
2. See U.S. CONST. amend. VIII.
4. The most common end result of a death sentence is reversal of the conviction, often after decades; however, besides the small number of commutations, every other death row resident will eventually be executed or otherwise die on the row. See Frank Baumgartner & Anna Dietrich, Most Death Penalty Sentences are Overturned. Here’s Why That Matters, WASH. POST (Mar. 17, 2015), https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/monkey-cage/wp/2015/03/17/most-death-penalty-sentences-are-overturned-heres-why-that-matters/ [https://perma.cc/28XX-4KF5]; see also Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238, 309 (1972) (Stewart, J., concurring) (“These death sentences are cruel and unusual in the same way that being struck by lightning is cruel and unusual.”).
have not seen the sun or felt the touch of another human being outside of being handcuffed since sentencing.5

People on death row often describe the conditions as worse than even their death sentence.6 The reality of life on death row causes “death row syndrome,” characterized by extreme anxiety, dissociation, and even full-blown psychosis.7 Since the reinstatement of the death penalty in 1976, at least 152 people sentenced to death have voluntarily dropped their appeals—in effect, choosing to die.8 People on death row are five times more likely to commit suicide than general population prisoners.9


9. David Lester & Christine Tartaro, Suicide on Death Row, 47 J. FORENSIC SCI. 1108, 1108 (2002) (finding a median of 1.13 death row suicides per 1,000 people in 1977–
Thus, the combination of capital punishment with uninterrupted solitary confinement imposes deep physical and psychological trauma.\textsuperscript{10}

However, the United States has begun to rapidly move away from this model of punishment, as more and more states take steps to ameliorate conditions on or even abolish solitary death rows.\textsuperscript{11} In the last six years, a set of politically and socially diverse states—Arizona, California, Florida, Louisiana, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia—have significantly reduced or eliminated the default use of solitary confinement for death row detainees.\textsuperscript{12} Several other states have implemented smaller changes or launched pilot programs to improve conditions for individuals on death row, for example allowing congregate time or access to religious services.\textsuperscript{13} These changes suggest that those states that maintain permanent solitary confinement for death row detainees are out of step with the modern understanding of the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment.

The Supreme Court has explained that the Eighth Amendment’s protection from cruel and unusual punishment “draw[s] its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society.”\textsuperscript{14} This standard “embodies a moral judgment . . . [that] remains the same, but its applicability must change as the basic mores of society change.”\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{10} Compared to a 1980–83 baseline average of 0.24 male suicides per 1,000 people across all prisons; see also Robert Johnson, \textit{Under Sentence of Death: The Psychology of Death Row Confinement}, 5 L. & PSYCHOL. REV. 141, 174 (1979) (“Just under one-half of the prisoners, in fact, consider the possibility of suicide in lieu of execution . . . .”).

\textsuperscript{11} See, e.g., Melvin I. Urofsky, \textit{A Right to Die: Termination of Appeal for Condemned Prisoners}, 75 J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY 553, 568–69 (1984) (“The simple reason most condemned prisoners want to terminate their appeals is that they find conditions on death row intolerable.”); Jackie Flynn Mogensen, \textit{For Years, This Nevada Death Row Inmate Asked to Be Executed. He Finally Just Took His Own Life}, MOTHER JONES (Jan. 6, 2019), https://www.motherjones.com/crime-justice/2019/01/nevada-death-row-inmate-scott-dzier-suicide [https://perma.cc/5L3H-Q65C] (Scott Dozier, who later killed himself on Nevada’s death row, stated “I don’t want to die, I just would rather be dead than do this.”).

\textsuperscript{12} The change has been decisive, only fourteen states retain a death row where solitary confinement is imposed for twenty-two or more hours daily. For a full accounting of state policies, \textit{see infra} Appendix.


\textsuperscript{14} Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86, 101 (1958) (plurality opinion).

\textsuperscript{15} Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238, 382 (1972) (Burger, C.J., dissenting).
This Note argues that the combined practice of permanent solitary confinement and capital punishment unconstitutionally violates societal standards of decency in violation of the Eighth Amendment. 16

To do so, this Note provides a comprehensive view of death row in the United States, combining historical research with an original empirical survey of modern death row conditions across the fifty states. It proceeds in three Parts. Part I presents the first full historical narrative of the evolution of conditions of confinement on American death rows. Part II reviews the key findings from the original national survey of death row conditions. This dataset is the most comprehensive to date. 17 Applying a historical lens to today’s death row, Part III concludes that the modern practice of permanent solitary confinement on death row is anathema to contemporary American standards of decency and, moreover, lack a historical analogue. The Appendix contains the findings of the survey in Part II for each jurisdiction, including a brief summary.

I. The Origins of Permanent Solitary Death Row

This Part traces the historical development of death row in America. Because the evolution of societal standards of decency informs the substance of the Eighth Amendment, this historical context is crucial to any meaningful assessment of whether and to what degree modern death row aligns with modern American standards.

---

16. The Supreme Court explained that the Eighth Amendment “must draw its meaning from the evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society.” *Trop*, 356 U.S. at 101 (plurality opinion).

17. In recent years, two reports have addressed parts of this topic. The ACLU took a survey of death-sentenced people in 2013 and published an analysis of their conditions of isolation. See ACLU, *A Death Before Dying: Solitary Confinement on Death Row* (2013). The ACLU report reasonably claimed to be the first critical overview of solitary confinement on death row. *Id.* at 4. Three years later, Yale Law School published a survey of the public statutory law and regulations related to conditions on death row. See *Yale L. Sch., Rethinking Death Row: Variations in the Housing of Individuals Sentenced to Death* (2016). In addition, Merel Pontier published a detailed comparative analysis of housing policies for death-sentenced and other incarcerated people which includes substantial insights into the conditions of confinement on many of America’s death rows. Merel Pontier, *Cruel but not Unusual the Automatic Use of Indefinite Solitary Confinement on Death Row: A Comparison of the Housing Policies of Death-Sentenced Prisoners and Other Prisoners throughout the United States*, 26 *Tex. J. C.L.* & C.R. 117 (2020).
societal standards of decency.\textsuperscript{18} First, Part I.A details the origins of solitary confinement and capital punishment in the United States. Part I.B then explores how the two systems melded into the contemporary practice of perpetual solitary confinement on death row. This Part pays particular attention to conditions at the time of the founding and the early republic, in light of the emphasis placed on these periods by judicial decisionmakers weighing Eighth Amendment challenges.\textsuperscript{19}

A. THE DIVERGENT DEVELOPMENTS OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND SOLITARY CONFINEMENT IN THE EARLY REPUBLIC

1. Capital Punishment in the Early Republic

The United States inherited a system of swift, lethal punishment.\textsuperscript{20} From the thirteenth century and through the colonial period, it was firmly established in English law that the punishment for a felony conviction was execution.\textsuperscript{21} During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Parliament dramatically expanded the scope of felonious criminal conduct, making England home to one of the harshest criminal code in Europe.\textsuperscript{22}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{18} See, e.g., Trop, 356 U.S. at 99–100 (looking to "our history" and the "Anglo-American tradition of criminal justice" in measuring the "concept of cruelty"); Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551, 560 (2005) (explaining that the Eighth Amendment must be weighed "by considering history, tradition, and precedent, and with due regard for its purpose and function in the constitutional design"); William Heffernan, Constitutional Historicism: An Examination of the Eighth Amendment Evolving Standards of Decency, 54 Am. U. L. Rev. 1355, 1364 (2005) ("Modern judicial interpretation of [cruel and unusual punishment] posits a connection between past and present. . . .").

\textsuperscript{19} See Craig Lerner, Justice Scalia’s Eighth Amendment, 42 Harv. J.L. & Pub. Pol’y 91 (2019) (reviewing originalism and the Eighth Amendment); see also Heffernan, supra note 18, at 1370–76.

\textsuperscript{20} STUART BANNER, THE DEATH PENALTY: AN AMERICAN HISTORY 7–8, 15–16 (2003) (detailing the Colonial-era development of lengthy lists of capital crimes and rapid executions designed to show a clear causal link between criminalized conduct and rapid execution); Douglas Hay, Property, Authority, and Criminal Law, in ALBION’S FATAL TREE 17–63 (Douglas Hay ed., 1975) (describing the “bloody code” inherited in the Thirteen Colonies from English law).

\textsuperscript{21} JOHN BAKER, AN INTRODUCTION TO ENGLISH LEGAL HISTORY 512 (1971). Felonies were considered to be so wicked that in preceding centuries a felony act severed the fundamental bond between landholding lord and the peasants, forfeiting the lands back to the feudal lord. See MAGNA CARTA art. 32.

\textsuperscript{22} Hay, supra note 20, at 18–19 ("The most recent account suggests that the number of capital statutes grew from about 50 to over 200 between 1688 and 1820."). In a contemporary account, William Blackstone noted the “melancholy truth” that by his count there were no less than 160 statutory felonies “worthy of instant death.” 4 BLACKSTONE, COMMENTARIES *18.
\end{flushright}
While the thirteen American colonies imported a somewhat tempered version of England’s “Bloody Code,” delays before execution remained brief.\textsuperscript{23} Several factors contributed to minimizing delays. For example, courts of the era operated with weak due process protections; appellate review in particular was exceedingly rare.\textsuperscript{24} Additionally, antebellum capital codes were racialized, with numerous provisions targeting enslaved and free Black people for expedited or harsher punishment.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{23} See BANNER, supra note 20, at 7–8, 15–18.

\textsuperscript{24} Dwight Aarons, \textit{Can Inordinate Delay Between a Death Sentence and Execution Constitute Cruel and Unusual Punishment?}, 29 SETON HALL L. REV. 147, 180–81 (1998). Both federal and state courts provided limited, if any, jurisdiction for appellate review through writs of error. It was only after the Civil War that the federal courts gained appellate jurisdiction to review either state or federal criminal cases. See United States v. Moore, 7 U.S. (3d Cranch) 159, 174 (1805) (Chief Justice John Marshall’s holding explained that the limited grant of civil appellate judicatation in the First Judiciary Act implied the withholding of any appellate jurisdiction.); see also United States v. Sanges, 144 U.S. 310, 323 (1892) (reviewing recent legislative changes and holding that they provided federal circuit courts of appeal with general federal appellate jurisdiction in criminal matters). Even where appellate courts were technically available, they sat infrequently and, often, far away, placing capital defendants in a lethal double-bind since the common law writ of error did not stay judgements. See David Rossman, \textit{“Were There No Appeal?” The History of Review in American Criminal Courts}, 81 J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY 518, 544 (1990) (reviewing appeals in the early republic). Largely, states tried serious crimes by one or several experienced judges riding circuits and offered the ability to raise legal issues both during and after proceedings; however, appellate review was severely limited with only six of the original thirteen colonies offering Writs of Error and six additional states offering legislative or executive de novo review, while Georgia offered neither form of review. Rossman, supra, at 525–50. In general, writs of error provided a more limited scope of appellate review compared to modern appellate review practices. See \textit{Writ of Error, BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY} (1st ed. 1891); see also Cohens v. Virginia, 19 U.S. 264, 410 (1821) (“Under the [First] [J]udiciary [A]ct, the effect of a writ of error is simply to bring the record into Court. . . . Nothing is demanded from the State. No claim against it of any description is asserted or prosecuted. The party is not to be restored to the possession of anything. Essentially, it is an appeal on a single point. . . .”).

\textsuperscript{25} BANNER, supra note 20, at 8–9. Broadly, more established slave states placed more value on swift punishment for enslaved people charged with capital crimes compared to newer slave states where the cost of enslaved human beings made additional due process economically desirable for capital crimes. See Daniel Flanigan, \textit{Criminal Procedure in Slave Trials in the Antebellum South}, 40 J.S. HIST. 537, 540 (1974). For Antebellum jurists, the economic rationale was not subtle. See, e.g., United States v. Amy, 24 F. Cas. 792, 810 (Taney, Circuit Justice, C.C.D. Va. 1859) (“[W]e must not lose sight of the twofold character which belongs to the slave. He is a person, and also property. As property, the rights of the owner are [protected].”); Cresswell’s Ex’r v. Walker, 37 Ala. 229, 233 (1861) (“So far as their civil status is concerned, slaves are mere property. . . .”); Ned v. State, 7 Port. 187, 214 (Ala. 1838) (describing Ned as property with an assessed value of eight hundred dollars without constitutional protections); Batten v. Faulk, 49 N.C. 233, 233–34 (1856) (“He has no legal mind. He is the property of his master. All the proceeds of his labor belong to his master. . . . [a] slave has no legal status in our courts, except as a criminal, or as a witness in certain cases. The policy of our laws in keeping slaves within their proper sphere, has run through all our legislation. . . .”); Murray v. State, 9 Fla. 246,
fulfilled certain religious obligations held by the state and society at large. Short delays were perceived to not only serve religious interests but also to balance state interests in deterrence and publicity. Finally, the financial and logistical realities of

254 (1869) ("[Rather] than that the slave be dignified and brought into court with the same importance with the white man[,]" summary punishment by the Justice of the Peace would have been preferred); Flora v. State, 4 Port. 111, 112–15 (Ala. 1836) (overturning an execution of an enslaved person for economic reasons when no evidence of their slave holder was entered); see also The Federalist No. 54 (James Madison) ("[Enslaved persons are] considered by our laws, in some respects, as persons, and in other respects as property."); THOMAS COBB, AN INQUIRY INTO THE LAW OF NEGRO SLAVERY IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 88–90 (Appleton Books ed., 2009) (1858) (arguing general statutory and the common criminal law only applied to “persons” and, thus, did not bind enslaved persons unless explicitly named). This sentiment was not limited to trained jurists; “[w]e, again, recommend planters to explain to their slaves offenses that are punishable by death,” the Montgomery Advertiser urged after the 1855 execution of an enslaved person, “it would not only be humane to do so, but it would be a savings of property.” MONT. ADVERT'S & STATE GAZETTE, Mar. 20, 1855.

Whether or not general criminal statutes applied often came down to a matter of expedience, particularly the economic expedience of the plantation class. Compare State v. Levin, 4 N.C. 250 (1815) (holding that a general statute requiring hanging for horse stealing was not applicable to enslaved persons) with State v. Peter, 53 N.C. 19 (The North Carolina Supreme Court found that a general rape statute applied to an enslaved person who was accused of raping a white woman because, as the court reasoned, while “person” did not apply to enslaved persons, there was a general presumption of legislative intent anyways.). Many states codified "the right to the owner" of part or even all of the market value of enslaved persons sentenced to death. See, e.g., ALA. CODE ANN. § 3327 (1852); ROBERT WATKINS & GEORGE WATKINS, A DIGEST OF THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA 169 (1799). Capital codes were often ancillary to the extrajudicial systems of lethal plantation 'justice' and the terror of the slave patrol. See Flanigan, supra, at 539; see also MICHAEL PFEIFER, ROUGH JUSTICE 35 (2006) (describing how mob lynching had become a familiar [practice] in the south by the 1850s); see also Gillian v. Senter, 9 Ala. 395, 397 (1846) ("[I]t is quite as well, perhaps better, that . . . punishment should be admeasured by a [plantation] tribunal. Certainly, this mode of procedure would be preferable for the master, as it would relieve him both from anxiety and the necessity of expending money."); cf. State v. Mann, 13 N.C. 263, 267 (1829) (per curiam) ("The slave, to remain a slave, must be made sensible that there is no appeal from his master.").

26. The process was designed to both facilitate the private repentance to God and serve as a public platform for religious edification. BANNER, supra note 20, at 33–35. During the colonial period, executions were both civil and religious acts, as magistrates and clergy each played a role." Davison Douglas, God and the Executioner: The Influence of Western Religion on the Use of the Death Penalty, 9 WM. & MARY BILL RTS. J. 137, 156 (2000). The Puritans, in particular, heavily borrowed from Mosaic law in developing their capital codes. Id. at 155. In a "drama of penitence," the soon-to-executed almost always played their assigned social role of sober penitence. LOUIS MASUR, RITES OF EXECUTION: CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND THE TRANSFORMATION OF AMERICAN CULTURE, 1776–1865, at 41–43 (1989). The minister’s role in this political-religious process was so formalized that a day-by-day guidebook was published instructing clergy on how to save the souls of the people condemned. See WILLIAM SMITH, THE CONVICT'S VISITOR: OR, PENITENTIAL OFFICES, (IN THE ANTIENT WAY OF LITURGY) CONSISTING OF PRAYERS, LESSONS, AND MEDITATIONS; WITH SUITABLE DEVOTIONS BEFORE, AND AT THE TIME OF EXECUTION (1791).

27. Speed was viewed as pivotal to effective deterrence, and “meant that trials normally took place when the community's memory of the crime was still vivid and when
incarceration in the early republic limited the length of any detention.28

In 1811, New York City witnessed one of its last public executions; the circumstances leading up to the execution illustrate the interplay of these five factors. After a racially-influenced jury trial with no ability to appeal, James Johnson, a Black citizen, was sentenced to death; Johnson was confined with John Sinclair to await their executions.29 People ranging from acquaintances, to religious figures to curious citizens visited Johnson and Sinclair; so many people came to the jail that, during their four weeks, guests had to be admitted in shifts of twenty, which was not out of the ordinary for condemned people.30 One of their guards wrote a journal of Johnson and Sinclair’s pre-execution incarceration (rapidly published and

the connection between the crime and the resulting legal proceedings was still perceived to be strong.” BANNER, supra note 20, at 16. For example, William Linsey burgled a Massachusetts home on September 8, 1770. He was caught the next day, and by September 22, he had been indicted, tried, and sentenced to death. He was hanged within 40 days of his offense. See id. at 15–16; WATT ESPY & JOHN ORTIZ SMYLA, EXECUTIONS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1608–2002: THE ESPY FILE, INTER-UNIV. CONSORTIUM FOR POL. & SOC. RSCH. (July 20, 2016), https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/NACJD/studies/8451/versions/V5 [hereinafter The Espy File] (listing Linsey’s execution as October 25, 1770). At Linsey’s execution, clergy delivered a long sermon, closing with the following:

We may here see the bitter fruits and effects of indulged wickedness.—

Overmuch wickedness tends to an immature death, sometimes by the sword of civil justice being drawn upon the committers of it, as in the instance before us, and in the instance we had in this place but about two years ago, as well as in other instances; and partly also as many vices tend by a natural causality to shorten men’s days upon earth. But then this is not the worst of it, for it tends to eternal death and destruction, as has been shown in the preceding discourse. O then, how ought every one, young and old, to take warning by the examples of others, and shun the paths of vice, and of the Destroyer! Let every sinner immediately repent and turn to God, and fly to Jesus who saves from sin, and delivers from the wrath to come; and henceforth live soberly, righteously and godly in the world, that so he may be happy in the favour of God here, and at last be received to the kingdom of glory. And O that all Israel may hear and fear and do no more so wickedly!


28. Historians have often highlighted ramshackle and crowded conditions among jails, where death-sentenced people were typically held, in the Early Republic. See, e.g., Stephen E. Tillotson & Jennifer A. Colanese, JAILS IN THE EARLY AMERICAN REPUBLIC: TRANSCARCERATION, DECARCERATION, AND RABBLE MANAGEMENT, 97 PRISON J. 118, 120–21 (2016); MARK KANN, PUNISHMENT, PRISONS, AND PATRIARCHY: LIBERTY AND POWER IN THE EARLY REPUBLIC 236 (2005). Delay also risked escapes, and the risk was far from theoretical—between 1790 and 1805, at least fifteen people sentenced to death or awaiting capital trials in Georgia escaped. BANNER, supra note 20, at 18.


30. Id. at 782, 785–86; BANNER, supra note 20, at 21–22.
printed on the day of the execution for sale as a souvenir), in which the guard detailed a nearly endless cavalcade of “respectable” visits by clergy and citizens. On their execution day, Johnson and Sinclair were dressed in white “to signify[y] their innocence before . . . God” and, accompanied by New York militia and religious figures, they marched to the scaffold near what is now Greenwich Village. Before the ropes were secured, there was a half hour of prayers, sermons, and singing of Christian Psalms before the tens of thousands assembled. Johnson and Sinclair shook hands, the platform dropped, Sinclair died instantly, and Johnson convulsed painfully for several minutes before dying.

The three months between Johnson’s arrest and his execution highlight the pressures to minimize delays between sentencing and execution. The due process was anemic: trial proceedings were “simple, almost informal,” featured startlingly unprepared defense counsel, and left no avenue for appeal. Johnson was among New York’s first generation of free black people, and his race strongly influenced his quick trial and execution. The short period before his execution was a flurry of state and religious action to pressure Johnson into redeeming his soul and offering a moral lesson to the public.

31. A Correct Journal of the Conduct of the Two Unfortunate Prisoners, Sinclair & Johnson, From the Time of Their Conviction Until Their Execution 8 (1811). The journal concludes with claim that the visitation and reflection thrust upon the pair, left “no doubt, when the fatal moment arrives which is to launch them into eternity, they will display a degree of fortitude which can only be acquired by a consciousness of their having obtained pardon from the Omnipotent Father.” Id. at 13–14.
33. Id. at 786, 788.
34. Id. at 788.
35. Id. at 754.
36. Id. at 780–82.
37. His crime was cast as evidence validating white New Yorkers’ perceptions that the dancing halls run by Black New Yorkers were dens of drinking, dancing, and other immorality. See id. at 755, 782, 789–90. Race also affected the trial process, with defense council showing a lack of “awareness that they were defending a black man and playing to a white jury in a city in which race relations were an important and frequently abrasive issue.” Id. at 782. In general, Black New Yorkers “accounted for much more than their fair share of [New York’s caseload],” though they tended to have faith in the system. Id. at 778.
38. White, supra note 29, at 786.
2. The Development of Solitary Confinement

The story of Johnson and Sinclair illustrates how the procedural, racial, religious, political, and logistical pressures of the early republic ensured executions were highly public, swiftly concluded affairs. At the same time—before the colonies declared independence—the American people were moving away from the systemic use of capital punishment that characterized English

39. A Correct Journal, supra note 31
law. For many revolutionaries, rejection of the excesses of the Bloody Code was part-and-parcel of rejecting the monarchy. The young republic witnessed a dramatic shift in public attitudes, as many states rapidly decapitalized crimes less heinous than homicide. The vanguard of this reformist movement was the Pennsylvania Prison Society, a group of leading intellectuals. The Society proposed replacing capital punishment with terms of solitary confinement, limited by statute to durations of only days or weeks, subject to both judicial oversight and outside

---

40. Tillotson & Colanese, supra note 28, at 123 (“Americans, fresh from the revolution, rejected corporal and capital punishments found in colonial period penal codes and adopted terms of incarceration to replace outworn inflictions of physical punishment.”).

41. For example, one of the first post-independence acts of the Virginia Legislature in 1776 was to appoint Thomas Jefferson, Edmund Pendleton, George Wythe, George Mason, and Thomas Judwell Lee as a committee to review the Commonwealth’s laws. An Act for the Revision of the Laws (Oct. 1776), reprinted in 9 WILLIAM WALLER HENING, THE STATUTES AT LARGE: BEING A COLLECTION OF ALL THE LAWS OF VIRGINIA, FROM THE FIRST SESSION OF THE LEGISLATURE, IN THE YEAR 1619, at 175–76 (Richmond, J. & G. Cochran 1821). The Committee, headed by Jefferson, corporal and capital punishment head-on in one of their recommended reforms, saying: “[T]he reformation of offenders, tho’ an object worthy the attention of the laws, is not effected at all by capital punishments, which exterminate instead of reforming . . . which also weaken the state by cutting off so many who, if reformed, might be restored sound members to society . . .” Thomas Jefferson et al., The Revisal of the Laws [of Virginia], 1776–1786: 64. A Bill for Proportioning Crimes and Punishment in Cases Heretofore Capital (June 18, 1779), in NAT'L ARCHIVES FOUNDERS ONLINE, https://founders.archives.gov/documents/jefferson/01-02-02-0132-0004-0064 [https://perma.cc/7TMD-HUQN]. John Adams opened his argument in the Boston Massacre trial by quoting the Italian philosopher Cesare Beccaria, saying: “If I can but be the instrument of preserving one life, his blessing and tears of transport, shall be a sufficient consolation to me, for the contempt of all mankind.” John Adams, Argument in Defense of the Soldiers in the Boston Massacre Trials (December 4, 1770), in NAT'L ARCHIVES FOUNDERS ONLINE, https://founders.archives.gov/documents/adams/05-03-02-0001-0004-0016 [https://perma.cc/6KTY-LGED]. Pennsylvania, Maryland, New Hampshire, and South Carolina adopted constitutions during or shortly after the Revolution that explicitly called for legislators to limit the penal code’s severity. See, e.g., S.C. CONST. of 1778, art. XL (“That the penal laws, as heretofore used, shall be reformed, and punishments made in some cases less sanguinary, and in general more proportionate to the crime.”); Md. Const. of 1776, art. XIV (“That sanguinary laws ought to be avoided, as far as is Consistent with the safety of the State: and no law, to inflict cruel and unusual pains and penalties, ought to be made in any case, or at any time hereafter.”); Penn. Const. of 1776, sec. 38 (“The penal laws as heretofore used shall be reformed by the legislature of this state . . . and punishments made in some cases less sanguinary, and in general more proportionate to the crimes.”); N.H. Const., art. 18 (“A multitude of sanguinary laws is both impolitic and unjust. The true design of all punishments being to reform, not exterminate mankind) (as amended in 1784).

42. BANNER, supra note 20, at 88, 97–98.

43. David Shapiro, Solitary Confinement in the Young Republic, 133 HARV. L. REV. 542, 552 (2019) (noting the organization’s original name as the Philadelphia Society for Alleviating the Miseries of Public Prisons).
The program was a radical penological shift, but the Prison Society would soon get a chance to test its unprecedented model.45

In 1790, the Pennsylvania legislature implemented this system at the Walnut Street Jail, in Philadelphia.46 Walnut Street relied on a sophisticated system of checks: only people convicted of the most serious felonies qualified for solitary confinement at all, and judges could impose solitary confinement for no more than half of the sentenced term of imprisonment;47 prison officials had to seek approval from an external oversight board and the mayor to impose more than two days of solitary for behavioral infractions by incarcerated people, and could seek a maximum of only fifteen days;48 and solitary periods were broken up by periods of normal incarceration and a system of organized visitation.49 None of this is to suggest the Walnut Street system lacked cruelty—some incarcerated people there begged to be killed.50 This robust system of checks, however, compares favorably to many modern death row practices and suggests a recognition of the cruelty of prolonged isolation.51

Walnut Street Jail was the debut of solitary confinement, and it was intended as a replacement for, not a prelude to,
execution. Observers from across the United States and abroad marveled at the new regime. “I have not a doubt,” South Carolina lawyer and politician Robert Turnbull wrote after his visit, that “a congeniality of legislative sentiment [towards the Walnut Street model] will soon become general throughout the Union." It was a pioneering effort, whose records “present many vivid glimpses of social customs and conditions during the early days of our republic." Philadelphia, the early republic’s largest city and trade center, was at the forefront of a national dialogue about progress away from the Bloody Code.

52. DuPuy, supra note 45, at 130.
53. Teeters, supra note 49, at 37. Many of these observers wrote reports. See, e.g., Frédéric, supra note 44; Robert Turnbull, A Visit to Philadelphia Prison; Being an Accurate and Particular Account of the Wise and Humane Administration Adopted in Every Part of That Building (1797) (originally published in the Charleston Daily Gazette); Caleb Lowens, An Account of the Alteration and Present State of the Penal Laws of Pennsylvania: Containing Also an Account of the Gaol and Penitentiary House of Philadelphia and the Interior Management Thereof (1799).
54. Turnbull, supra note 53, at 85.
55. DuPuy, supra note 45, at 135.
56. Id. at 135–36; Banner, supra note 15, at 88, 97–98; see also Shapiro, supra note 43, at 547, 551–54; Turnbull, supra note 53, at 79–80 (“In fine, it appears, that the genii of reason and true philosophy have, ager a long and tedious flight over the regions of the earth, at length lighted upon this spot [Philadelphia] as their residence. . . .”).
At the Walnut Street Jail, solitary confinement was developed to displace capital punishment and to demonstrate the viability of a radical alternative. The robust system of checks adopted at Walnut Street evinces the jailers’ understanding of the cruelty of prolonged isolation. Judges’ sentencing decisions further reflected social unease with solitary confinement, which averaged closer to the minimum sentence than to the maximum. As American society moved away from capital punishment, many viewed solitary confinement—carefully controlled—as the replacement.

59. Id. at 558.
3. Conclusion

In the early republic, as detailed above, capital punishment and solitary confinement were distinct penal approaches. Procedural, racial, religious, political, and logistical dynamics led capital punishment to be swift and highly public. As early American society shifted away from the Bloody Code, solitary confinement emerged to displace capital punishment. Unlike capital punishment, solitary confinement relied on a carefully managed and checked system of isolation. In short, solitary confinement and capital punishment stemmed from distinct normative bases and operated according to divergent processes and procedures. Combining these two systems would consequently seriously undermine the purposes and administration of both systems.60

B. CAPITAL PUNISHMENT AND SOLITARY CONFINEMENT ONLY FOUND THEIR CONFLUENCE IN THE MID-TWENTIETH CENTURY

Colonial and Founding-era conceptions of solitary confinement and capital punishment in are antithetical to contemporary death row practices. This subpart lays out four chronological phases that led to the formation of the modern death row in the twentieth century: (1) the Antebellum penal reform movement, which movement’s led to rejection of permanent solitary confinement and even the death penalty itself; (2) the retrenchment in the Post-Bellum era retrenchment; (3) the twentieth century’s increasing reliance on the death penalty, swifter executions, and hardening prison conditions; and (4) the dramatic worsening of conditions in the post-Gregg v. Georgia61 era.

---

60. *Id.* at 594–95.
1. 1800–1860: National Reform and the Rejection of Perpetual Solitary Confinement

Following the example set by Walnut Street, states experimented with different levels of solitary confinement. By the 1830s, however, solitary confinement began to lose support. In the 1820s, several states attempted and—in short order—abandoned permanent solitary confinement. Faced with overcrowding and mounting public pressure against the costs of administration, even Pennsylvania rapidly moved away from solitary confinement—reducing maximum solitary sentences to nine months by 1853. In multiple states, opinion decisively turned against extended solitary confinement; by Reconstruction, prolonged solitary confinement was abandoned and came to be seen as “a hopelessly crude and elementary penal system [that] few possessed the audacity or stupidity to prolong.” By the turn of the century, the United States had so thoroughly repudiated solitary confinement that the Supreme Court granted a rare habeas petition, releasing a man convicted of capital murder.


63. For example, in New York a disastrous 1821 pilot program for complete isolation produced “results so dire” the governor ended the experiment and released the 26 “survivors.” Smith, supra note 46, at 457; Harry E. Barnes, Historical Origins of the Prison System in America, 12 J. CRIM. L. & CRIMINOLOGY 35, 52–53 (1922). Maine, New Jersey, and Virginia also piloted programs to fully isolate part of their prison population, which all three swiftly abandoned as disastrous on mental and physical health. For a description of each, see Francis Gray, Prison Discipline in America 43 (1848).

64. See Barnes, supra note 62, at 56 n.54 (showing several dates of adoption and abandonment of the Pennsylvania system). For an overview of these issues at Pennsylvania’s Eastern State Penitentiary, see Margaret Charleroy & Hilary Marland, Prisoners of Solitude: Bringing History to Bear on Prison Health Policy, 40 ENDEAVOR 141, 143–44 (2016).

65. Barnes, supra note 63, at 58. In 1848, Francis Gray, who observed that more than 4,000 people were held in solitary confinement, explained the national mood as being that “constant confinement, total privation of social intercourse, should form no part of any [penal] system.” Gray, supra note 63, at 2. By the mid-century, physicians continued to echo concerns of psychosis caused by sustained solitary confinement, and “[a]s the evidence accumulated in the medical community, the legal community followed in noting the inhumanity and detrimental psychological impacts of solitary confinement.” David Cloud et al., Public Health and Solitary Confinement in the United States, 105 AM. J. PUB. HEALTH 18, 19 (2015).
because he was placed into solitary confinement for four weeks pending his execution without prior legal authorization.66

2. 1860–1930: The Precursors of Modern Death Row

The spirit of reform in the solitary confinement context extended to capital punishment: Michigan (1846), Rhode Island (1852), and Wisconsin (1854) became the first states to abolish capital punishment.67 Many other states reduced the number of capital crimes, empowered juries to extend mercy in sentencing, transferred the authority for executions from local jurisdictions to the state level, and shifted executions out of public view.68 While condemned people were usually held in the regular prison or jail population,69 several states began codifying requirements that death-sentenced individuals be held in solitary confinement for short periods pending execution.70

66. See In re Medley 134 U.S. 160, 172 (1890); see also Ruiz v. Texas, 137 S. Ct. 1246, 1246 (2017) (Breyer, J., dissenting from denial of a stay of execution) (“This Court long ago, speaking of a period of only four weeks of imprisonment prior to execution, said that a prisoner’s uncertainty before execution is ‘one of the most horrible feelings to which he can be subjected.’”) (quoting In re Medley).

67. Background and Developments, in THE DEATH PENALTY IN AMERICA 3, 8 (Hugo Bedau, ed. 1997) [hereinafter Bedau]. In this era, Ohio and Pennsylvania nearly repealed their death penalties. Id. at 4–7; ROBERT BOHM, DEATHQUEST 8 (5th ed. 2016); BANNER, supra note 20, at 144–68.

68. Id. at 13. By 1925, only Louisiana and Mississippi held such executions. Id. Localities typically did not operate prisons, as a result most death-sentenced people were held in jails. See, e.g., Rooney v. North Dakota, 196 U.S. 319, 320–23 (1905) (describing a shift from keeping condemned people in jails to the state penitentiary).

69. In the 1890s, 90% of executions were held by local authorities. BOHM, supra note 68, at 13. By 1925, only Louisiana and Mississippi held such executions. Id. Localities typically did not operate prisons, as a result most death-sentenced people were held in jails. See, e.g., Rooney v. North Dakota, 196 U.S. 319, 320–23 (1905) (describing a shift from keeping condemned people in jails to the state penitentiary).

70. The first solitary-like death rows appear during this period. Several states with short periods between sentencing and execution began codifying requirements that death-sentenced individuals be held in solitary confinement pending execution, including New York, Colorado, Minnesota, and New Jersey. See McElvaine v. Brush, 142 U.S. 155 (1891) (describing a New York statute providing one to two months of solitary pending execution); In re Medley 134 U.S. 160 (similar, for Colorado); Holden v. Minnesota, 137 U.S. 483, 487–90 (1890) (similar, for Minnesota); State v. Tomassi, 75 N.J.L. 739, 747 (1908) (similar, for New Jersey). Other states, like Vermont, required a mix of solitary and traditional confinement. See Rogers v. Peck, 199 U.S. 425, 432–33 (1905) (describing the Vermont statute which provided for a six-month interim period, with three-months of solitary confinement).
3. 1930–1972: The First Death Rows

While it was common in the nineteenth century for people to be executed without any appellate review, by the mid-1900s, states begrudgingly began establishing appellate processes for capital cases.71 By the 1940s, the Supreme Court began reviewing capital cases in earnest, resulting in expanded procedural safeguards.72 The United States also witnessed an increase in death sentences but a steady decline in execution rates.73 Fueled by anxiety over a perceived crime wave generated by Prohibition and the Great Depression, executions peaked in the 1935.74 This trend was further fueled by the South’s transitioning from lynching to the “legal lynching” of swift show trials followed by executions.75 Nationally, between 1880 and 1960, Black Americans represented 10 percent of the population and 61 percent of those executed.76

After peaking in 1935, the execution rate sharply declined.77 The average execution rate in the 1950s was half that of the previous two decades, and the rate continued to plummet in the 1960s.78 The following execution numbers clearly demonstrate this trend:

71. Bedau, supra note 67, at 11 (Bedau explains that “at least perfunctory review by state appellate courts became almost routine, although very few states went so far as to enact statutes requiring [such review].”).
72. Id. at 13; see also Powell v. Alabama, 287 U.S. 45 (1932) (holding the state must provide counsel to indigent capital defendants); Brown v. Mississippi, 297 U.S. 278 (1936) (prohibiting coerced confessions from being used at trial); Malinski v. New York, 324 U.S. 401 (1945) (requiring convictions based, even in part, on a coerced confession to be set aside); Witherspoon v. Illinois, 391 U.S. 510 (1968) (holding that a juror’s mere reservations about capital punishment was an insufficient cause to strike in voir dire).
73. See The Eady File, supra note 27.
74. Bedau, supra note 67, at 8–9.
75. Pfeifer, supra note 25, at 88; see also James Clarke, Without Fear or Shame: Lynching, Capital Punishment and the Subculture of Violence in the American South, 28 Brit. J. Pol. Sci. 269, 287 (1998) (explaining that in the early to mid-Twentieth Century, 1,963 of 2,613—or 75%—of recorded executions in the South targeted Black Americans).
76. Clarke, supra note 75, at 286.
77. Banner, supra note 20, at 208.
A massive litigation campaign spearheaded by civil rights activists contributed to the sharp decline in executions. Public support for capital punishment fell to its lowest levels ever: in May 1966, when asked about the death penalty for murder, more Americans were opposed (47 percent) than in favor (42 percent). Hundreds were on death row, but executions reduced to a trickle. In 1968, the United States witnessed its first year ever without a single execution. The concomitant result was a growing death row population spending ever-lengthening amounts of time in conditions that were never intended for such sustained detention. At the end of 1953, 131 people were under a death sentence, but by 1970, the number quintupled to 631. In 1972, relying in part on declining execution rates and the soaring condemned population, the

80. Bedau, supra note 67, at 13; see also Furman v. Georgia, 408 U.S. 238, 291–92 (Brennan, J., concurring) (discussing the dropping execution rate and soaring death row population).
82. Warren Weaver, Death Penalty: A 300 Year Issue in America, N.Y. TIMES (July 3, 1976).
83. The Espy File, supra note 27; BANNER, supra note 20, at 208.
84. Bedau, supra note 67, at 14.
85. DOJ BUREAU OF JUST. STAT., CAPITAL PUNISHMENT 2020, 21 app. tbl.2 (Sept. 2020).
Supreme Court held in *Furman v. Georgia* that the death penalty as practiced was unconstitutional.\(^86\)


But *Furman* was short lived. Four years later, in *Gregg v. Georgia*, the Supreme Court permitted the resumption of capital punishment, provided that expanded procedures were in place to address the Court’s concerns in *Furman*.\(^87\) Between 1973 and 2000, death sentences flooded in—with hundreds of people sentenced to death annually.\(^88\) In the same period, executions slowed, with an average of 25 annually and a peak of 98 executions in 1999.\(^89\) From 1973 to 2000, over three thousand more people were added to America’s death rows than were removed (through execution, natural death, or exoneration).\(^90\) By 1995, death-sentenced individuals spent an average of eleven years on death row.\(^91\)

This increasing number of individuals on death row accompanied a national shift towards unprecedented reliance on solitary confinement and complete contact deprivation in new “supermax” prisons, in particular with the 1963 advent of the segregation block.\(^92\) States followed this federal example, building their own segregated units.\(^93\) In 1989, Pelican Bay opened as the first “supermax” prison—a facility specifically designed to keep all residents in permanent solitary with no visual or physical contact with anyone, and the states again followed suit.\(^94\) Pelican Bay and its progeny were controversial from the start, inspiring a wave of critical scientific research and

---

86. *Furman v. Georgia*, 408 U.S. 238, 239–40 (1972) (per curiam); see also id. at 291–92 (Brennan, J., concurring) (noting the declining execution rate and soaring death row population as justifications).
88. DOJ BUREAU OF JUST. STAT., supra note 85, at 22 app. tbl.3.
89. Id. at 23 app. tbl.4.
90. See id. at 22 app. tbl.3.
92. Haney & Lynch, supra note 62, at 488; Cloud, supra note 65, at 19.
93. Cloud, supra note 65, at 19.
94. Id.
social mobilization, but the use of permanent solitary confinement nevertheless persisted and expanded. Many current death rows were built during this period, including Alabama’s Holman Prison (1969), South Carolina’s Broad River (1988), and Virginia’s Sussex I (1998). By the late 1980s, advocates began to identify a “Death Row Phenomenon” where the long delays before execution were compounded by harsh conditions to produce previously unseen psychological distress.

**GRAPH 2: AVERAGE DELAY BETWEEN SENTENCING AND EXECUTION, 1984–2020**

---

95. Haney & Lynch, supra note 62, at 488–89.
99. See Smith, supra note 7, at 239–41.
100. Calculated from data in CAPITAL PUNISHMENT 2020, supra note 83, at 22 appx. tbl.12.
Reacting to the flood of litigation, growing pre-execution period, and high error-discovery rate, Congress enacted the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA) of 1996, placing unprecedented barriers between death-sentenced people and post-conviction review. AEDPA codified Supreme Court decisions requiring dismissal of potentially meritorious claims for procedural errors. AEDPA also created further and created additional obstacles, including requiring federal courts to defer to state court decisions—even “erroneous” ones, imposing a one-year statute of limitations on habeas claims, severely

101. Calculated from data in CAPITAL PUNISHMENT 2020, supra note 83, at 22 appx. tbl.3.
103. For example, 28 U.S.C. § 2254(c) codified the Wainwright procedural default rule and 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(2)(A)(i) codified the Teague non-retroactivity rule. See Wainwright v. Sykes, 433 U.S. 72, 86–87 (1977) (holding that, in a state with a contemporary objection rule, a failure to object at trial procedurally defaulted raising that same legal issue later in federal habeas); Teague v. Lane, 489 U.S. 288, 306 (1989) (announcing that generally a newly announced rules of criminal procedure would not be available as grounds for habeas review where finality predated the announcement of the rule).
104. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d).
restricting the ability to file successive habeas petitions, and largely prohibiting habeas courts from holding evidentiary hearings. AEDPA, the delay between sentencing and execution has continued to climb unabated—from 125 months at AEDPA’s passage to 243 months in 2021. The result was a population boom on death row, peaking in 2000 at 3,601 people.

![Graph: Annual Death Row Population, 1955–2020]

**GRAPH 4: ANNUAL DEATH ROW POPULATION, 1955–2020**

C. CONCLUSION

The contrast between present conditions and the values of the past is sharp. For example, religious visitation of condemned people was so common in the early republic that a day-by-day guide was printed to help death-sentenced persons prepare to “enter the dark valley of death.” Whether ministers with the guidebook, friends, or family, for the short weeks before their execution, condemned people were rarely alone. Today, the

106. *Id.* at § (b)(1).
107. 28 U.S.C. §§ 2254(e)–(f).
108. *See Time on Death Row, supra* note 3.
109. From 1973 to 1980, an average of 53 more people were placed on death row than those who left it through execution, clemency, appeal, or other death. DOJ BUREAU OF JUST. STAT., CAPITAL PUNISHMENT—2018 STATISTICAL TABLES, at 22 appx. tbl.3 (2018). The rate increased, with 167 more annual additions from 1981 to 1990 and 125 more from 1991 to 2000. By 2000, there were 3,601 people were under a death sentence—nearly 27 times the death row population in 1973. *Id.*
111. WILLIAM SMITH, *supra* note 26, at 84.
112. *See Banner, supra* note 20, at 21–22.
journey through the dark path to death has grown from weeks to decades and people sentenced to death are left to walk it alone.\textsuperscript{113} People on death row are denied religious support,\textsuperscript{114} access to sunlight, or even the touch of another human being, except for prison officials during handcuffing.\textsuperscript{115} As the above discussion detailed, Americans from the early republic to the twentieth century would have been aghast that people on today’s death rows are left alone in the valley of the shadow of death.\textsuperscript{116}

II. AMERICA’S DEATH ROWS IN 2021: A DATA-DRIVEN ANALYSIS

The preceding Part explained that decades-long permanent solitary confinement on death rows is a distinctly modern phenomenon that doesn’t resemble the penological conceptions and practices of the first two centuries of American history. Part II provides a snapshot of conditions on American death rows today. Across the 29 American jurisdictions with capital punishment, there are 2,436 people living under a death sentence.\textsuperscript{117} Many will spend, or have spent, decades awaiting execution, isolated for twenty-three hours a day in a tiny concrete cell.\textsuperscript{118}

There is a growing trend, however, toward more humane treatment. At least nine jurisdictions in the past six years have taken significant steps toward ending permanent solitary confinement on their death rows.\textsuperscript{119} Part II.A outlines the chronology of the largest changes in this trend. Then, Part II.B describes the methodology of this Note’s jurisdiction-by-jurisdiction study of death row conditions as they exist in the

\begin{itemize}
\item [113.] See \textit{Time on Death Row}, supra note 3 (showing the average time on death row extending to decades in the modern era); \textit{infra} Appendix (outlining policies requiring solitary confinement).
\item [115.] See ACLU, supra note 17 (detailing these conditions and more).
\item [116.] See \textit{Psalms} 23:4.
\item [117.] NAACP LEGAL DEF. FUND, supra note 3, at 1, 37–59.
\item [118.] See \textit{infra} Appendix (detailing conditions); see also ACLU, supra note 17, at 4 (finding most death row cells to be the size of an average bathroom).
\item [119.] These states are Arizona, California, Louisiana, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia. See \textit{infra} Part II.A (detailing changes).
\end{itemize}
United States today. Finally, Part II.C reviews this Note’s most significant findings regarding present-day death row conditions.

A. RECENT EVENTS INDICATE A GROWING REJECTION OF FULLY SOLITARY DEATH ROWS

This subpart surveys the circumstances and chronology of a growing consensus against permanent solitary death rows. The trend began in Missouri which, as part of a 1991 consent decree, abolished its death row, moving all death-sentenced people into standard housing. Soon after, North Carolina began permitting sixteen hours out-of-cell daily. The trend picked up speed, with at least eight states in the last six years reforming their death row living conditions.

Prior to 2014, Colorado automatically placed death-sentenced people into solitary confinement for twenty-three hours daily. As part of a broad reform effort to reduce solitary confinement, the Colorado Department of Corrections began allowing at least four hours out-of-cell, contact visits, and work opportunities.

In 2015, a person incarcerated on Arizona’s death row sued the state’s corrections department in federal court, claiming that the automatic and unreviewable placement of death-sentenced people in solitary confinement violated the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments. Following a 2017 settlement, Arizona ended mandatory solitary confinement, allowed for contact visitation, and provided community social, recreation, and meal time.

The same year, three people on death row in Louisiana’s infamous Angola Prison brought a class action suit seeking the end of the state’s policy of automatic and unreviewable solitary confinement.

---

120. George Lombardi et al., Mainstreaming Death Sentenced Inmates: The Missouri Experience and its Legal Significance, 61 JUNE FED. PROB. 3, 5 (1997); YALE L. SCH., supra note 17, at 12.
121. YALE L. SCH., supra note 17, at 9–10.
122. These states are Arizona, California, Colorado, Louisiana, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia. See infra Appendix (detailing conditions).
123. YALE L. SCH., supra note 17, at 15.
124. YALE L. SCH., supra note 17, at 15–17.
confinement for people sentenced to death.\footnote{127} Policy changed weeks later, providing at least four hours out-of-cell daily, during which groups could use a common or non-caged outdoor space.\footnote{128}

Similar challenges, and responsive policy changes, percolated across the country.\footnote{129} In May 2019, the Fourth Circuit held that Virginia’s death row, which isolated people on death row in-cell for twenty-three or more hours daily and provided no congregate time, constituted cruel and unusual punishment—the first Circuit Court to do so.\footnote{130} The ruling made permanent earlier voluntary reforms that ended indefinite solitary by providing contact visitation, at least three hours out of cell, and congreation time.\footnote{131} Six months later, a settlement ended Pennsylvania’s solitary death row—and required the state provide more than forty hours weekly out-of-cell.\footnote{132} Following the Fourth Circuit’s ruling and similar litigation, South Carolina ended its permanent solitary death row.\footnote{133}

This trend has continued through the present, despite the COVID-19 pandemic creating an unprecedented backlog in the courts, drawing legislative and executive attention, and presenting logistical barriers to prison management, including disincentivizing removing people from isolation.\footnote{134} In January

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext{130}{Porter v. Clarke, 923 F.3d 348, 353 (4th Cir. 2019).}
\footnotetext{132}{Settlement Agreement, Reid v. Wetzel, No. 18-CV-0176 (M.D. Pa. 2018).}
\end{footnotes}
2020, before COVID-19 was declared a pandemic, California launched a pilot program to allow the vast majority of people incarcerated on death row to transfer to one of eight non-solitary facilities. The program was maintained throughout the pandemic and, taking the next step, merging its death row population with the main prison population—closing the nation’s second-largest death row. In May 2020, during the first wave of the pandemic, Oregon closed its death row and integrated the people on its death row into the general prison population. Most recently, Florida settled a lawsuit brought by people on its death row challenging their automatic placement into solitary confinement. The settlement includes provisions for 15–20 weekly congregate hours in facilities for congregation, at least six hours of exercise, and access to mental healthcare.

In short, these nine states are the vanguard in a growing national trend, alongside other states implementing smaller changes and ongoing suits challenging solitary death rows.

---


This trend is striking in its growing scope and clear direction: several states are quickly moving away from and no state is moving towards solitary death rows. Compared with the period of hardening conditions from the 1970s to the 2000s, the tide has shifted—and fast.

B. NATIONAL SURVEY METHODOLOGY

This Note gathers the most up-to-date publicly available sources on death row conditions in each of the 27 jurisdictions that maintain capital punishment. The author surveyed and compiled case law, statutes, administrative regulations, news articles, videos, photographs, blog entries, and book chapters related to death row conditions. The Appendix infra presents this information, collated and supported with citations.

Definitions of solitary confinement vary and generally employ non-specific terms. For this reason, this Note will use the definition used in the Mandela Rules, unanimously adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. Under the Mandela Rules, solitary confinement is “confinement of prisoners for twenty-two hours or more daily without meaningful human contact.” Though the practices in the jurisdictions studied are diverse and shifting, this study is organized around five broad categories, arranged in the following tiers, from most to least restrictive:

---

142. For each state a variety of relevant searches were made in LexisNexis, Westlaw, and Google. The Internet Archive and reverse image searching was also relied on to find original sources.

143. A variety of possible definitions have been used. See, e.g., SOLITARY CONFINEMENT, Black’s Law Dictionary (11th ed. 2019) (“Separate confinement that gives a prisoner extremely limited access to other people. . . .”); Stuart Grassian, Psychiatric Effects of Solitary Confinement, 22 WASH. U. J.L. & POL’Y 325, 325 (2006) (“confinement of a prisoner alone in a cell for all, or nearly all, of the day with minimal environmental stimulation and minimal opportunity for social interaction. . . .”); Solitary Confinement (Isolation): Definition, NAT’L COMM. ON CORR. HEALTH CARE, https://www.ncchc.org/solitary-confinement [https://perma.cc/DAK6-HEK9] (“Solitary confinement is the housing . . . with minimal to rare meaningful contact with other individuals.”).


145. Mandela Rules, supra note 144, at annex r.44.
• **Permanent Solitary Confinement:** requires 22 or more hours alone, in-cell daily.
  • **Semi-Solitary Death Row:** requires 20–22 hours alone, in-cell daily.
  • **Non-Solitary Death Row:** requires less than 20 hours alone, in-cell daily.
  • **Semi-Reformed Death Row:** requires less than 20 hours alone, in-cell daily and extends the same or substantially similar privileges to death-sentenced people as enjoyed by the general prison population.
  • **Reformed Death Row:** houses death-sentenced people in general population.

In a few jurisdictions, a privilege system permits better conditions for some people on death row who qualify. In these jurisdictions, the regulation applicable to a majority of the population was chosen. Where the majority was unclear, the more restrictive category was chosen. For clarity, the terms male/men and female/woman are used in line with the local jurisdictions’ usage.

C. FINDINGS

Of the twenty-seven¹⁴⁶ state jurisdictions currently operating death rows, approximately half (fourteen) impose either permanent or semi-solitary confinement (i.e., an average of at least twenty hours of solitary confinement per day) on people sentenced to death. Of these states, eleven keep death row population in permanent solitary confinement.¹⁴⁷ Ten states have

---

¹⁴⁶. The federal government, military, and 27 states have functional capital regimes. Though one of these 27 states, Wyoming, has a death row that is currently empty. See Appendix. In theory, American Samoa permits first-degree murder to be punished by death, but the territory has no valid method of execution and has not carried out an execution since attaining self-governance. *See American Samoa Governor Moves to Repeal Death Penalty, HONOLULU STAR ADVERTISER* (Sept. 13, 2012), https://www.staradvertiser.com/2012/09/13/breaking-news/american-samoa-governor-moves-to-repeal-death-penalty/ [https://perma.cc/Q6QD-7CSM]. On the other side, 23 states plus Guam, the Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands have abolished capital punishment. *See COUNCIL OF STATE GOV'TS, THE BOOK OF THE STATES tbl9.26 (2019).*

¹⁴⁷. These eleven states are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, and Wyoming. In addition, the federal government and military opt for Permanent Solitary Confinement.
a non-solitary death row.148 Three states have integrated their death-sentenced population into the general prison population.149 Douglas Ray Stankewitz of California’s death row is the living person who has been on death row the longest, with more than 43 years elapsing since his sentence. The national average for the longest stay of a current death row resident is more than 36 years.

MAP 1: UNITED STATES JURISDICTIONS COLORED BY DEATH ROW CONDITIONS

Typical cells are approximately 8 feet by 12 feet—smaller than the average American full bathroom—have solid steel doors, and are furnished with a steel bed, table, and combined sink-toilet.150 Virtually every jurisdiction assigns one person to one cell. In the majority of jurisdictions, out-of-cell time to shower or exercise is done alone, except for the guards. Every permanent solitary death row requires inmates to eat meals alone, in-cell. In the vast majority of jurisdictions, death-sentenced individuals cannot even the touch of their family or lawyer. Many jurisdictions deny inmates access to group religious service and several deny religious visitation.

148. These ten states are Arizona, Florida, Indiana, Louisiana, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.
149. These three states are California, Missouri, and Oregon.
150. ACLU, supra note 17, at 3–4.
The findings also confirm the growing trend towards humane treatment described in Part II.A. At least nine jurisdictions in the past six years have taken significant steps to end permanent solitary confinement on their death rows. Additional states have taken smaller steps towards ending permanent solitary death rows. Many death rows have reintroduced contact visitation and several have begun permitting group meals out-of-cell. Most strikingly, no jurisdiction has imposed a more restrictive form of solitary confinement. Senior corrections officials in jurisdictions that have reformed or semi-reformed death rows universally praised the change.

III. THE FALTERING CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE “MODERN” DEATH ROW

This Note earlier demonstrated that solitary confinement and capital punishment developed as opposing systems that only combined in the years following Gregg v. Georgia, with the brutality of each exacerbated by the other. Nevertheless, Part II showed that there are indications that the post-Gregg cruelty is beginning to ebb, as politically and socially diverse states are shifting away from solitary confinement on death rows. This

151. These states are Arizona, California, Louisiana, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia.

152. For example, Tennessee’s three-tiered system of privileges ranges from permanent solitary confinement to a comparatively relaxed regime similar to that in the rest of the prison. See Death Penalty in Tennessee, supra note 13.


155. For one view of the impact of permanent solitary death row, see David Lester & Christine Tartaro, Suicide on Death Row, 47 J. FORENSIC SCI. 1108, 1111 (2002) (finding a median of 1.13 death row suicides per 1,000 people in 1977–99 compared to a 1980–83 baseline average of .24 male suicides per 1,000 people across all prisons); see also Robert Johnson, Under Sentence of Death: The Psychology of Death Row Confinement, 5 L. & PSYCH. REV. 141 (1979) (“Just under one-half of the prisoners, in fact, consider the possibility of suicide in lieu of execution. . . .”).

156. In recent years, Arizona, California, Louisiana, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia have significantly reduced or eliminated their reliance on automatic solitary confinement on death row. See infra Appendix. Other
Part addresses the question of whether the practice remains constitutional in the 12 states that retain permanent solitary death rows (hereinafter “retentionist states”).

The Eighth Amendment prohibits states and the federal government from subjecting individuals to “cruel and unusual” punishment. The Amendment expresses “the ‘cry of horror’ against man’s inhumanity to his fellow man” and affirms the duty of the government to respect the dignity of all persons “by protecting even those convicted of heinous crimes.” To that end, courts identify such violations of the Amendment by reference to the “evolving standards of decency that mark the progress of a maturing society.” A punishment that runs so contrary to contemporary public values, as tempered by judicial discretion, fails to accord with the dignity of man and, thus, with the requirements of the Eighth Amendment.

Contemporary values are measured by “a review of objective indicia of consensus.” These objective indicators are: (1) legislative and executive repudiation of a punishment; (2) the number of jurisdictions authorizing a punishment; (3) evidence of social repudiation of the practice; (4) historical development; and (5) international legal opinions. This Part reviews each of these five indicia in turn and argues that they reveal an accelerating trend away from permanent solitary death rows.

states implemented smaller changes or launched pilot programs to ameliorate conditions. See, e.g., Death Penalty in Tennessee, supra note 13.

157. These are Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Montana, Oklahoma, Texas, South Dakota, Wyoming. See infra Appendix.

158. Defined earlier as jurisdictions that “require 22+ hours alone, in-cell daily.” See supra Part II.

159. U.S. CONST. amend. VIII; see also Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86, 100 (1958) (plurality) (applying the Amendment); Robinson v. California, 370 U.S. 660 (1962) (incorporating the “cruel and usual punishments” clause against the states).


162. Id. at 561 (quoting Trop, 356 U.S. at 100–01).


164. Roper, 543 U.S at 564.

165. See, e.g., id. at 564, 595–96 (emphasizing the importance of legislative enactments and relying on the number of jurisdictions practicing the punishment); Enmund v. Florida, 458 U.S. 782, 788–89 (1982) (indicating historical development of the punishment, legislative judgments, international opinion and the sentencing decisions of juries have bearing on the evolving standards analysis); Coker v. Georgia, 433 U.S. 584, 596 n.10 (1977) (relying on international opinion).
This Part focuses solely on the constitutionality of permanent solitary confinement on death rows. Permanent solitary death rows necessarily combine two punishments that are more pernicious than the sum of their parts: capital punishment and perpetual solitary confinement. Since rejecting either or both constituent practices is necessarily a rejection of the combined practice of solitary death row itself, the following subparts consider evidence of rejecting either or both practices. As such, while addressing evidence of shifting social consensus against capital punishment and permanent solitary confinement, the constitutionality of either as a stand-alone punishment is not addressed. This Part will argue, however, that the tides of social consensus have shifted against permanent solitary death rows by considering each of the five indicators in turn.

A. STATE LEGISLATURES AND EXECUTIVES ARE INCREASINGLY REPUDIATING PERMANENT SOLITARY DEATH ROW

Among the objective indicia, the laws enacted by states are the “clearest and most reliable objective evidence of contemporary values.” This subpart describes the significant evidence that state legislatures are moving to end either or both capital punishment or long-term solitary. Twenty-three states and the District of Columbia have abolished the death penalty, with nearly half repealing their capital statutes since 2000. Further, in the last decade, three governors have instituted execution moratoriums for political or moral reasons. All three moratorium-supporting governors have won reelection since.

166. See Marah McLeod, Does the Death Penalty Require Death Row? The Harm of Legislative Silence, 77 OHIO ST. L.J. 525 (2016) (McLeod argues that solitary confinement is more than an inevitable administrative aspect of a death sentence and that because its only penological purpose could be retribution, only a legislature could authorize such additional punishment.).


Legislatures have largely left regulation of the specifics of conditions on death rows to executive officials. Nevertheless, legislatures are debating and states are implementing—at record levels—statutes and regulations to reduce solitary confinement. In 2019 alone, twelve states enacted laws to

171 See Yale L. Sch., supra note 17, at app. A (listing statutes, administrative regulations, and caselaw related to death row living conditions by jurisdiction).

172 Amy Fettig, 2019 Was a Watershed Year in the Movement to Stop Solitary Confinement, ACLU (Dec. 16, 2019), https://www.aclu.org/news/prisoners-rights/2019-was-
outright ban solitary confinement or otherwise severely restrict its use.\textsuperscript{173} Most recently, in 2021, New York prohibited solitary confinement for longer than 15 days.\textsuperscript{174} At the federal level, the 2018 First Step Act limited long-term solitary confinement for juveniles in federal prisons.\textsuperscript{175}

State executive officials have also taken significant steps to curtail or end long-term solitary confinement. The Oregon Department of Corrections eliminated its death row and integrated the remaining death-sentenced people into standard housing.\textsuperscript{176} California launched a two-year pilot program to enable nearly all the 737 people on its death row to transfer to non-segregated housing.\textsuperscript{177} That program was since made permanent.\textsuperscript{178} Beyond death row, many states are effectively ending their reliance on perpetual solitary confinement. Colorado has reduced the aggregate time spent in solitary by 85 percent.\textsuperscript{179} Mississippi removed as many as 1,000 incarcerated people from solitary confinement.\textsuperscript{180} Ten more states partnered with the Vera Institute, a non-profit focused on ending mass-incarceration, to enact significant measures to end their reliance on solitary segregation blocks—including for death rows.\textsuperscript{181}

In short, at least twenty-eight states have recently reconsidered solitary confinement or capital punishment (or both). Moreover, the direction of change has unanimously been away from permanent solitary confinement: no state has introduced a more restrictive form of solitary confinement since

\textsuperscript{173} The twelve states who passed reforms are Arkansas, Connecticut, Georgia, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, Texas, Washington, and Virginia. Id.


\textsuperscript{177} \textit{Condemned Inmate Transfer Pilot Program}, supra note 135.

\textsuperscript{178} Id. at 14.


\textsuperscript{180} Id.

at least 2000. The first indicator points towards a growing consensus against permanent solitary death rows.

B. A SIGNIFICANT MAJORITY OF PENAL SYSTEMS HAVE SHIFTED AWAY FROM PERMANENT SOLITARY CONFINEMENT

This subpart considers the second indicator of evolving social standards: the prevalence of the punishment in practice. The Supreme Court looks to a practice’s prevalence, including the pace and consistency of change away from that practice, to determine standards of decency.\footnote{See Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551, 555 (2005) (looking to the number of states with juvenile execution); Atkins v. Virginia, 536 U.S. 304, 315 (2002) (similar).} In \textit{Roper v. Simmons}, the Court found that there was broad social consensus against juvenile executions, based largely on the fact that thirty states had rejected the juvenile death penalty and the infrequency of such executions in the remaining states.\footnote{Roper, 543 U.S. at 555.} The \textit{Roper} Court explained that “it is not so much the number of these States that is significant, but the consistency of the direction of change.”\footnote{Atkins, 536 U.S. at 315 (emphasis added).} In \textit{Atkins v. Virginia}, the Court held that the rapidity and consistency of change—seventeen states passing laws ending the execution of the intellectually disabled within a 12 year period—suggested a new social consensus.\footnote{Id. at 315–16.}

states are Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Kentucky, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas. If one accepts that, arguendo, jurisdictions without an execution in a decade have de facto rejected capital punishment, then 42 of 50 states have rejected the “modern” death row. 187 Most importantly, not one state has taken steps to change from a non-solitary death row toward a solitary one. 188

In light of what the Atkins Court described as the “well-known fact that anticrime legislation is far more popular than legislation providing protections for persons guilty of violent crimes,” the uniform direction of change makes “complete absence of States passing legislation reinstating the [practice]” exceptionally compelling evidence. 189 Considering that the practice of decades-long solitary confinement on death row developed largely without explicit intention or authorization, the affirmative decision to shift practice is even more noticeable. 190 In recent years, states have gone to great lengths to shield death rows and executions from the public eye, limiting chances to spur discourse and

---


190. McLeod, supra note 166 (explaining how legislatures never authorized such solitary death rows); see also supra Part I.B.4 (outlining the unintentional development of permanent solitary death rows).
Nevertheless, both execution and sentencing rates are at historic lows, with fewer than fifty death sentences imposed and fewer than thirty executions carried out in each of the past six years. There are a growing number of states, with a clear direction of change, that are rejecting either or both the death penalty and solitary death row in practice. The second indicator points to a growing consensus against permanent solitary death rows.

C. THE PUBLIC INCREASINGLY HAS REJECTED PERMANENT SOLITARY DEATH ROWS

Polling, social scientific evidence, and the opinions of organizations with relevant expertise can carry some, albeit limited, weight in the evolving standards analysis. In recent decades, public support for the death penalty has consistently waned. In 1995, 80 percent of Americans were in favor of the death penalty in the case of murder, but support declined to 64 percent in 2010 and to just 54 percent in 2021. There is little-to-no polling available for popular support for permanent solitary confinement on death row, but some subset of the 54% in favor of capital punishment may believe the death penalty, compounded by endless years on death row in permanent solitary confinement, is nevertheless too cruel. This could explain why a 60 percent


192. DEATH PENALTY INFO. CTR., supra note 186, at 2.

193. See Atkins v. Virginia, 536 U.S. at 316 n.21 (2002) (relying on inter alia polling as additional evidence of social consensus); id. (using evidence that “several organizations with germane expertise have adopted official positions opposing the [punishment].”); cf. Kennedy v. Louisiana, 554 U.S. 407, 433 (2008) (finding that statistics about the number of executions may help measure consensus against a punishment); contra id. at 348 (Rehnquist, C.J., dissenting) (describing opinion polling as irrelevant).

194. GALLUP, supra note 81.

195. Id.

196. For example, a recent opinion piece by Wyoming Representative Olsen argues to end the death penalty not because it is inherently wrong but because “few conservatives trust the government to get it right.” Jared Olsen, I’m a Republican and I Oppose Restarting Federal Executions, N.Y. TIMES (July 29, 2019), https://www.nytimes.com/2019/07/29/opinion/death-penalty-federal.html [https://perma.cc/5ETQ-7TFM]. Others have argued that the “high costs and rare results,” not any opposition to executions themselves,
majority say that life imprisonment without parole is a better punishment for murder than execution.\textsuperscript{197}

Moreover, there are signs that the national electorate has shifted against capital punishment as part of a national rethinking of criminal law generally. President Biden campaigned and was elected as the first openly anti-death penalty president.\textsuperscript{198} Anti-death penalty prosecutors are increasingly being elected in counties where capital punishment has historically been heavily used.\textsuperscript{199} In the last five years, Los Angeles county was responsible for more people on death row than Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee and Virginia combined; currently, more than 200 people on death row were tried and sentenced in Los Angeles.\textsuperscript{200} After a campaign where capital punishment was a central issue, Los Angeles elected anti-death penalty challenger George Gascón over the incumbent Jackie Lacey.\textsuperscript{201} The 2020 electoral shift away from the death penalty in Los Angeles and three other counties, which combined accounted for nearly ten percent of the national death row population, marks yet another turning point away from capital punishment.

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Finally, professional organizations have rejected permanent solitary confinement, with the American Psychological Association condemning the practice as useless. The professional ethical code of doctors, anesthesiologists, nurses, and pharmacists all prohibit any participation in executions has resulted in significant delays and difficulties for states trying to administer the death penalty. Some states have been caught illegally smuggling execution drugs into the United States; Georgia, for example, was discovered to have been buying a sedative, sodium thiopental, from a supplier operating out of the back of a London driving school.

The third indicator, then, acts as a confirmation of the growing American rejection of the permanent solitary death row.


D. THE HISTORICAL EVIDENCE REVEALS A LONG TRADITION OF AMERICANS REJECTING PERMANENT SOLITARY DEATH ROWS

Tracing the evolution of American standards of decency involves looking to the historical link between the past and the present. As described above, American attitudes toward permanent solitary death rows can be understood as spanning seven broad phases: (1) the early republic period saw the advent of short-term, carefully-managed solitary confinement as a replacement for capital punishment; (2) the Antebellum penal reform movement led to the rejection of permanent solitary confinement and, in some instances, even the death penalty itself; (3) the dwindling of the reform momentum in the Reconstruction era; (4) the swift and more frequent executions and hardening prison conditions of the mid-twentieth century; (5) the dramatic worsening of conditions in the post-Gregg era; (6) the stagnation of the early 2000s; and (7) the growing contemporary rejection of permanent solitary death row. This history, the fourth indicator, establishes that permanent solitary death rows are not a long-standing practice but a distinct modernism; indeed, one that would have been rejected through much of American history as counterproductive and barbaric.

E. THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY HAS REJECTED PERMANENT SOLITARY DEATH ROW

The climate of international opinion can serve a confirmatory role in determining the evolution of American standards of decency. This subpart first reviews the practices of the

205. See Heffernan, supra note 18, at 1364 (“Modern judicial interpretation of [cruel and unusual punishment] posits a connection between past and present that . . . incorporates eighteenth century notions of cruelty but expands on these by including subsequent changes in sentiments about punishment.”); see also Trop v. Dulles, 356 U.S. 86, 99, 100 (1958) (plurality opinion) (looking to “our history” and the “Anglo-American tradition of criminal justice” in measuring the “concept of cruelty”).

206. See supra Part I (detailing the first six phases); supra Part II.A (detailing the modern rejection).

207. See Shapiro, supra note 43, at 594 (“The prison reformers of the 1790s would be dismayed by what solitary confinement has become. . . . They restrained the cruelty of isolation with a system of checks and balances . . . but little remains of that [protective] regime.”).

international community as a whole, before turning to the practices in other jurisdictions, with a focus on foreign states with the death penalty and comparable political, judicial, or penal systems.

1. **Both the Laws and Practices of the International Community Show a Clear Rejection of Permanent Solitary Death Rows**

   The United States stands nearly alone in a world that has turned its back on permanent solitary confinement and the death penalty.\(^{209}\) The death penalty has been abolished in 108 countries.\(^{210}\) According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, 170 member states of the United Nations with a variety of legal systems, traditions, cultures and religious backgrounds, have either abolished the death penalty or do not practice it.\(^{211}\) The United States is the only country in Europe and the Americas to have had a recent execution, and is one of only eighteen nations that currently employ capital punishment.\(^{212}\) Japan is the only other developed democracy with the death penalty.\(^{213}\)

   Another source of international consensus is international legal authorities.\(^{214}\) Regarding capital punishment generally, the *Second Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights*, which binds states to abolish capital punishment, has eighty-nine state parties.\(^{215}\) More recently, 123 of 193 United

---

209. *See Roper*, 543 U.S. at 577 (“In sum, it is fair to say that the United States now stands alone in a world that has turned its face against the juvenile death penalty.”).


Nations member states voted for a resolution calling for a global moratorium on executions.216

For solitary confinement, the Mandela Rules are the primary source of international standards and custom.217 The Rules prohibit "confinement of prisoners for twenty-two hours or more daily without meaningful human contact."218 The United States played an active role in both drafting and securing the votes for the Mandela Rules,219 Yet, the U.N. Special Rapporteur on Torture recently expressed alarm at the excessive use of solitary confinement in the United States.220 The Rapporteur classifies solitary confinement for more than 15 days as torture.221

The United States stands out even among the few retentionist countries for the brutality of the distinctly American practice of decades-long solitary confinement for those sentenced to death. Taiwan,222 Ghana,223 and China224 reject the practice. Besides the United States, only Japan, Jordan, and Malaysia require that death-sentenced individuals be placed in solitary confinement for more than fifteen days,225 Of these, Japan is the only other

218. Id. at annex rule 44.
222. Id. at 30.
225. According to one 2018 report, prolonged solitary confinement has been reported in China, Indonesia, Jordan, India, and the United States. Id. at 3. India has since rejected the practice. See Saurabh Malik, HC Abolishes Solitary Confinement for Prisoners Facing
country where solitary confinement can stretch into decades.\textsuperscript{226} Again, \textit{Roper} is highly analogous; the Supreme Court found “confirmation in the stark reality” that since 1990 only seven other countries had officially sanctioned juvenile execution, all of which had since halted or pledged to halt the practice.\textsuperscript{227} Like in \textit{Roper}, the stark reality is that the United States is virtually alone on the world stage.

2. \textit{Extranational Jurists are Decisively Against Permanent Solitary Death Rows}

Beyond the measure of international consensus, the writings of international jurists can be instructive.\textsuperscript{228} According to former Justice Breyer, the value of referencing extranational decisions lies in the fact that:

\begin{quote}
[A] judge, with similar training [applies] similar language (“cruel and unusual punishment” or the like), in a society that is somewhat similarly democratic and protective of basic human rights. England is not the moon, nor is India. Neither is a question of “cruel and unusual punishment” an arcane matter of contract law where differences in legal systems are more likely to make a major difference. . . . If in a “cruel and unusual punishment” case the fact that everyone in the world thinks one thing is at least worth finding out,
\end{quote}

\footnotesize\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{227} Roper v. Simmons, 543 U.S. 551, 575 (2005).
\item \textsuperscript{228} See Atkins v. Virginia, 536 U.S. 304, 325 (2002) (indicating international opinion serves a confirmatory role though not a replacement for American values of decency); see also Enmund v. Florida, 458 U.S. 782, 796 (1982) (citing international cases).
\end{itemize}
for I doubt that Americans are so very different from people elsewhere in the world in respect to such matters.\textsuperscript{229}

The Supreme Court references foreign and international law as non-binding, instructive sources, which began in earnest following \textit{Roper}, is a return to traditional methods of Eighth Amendment analysis.\textsuperscript{230} The Court has relied on foreign legal practice to help resolve the meaning of “cruel and unusual” since 1879.\textsuperscript{231}

While the British Parliament abolished its death penalty in 1965, British jurists have continued to consider capital punishment and solitary confinement.\textsuperscript{232} For example, in \textit{Pratt}, two appellants were convicted of capital murder in 1979 and, over fourteen years of imprisonment on death row, faced possible execution three times.\textsuperscript{233} On appeal from Jamaica, the UK Privy Council explained “these bare facts [are] sufficient to bring home to the mind of any person of normal sensitivity and compassion the agony of mind that these men must have suffered as they alternated between hope and despair ... facing the gallows.”\textsuperscript{234} The Council held that “unconscionable delay” was unlawful inhuman and degrading punishment unless that delay was the appellant’s fault (e.g., a delay or time-wasting appeals).\textsuperscript{235} Delays resulting from legitimate appeals, however, could not justify delaying the sentence:

It is part of the human condition that a condemned man will take every opportunity to save his life through use of the appellate procedure. If the appellate procedure enables the


\textsuperscript{231} \textit{Id.}; see also Wilkerson v. Utah, 99 U.S. 130, 134 (1879) (“Corresponding rules prevail in other countries, of which the following [cited] authorities will afford sufficient proof.”).

\textsuperscript{232} See Murder (Abolition of Death Penalty) Act 1965, c. 71, § 1 (UK).

\textsuperscript{233} Pratt v. Att’y Gen. of Jam. [1993] UKPC 1, ¶ 1 (appeal taken from Jam.); \textit{see also} Riley v. Att’y Gen. of Jam. [1982] 3 All ER 469 (Scarman, L., dissenting) (arguing that “prolonged delay when it arises from factors outside the control of the condemned man can render a decision to carry out the sentence of death an [unlawful] inhuman and degrading punishment”).

\textsuperscript{234} \textit{Id.}

\textsuperscript{235} \textit{Id.} at ¶ 60, 61, 73.
prisoner to prolong . . . over a period of years, the fault is to be attributed to the appellate system that permits such delay and not to the prisoner who takes advantage of it. Appellate procedures that echo down the years are not compatible with capital punishment. The death row phenomenon must not become established as part of our jurisprudence.236

The Council held that a delay of more than five years was prima facie evidence of unlawful punishment, commuting the petitioner’s sentences to life imprisonment.237 Today, more than 1,385 people are eligible for execution in the United States, having exhausted their appeals years ago, yet remain on death row.238 Pratt is not unusual, the British House of Lords and the Supreme Court that replaced it have issued several decisions curbing capital punishment239 and solitary confinement.240

The Supreme Court of India has long recognized that the “excruciation of a long pendency of [a] death sentence, with the prisoner languishing in near solitary confinement suffering all the time may make the death sentence unconstitutionally cruel and agonizing.”241 The Indian judiciary has regularly voided death sentences after delays of two or three years.242 A recent

---

236. Id. at ¶ 73.
237. Id. at ¶ 85, 87.
238. NAACP LEGAL DEF. FUND, supra note 3, at 1.
239. Since Pratt, the common law prohibition on execution after long delay has continued to be affirmed in different contexts. See Guerra v. Baptiste, [1995] UKPC 3 (appeal taken from Trin. & Tobago) (holding that Pratt’s prohibition is “consonant with the tradition of the common law.”); Henfield v. Att’y Gen., [1996] UKPC 36 (appeal taken from the Bahamas) (finding a three-and-a-half-year delay unconstitutional). The UK Supreme Court has held that the British government cannot provide legal assistance to American prosecutors without assurances the death penalty will not be sought. Elgizouli v. Sec’y, [2020] UKSC 10. In a series of decisions, the Privy Council ended the mandatory death penalty in the Caribbean. See, e.g., Roodal v. State, [2003] UKPC 78 (appeal taken from Trin. & Tobago) (reading Trinidad’s mandatory death penalty statute as having implicit discretion to avoid unconstitutional cruel punishment); Reyes v. The Queen, [2002] UKPC 11 (appeal taken from Belize) (similar); Regina v. Hughes, [2002] UKPC 13 (appeal taken from St. Kitts & Nevis) (similar).
240. See, e.g., Regina v. Sec’y, [2015] UKSC 54 (affirming that solitary confinement beyond 72 hours requires special safeguards, including approval by the Secretary of State).
241. Anamma v. Andhra Pradesh, 1974 SCR (3) 329, 335 n.29 (India); see also Singh v. Punjab, 1983 SCR (2) 583, 591 n.31 (India) (“[T]he prolonged anguish of alternating hope and despair, the agony of uncertainty, the consequences of such suffering on the mental, emotional and physical integrity and health of the individual can render the decision to execute the sentence of death an inhuman or degrading punishment . . . .”).
242. See, e.g., Chauhan v. Union of India, 1 Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 55 of 2013, decided on Jan. 21, 2014 (SC) (India); Mannan v. Bihar, Criminal Appeal No. 379 of 2009,
opinion by the High Court of Punjab and Haryana held that the practice of holding death-sentenced people in solitary confinement pending execution was unconstitutional.\textsuperscript{243} Keeping the convict in custodial segregation/solitary confinement before the exhaustion of [all legal appeals] is without authority of law;\textsuperscript{244} the Court reasoned, “[i]t will amount to additional punishment. It also amounts to torture and [is] violative of his basic human rights.”\textsuperscript{244} Regardless, Indian law has long restricted solitary confinement to no more than fourteen-day consecutive periods.\textsuperscript{245}

In Kenya, where nobody has remained on death row longer than four years, a Supreme Court commission found a “growing consensus that extended time on death row, if not the death penalty itself, constitutes inhuman punishment in violation of international law, regional law and most modern constitutions.”\textsuperscript{246} Similarly, in one of its first decisions, the South African Constitutional Court found it “intolerable” that “approximately half [of the three to four hundred people] on [Death] Row were sentenced more than two years ago.”\textsuperscript{247} Immediate action was required.\textsuperscript{248} The Court held that capital punishment was “cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment,”\textsuperscript{249} in part because of the well-documented “mental anguish suffered by convicted persons awaiting the death sentence.”\textsuperscript{250} In recent years, similar decisions have been issued by \textit{inter alia} the European Court of Human Rights,\textsuperscript{251} the Inter-American Commission of Human Rights,\textsuperscript{252} and the Ugandan decided on Feb. 14, 2019 (SC) (India) (commuting a death sentence after a decade in solitary); Vatheeswaran v. Tamil Nadu, 1983 SCR (2) 348 (India) (“[W]e think that delay exceeding two years in the execution of a sentence of [entitles] the person [to] demand the quashing of the sentence of death.”); Singh v. Uttar Pradesh, AIR 1978 SC 59 (Aug. 18, 1977) (India) (commuting a death sentence because of a delay of two-and-a-half years).

\textsuperscript{243} Haryana v. Arun, CRM. No. M-1276, ¶ 92, decided on Nov. 17, 2014 (SC) (India).

\textsuperscript{244} Id. at ¶ 92.

\textsuperscript{245} Indian Penal Code, 1860, § 74.

\textsuperscript{246} AMNESTY INT’L, \textsc{Death Sentences and Executions: 2019} at 48 (2020).

\textsuperscript{247} In the matter of the State v. Makwanyane, 1995 (3) S.A 391 at ¶ 6 (S. Afr.).

\textsuperscript{248} Id.

\textsuperscript{249} S. Afr. Const. ch. 2, art. 12.

\textsuperscript{250} Makwanyane 1995 (3) S.A 391 n.3 (S. Afr.), supra note 247.

\textsuperscript{251} See, e.g., A.L. (X.W.) v. Russia, Eur. Ct. H.R. (2015) ¶ 76 (holding that any use of solitary confinement requires a particularized justification, exceptional circumstances, and monitoring); Sanchez v. France, 2006-IX Eur. Ct. H.R. 171, 217 ¶ 120 (July 4, 2006) (holding complete sensory isolation, coupled with total social isolation, can destroy the personality and constitutes a form of inhuman treatment which cannot be justified by the requirements of security or any other reason).

Supreme Court. In short, international and foreign courts have rejected permanent solitary death rows.

F. TAKEN TOGETHER, ALL FIVE OBJECTIVE INDICIA SUGGEST THAT AMERICAN STANDARDS OF DECENCY HAVE DECISIVELY TURNED AGAINST PERMANENT SOLITARY DEATH ROWS

The objective indicia are used to determine whether there is a consensus against a certain penalty. Just like the imposition of death for the crime of raping an adult woman, for felony murder, for people who are “mentally retarded,” and for juveniles, state legislation and practice have clearly and uniformly moved against permanent solitary death rows. The available evidence of public opinion, historical development, and extranational opinion all confirm the conclusion that society’s standards of decency have indeed evolved past tolerating permanent solitary death rows. Considering the weight of the objective factors, the retentionist states find themselves drifting onto the wrong side of American history.

or indeterminate solitary confinement is CIDT (unlawful cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment); INTER-AM. COMM’N H.R., PRINCIPLES AND BEST PRACTICES ON THE PROTECTION OF PERSONS DEPRIVED OF LIBERTY IN THE AMERICAS at principle XXII.3 ¶ 3, 4 (2008) (requiring solitary inter alia be strictly time limited and subject to judicial oversight since prolonged or unnecessary solitary would be torture or CIDT).


257. Atkins, 536 U.S. at 321 (relying on six states abandoning the practice in 12 years).


259. As discussed above, only 12 states maintain the practice and this is substantially strengthened by the fact that ten states in the last six years have abandoned permanent solitary death rows or the capital punishment entirely—more than four times the Atkins rate of change and more than six times the Roper rate of change. See Atkins, 546 U.S. at 321 (relying on one state per two years); Roper, 543 U.S. at 565–66 (relying on one state per three years). The rate of change has been both uniform and consistent, further enhancing the weight of the social change. Id.
CONCLUSION

Following *Gregg v. Georgia*, the compounding cruelty of capital punishment combined with endless years of permanent solitary confinement came to death row. However, American standards of decency have evolved. State legislatures and executive officials are increasingly and uniformly moving against permanent solitary death rows. The number of jurisdictions operating solitary death rows, already a serious minority, are shrinking at an escalating rate. The American public is increasingly expressing an intolerance of solitary confinement and capital punishment. Moreover, permanent solitary death rows are a modernism that—for much of American history—the public would view as cruel and unusual punishment. This clear trend away from tolerating permanent solitary death rows in the United States is in accord with the overwhelming direction of the international community.

It is clear that society would not tolerate a state intermittently waterboarding those on death row or engaging in intentional psychological torture. Indeed, the Constitution would not bear it.\(^260\) There is little difference when the torturer is four concrete walls, perpetual silence, and unbounded time. Human decency demands better. As such, states retaining permanent solitary death rows continue to violate the Eighth Amendment’s prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment. Courts, lawyers, politicians, and activists should quickly work towards ending the unconstitutional stain of permanent solitary death rows.\(^261\) In short, American decency must come full circle.

\(^{260}\) *In re Kemmler*, 136 U.S. 436, 447 (1890) (“Punishments are cruel when they involve torture or a lingering death.”).

\(^{261}\) As evolving American standards of decency turn against permanent solitary death row, many jurisdictions are falling into a legal twilight of capital punishment. Judges, legislators, officials, lawyers, academics, activists can take several steps to facilitate the change. First, several states have shifted away from permanent solitary death row via executive or judicial order. See, e.g., *Cal. Dep’t of Corr. & Rehab*, supra note 135. Legislators and political activists should encourage the statutory codification of executive and judicial decisions shifting to both preserve the change while also clarifying the evolving standards analysis. See *Roper*, 543 U.S at 564 (noting legislative enactments addressing the question are particularly expressive of consensus). Second, several states voluntarily piloted and introduced reforms to end permanent solitary confinement on their death rows. See *Death Penalty Info. Ctr.*, *The Death Penalty in 2019: Year End Report* 23–24 (Dec. 17, 2019) (describing multiple reforms implemented in 2019). For the last decade, the Vera Institute of Justice has worked to reduce reliance on solitary in jails and prisons, and encouraging similar partnerships going forward may speed the way
APPENDIX:
FINDINGS OF THE NATIONAL SURVEY OF CONDITIONS ON DEATH ROWS

Note: Within this appendix the term “male” / “men” and “female” / “woman” are used in line with the local jurisdiction’s usage. Such usage is not an endorsement or intended to minimize the discrimination faced by transgender or non-binary people on death row or within the carceral system more generally.262 Similarly, the failure to mention facilities designated for women is not meant to minimize their particular challenges263 but, rather, reflects a lack of clarity in local policy.

For purposes of this study, “incarceration” and “confinement” are measured from the date of sentencing. The value of “average time in-cell” is computed using the information in the synopsis.

The data presented below is current as of August 7, 2022.

toward change. See Sara Sullivan et al., Rethinking Restrictive Housing, VERA (May 2018) https://www.vera.org/publications/rethinking-restrictive-housing [https://perma.cc/66JS-MPK8]. Third, there is a dearth of information related to the needs and desires of the people on death row related to the conditions of their confinement; it is unclear that simply mainstreaming death row residents is desirable. See Interview with Bernard Harcourt, Professor of L., Colum. L. Sch. (Feb. 2, 2021) (describing the importance of a community of shared experience and the privacy of single cells to many death-sentenced people). Finally, litigation challenging death row conditions has been remarkably successful. See, e.g., Porter v. Clarke, 923 F.3d 348, 353 (4th Cir. 2019). New suits are being filed. See, e.g., Kansas Death-Row Prisoners File Suit Challenging Conditions of Confinement, DEATH PENALTY INFO. CTR. (Nov. 16, 2020), https://deathpenaltyinfo.org/news/kansas-death-row-prisoners-file-suit-challenging-conditions-of-confinement [https://perma.cc/RXR8-6MZ9]. New challenges will not only provide tangible relief from unconstitutional conditions of confinement, but also will pressure reform and bolster the evolving standards argument.


263. Tamar Sarai Davis, Conditions on Death Row Are Horrible, But Women Have It Especially Hard, PRISM (Jan. 11, 2021), https://prismreports.org/2021/01/11/conditions-on-death-row-are-horrible-but-women-have-it-especially-hard/ [https://perma.cc/V3QE-T8ZV] (describing the particular solitude, sexual violence, harassment, and assault that women face on death row).
Status: Permanent Solitary Confinement

Total Incarcerated: 44 people

Longest Current Incarceration: 29 years (since June 1, 1993)

Average Time In-Cell: 22+ hours daily

Synopsis: Death-sentenced people are housed at the Special Confinement Unit (SCU) of the Terre Haute United States Penitentiary in Indiana, which is rated for 50 single cells. For 22+ hours daily, SCU residents are isolated behind solid steel doors in small cells where they eat, shower, and sleep. Residents are chained anytime they are out-of-cell and, three times a week, can exercise alone in a tiny cage with a small skylight. Visitation is non-contact and limited to four hours a month.

Status: Permanent Solitary Confinement

Total Incarcerated: 4 people

Longest Current Incarceration: 34 years (since April 12, 1988)

Average Time In-Cell: 23+ hours daily

Synopsis: Members of the military who are sentenced to death are housed in a segregated area of the United

264. NAACP LEGAL DEF. FUND, supra note 3, at 38.
266. Kadamovas v. Caraway, 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 206013, at *6 (S.D. Ind. 2018) (“The SCU is the only ‘death row’ in the federal prison system.”); see also PRISON RAPE ELIMINATION ACT (PREA) AUDIT REPORT: FCC TERRE HAUTE 7 (2019) (noting the SCU has a rated capacity of 50 single housing cells).
268. Editorial Staff, supra note 267.
270. NAACP LEGAL DEF. FUND, supra note 3, at 38.
271. The person incarcerated the longest in the Disciplinary Barracks is Ronald Gray, who was sentenced by the military in April 1988. See United States v. Gray, 51 M.J. 1, 9 (C.A.A.F. 1999) (listing Gray’s sentencing date).
States Disciplinary Barracks (DB) in Kansas.\textsuperscript{272} Isolation is maintained for 23 hours per day, with one hour reserved for exercising and showering.\textsuperscript{273}

\textbf{Ala.}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Status: Permanent Solitary Confinement}
  \item \textbf{Total Incarcerated:} 165 people\textsuperscript{274}
  \item \textbf{Longest Current Incarceration:} 40 years (since January 29, 1982)\textsuperscript{275}
  \item \textbf{Average Time In-Cell:} 23+ hours daily
\end{itemize}

\textbf{Synopsis:} Death-sentenced people are housed in a segregated area of Holman Prison and Tutwiler Prison (for five women).\textsuperscript{276} Holman Prison has been partially shut down after a scathing DOJ report found unconstitutionally unsafe conditions.\textsuperscript{277} Holman residents are isolated in 5×8 foot cells for 23 hours daily, with solo showers and religious and legal visits permitted.\textsuperscript{278} Solitary conditions are believed to have contributed the recent death row suicides of Jamal Jackson and Jeffery Borden.\textsuperscript{279}

\begin{verbatim}
\textsuperscript{272} Army Reg. 190-47, The Army Corrections System § 12-6(b) (2006) (as revised 2014).
\textsuperscript{274} Alabama Inmates Currently on Death Row, ALA. DEP’T OF CORR., http://www.doc.state.al.us/deathrow [https://perma.cc/6SQ2-B4DP].
\textsuperscript{275} Id. (listing this date as when William Bush moved to death row).
\textsuperscript{276} ALA. DEPT OF CORR., supra note 96.
\textsuperscript{279} Plaintiff’s Notice to the Court of Recent Suicides 5, Braggs v. Dunn, No. 2:14-cv-00601-MHT-JTA (M.D. Ala. 2020).
\end{verbatim}
Status: Semi-Reformed Death Row
Total Incarcerated: 111 people
Longest Current Incarceration: 44 years (since August 31, 1977)
Average Time In-Cell: <20 hours daily

Synopsis: Death-sentenced men are housed primarily at the Central Unit of the Arizona State Prison Complex-Florence, with a minority at Arizona State Prison Complex-Eyman, and the three death-sentenced women are housed in the Lumley Unit at the Arizona State Prison Complex-Perryville. Cells at Eyman are 11 feet 7 inches by 7 feet 9 inches (89.8 square feet) and cells at Lumley are 12 feet by 7 feet 2 inches (86 square feet). Since a 2017 settlement, death-sentenced people are no longer automatically maximum security based merely on their sentence, and are eligible for security review based on the criteria used generally. In 2017, approximately 80% of death-sentenced males were moved to the Central Unit, where group meals are in the common room, contact visitation is allowed, cells are left open three hours a day, and three times a week access to recreation fields is available in three-hour and fifteen minute blocks.
### Ark.

**Status:** Permanent Solitary Confinement  
**Total Incarcerated:** 30 people  
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 31 years (since October 18, 1990)  
**Average Time In-Cell:** 23+ hours daily

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed in segregated areas of the Varner Unit. Death row cells are single-occupancy 6×9 foot cells with solid steel doors and in-unit showering. Lights-off lasts only four hours, between 10:30pm and 2:30am, when breakfast is served. Yard time is solitary, spent in a tiny concrete cell, with a single mesh panel allowing sunlight into the room, though not permitting a view outside.

### Cal.

**Status:** Mainstreamed Death Row  
**Total Incarcerated:** 684 people  
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 44 years (since September 7, 1977)  
**Average Time In-Cell:** >22 hours daily (transfer program)  
23+ hours daily (San Quentin: restricted)  
22 hours daily (San Quentin: privileged)

**Synopsis:** A pilot program was announced in February 2020 to permit some death row residents to voluntarily transfer to one of eight other non-permanent solitary facilities, where they will be housed with non-condemned incarcerated people and, through the program, death-sentenced individuals will be eligible for work details.

---

287. Id.
290. Id.
292. Id.
This program was made permanent in January 2022 and had generated $49,000 in restitution payments through the work program by that date.\(^{294}\) Before the program, death-sentenced people were housed primarily at San Quentin State Prison for men, and Central California Women’s Facility for the 23 women, and were automatically classified as maximum security.\(^{295}\) Death-sentenced males are housed in three units at San Quentin: the Adjustment Center, where death-sentenced prisoners were initially housed, and to which they were returned “if they behave badly;” North Segregation, for prisoners “who have behaved well for years;” and East Block, which housed “everyone else.”\(^{296}\)

Prisoners housed in the Adjustment Center are in single cells, behind solid steel doors for 23 ½ hours daily, denied natural light and religious services.\(^{297}\) A recent lawsuit argues the review process, which occurs every 90 days, is perfunctory and random—leaving several seemingly well-behaved residents in the Adjustment Center for decades.\(^{298}\) Residents of East Block live in conditions similar to the general population.\(^{299}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fla.</th>
<th><strong>Status:</strong> Non-Solitary Death Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Incarcerated:</strong> 307 people(^{300})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Longest Current Incarceration:</strong> 46 years (since July 16, 1976)(^{301})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average Time In-Cell:</strong> &gt;22 hours daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed in segregated areas of Florida State Prison, Union Correctional Institute Prison, and the Lowell Annex (for [describing the transfer program from the perspective of a current death row resident]).

298. *Id.*
299. *Id. at 11.*
301. *Id.*
the three women). A May 2022 settlement of a 2017 case ended solitary confinement on Florida’s death row. Changes include up to 20 hours a week of congregate access to a day room, six hours of recreation a week, and access to jobs within the death row unit. Prior to the settlement, residents spent at least 23 hours daily in-cell, where they ate meals. Showers were offered every other day, and up to six hours of outdoor exercise was provided weekly, and one contact visitation was allowed per week. Residents granted privileges were allowed group recreation and access to a kiosk to email family. Typical cells have bars, though a few “heightened security” cells have solid steel doors. Non-security cells have television access.

**Ga.**

**Status:** Permanent Solitary Confinement  
**Total Incarcerated:** 48 people

**Longest Current Incarceration:** 46 years (since May 1976)

**Average Time In-Cell:** 23+ hours daily

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed in a segregated area of the Georgia Diagnostic and Classification Center (GDCC) and Arrendale State Prison (for the sole woman). Death row at the GDCC is an administrative segregation (solitary confinement) unit. Death-sentenced individuals are automatically assigned to “close security” (Georgia’s highest) and cannot be

---

304. Id.; see also Dan Sullivan, *supra* note 139 (providing additional details about the settlement).  
305. Dan Sullivan, *supra* note 139 (describing previous conditions).  
308. Id. at *6–7.  
309. Id. at *7.  
311. Id. at 4.  
312. Id.  
reclassified to a lower level. Residents are locked in 6.5×9 foot cells for at least 23 hours daily, with a small common room and yard accessible to small groups.

Idaho

**Status:** Permanent Solitary Confinement  
**Total Incarcerated:** 8 people  
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 39 years (since January 1983)  
**Average Time In-Cell:** 23+ hours daily

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced individuals are automatically placed into administrative segregation (solitary confinement) and are housed at Idaho Maximum Security Institution and Pocatello Women’s Correctional Center (for the sole woman). Residents are isolated in 12×7 foot cells for 23 hours daily, and only permitted to be out-of-cell for a single hour of outdoor solo recreation, to shower, for legal visits, or for medical care. A mental health professional reviews residents every 90 days and may recommend a temporary placement in somewhat less restricted housing.


317. Thomas Creech is the person longest on Idaho death row. *Id.* Note that the Idaho Department of Correction’s listed “received” date for Thomas Creech is used here, *id.*, rather than Creech’s sentencing date due to an unusual clerical error affecting his effective sentencing date. See State v. Creech, 105 Idaho 362, 365 n.1 (1983).


319. IDAHO DEPT OF CORR., Death Row, supra note 318.

320. IDAHO DEPT OF CORR., STANDARD OPERATING PROC., supra note 318.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Status: <strong>Non-Solitary Death Row</strong></th>
<th>Total Incarcerated: 8 people[^321]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>Longest Current Incarceration: 29 years (since March 26, 1993)[^322] TOTAL INCARCERATION: 8 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Time In-Cell: &lt;20 hours daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed at the Indiana State Prison (X-Row) and automatically placed in maximum security single-cells, though the sole female sentenced to death currently is incarcerated in Ohio.[^323] X-Row cells are 12×9 feet, windowless, have bar-doors, permit personal decorations, and are lit 24 hours a day.[^324] One resident has been permitted to have a cat.[^325] Residents have four hours out-of-cell per day, including up to an hour in a caged outdoor area.[^326] There are religious services and visitation.[^327]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Status: <strong>Permanent Solitary Confinement</strong></th>
<th>Total Incarcerated: 9 people[^328]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kan.</td>
<td>Longest Current Incarceration: 19 years (since November 15, 2002)[^329] TOTAL INCARCERATION: 9 people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Time In-Cell: 23+ hours daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced individuals are typically housed at El Dorado Correctional Facility as a part of an administrative segregation (solitary confinement) unit,[^321] NAACP LEGAL DEF. FUND, supra note 3, at 37; No Longer on Death Row, IND. PUB. DEF. COUNCIL, https://www.in.gov/ipdc/files/No-Longer-on-Indiana's-Death-Row.pdf [https://perma.cc/J66G-WXE].

[^324]: Vic Ryckaert, **This is What a Condemned Inmates’ Last Hours are Like on Indiana’s Death Row**, INDYSTAR (Dec. 11, 2019), https://www.indystar.com/story/news/crime/2019/12/11/death-penalty-indiana-inmates-last-hours/2607497001 [https://perma.cc/F5BF-9VU9]; see also INSIDE DEATH ROW WITH TREVOR McDONALD (ITV1 2013) (depicting several cells).
[^325]: Id. at 24:25.
[^326]: Ryckaert, supra note 324.
[^329]: Id.
though females would be assigned to the Topeka Correctional Facility.\(^{330}\) Residents are automatically held in solitary confinement for 23 hours per day behind a solid steel door in their 83-square-foot concrete cells, where they eat.\(^{331}\) Human interaction is rare: four or five days a week, residents are allowed to exercise alone in a 10×20 foot cage (often scheduled in the middle of the night), three days a week they shower, and non-contact visits are infrequent.\(^{332}\) There are no religious or other programs.\(^{333}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ky.</th>
<th>Status: Permanent Solitary Confinement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Incarcerated: 26 people(^{334})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longest Current Incarceration: 42 years (March 29, 1980)(^{335})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Time In-Cell: 22–23 hours daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed in segregated areas of Kentucky State Penitentiary and Kentucky Correctional Institute for Women (for the sole woman).\(^{336}\) Three times the number of residents executed (3) have died instead from suicide or natural causes (9).\(^{337}\) Residents are automatically placed into long-term solitary confinement, with at least three showers and limited exercise weekly.\(^{338}\) Residents are entitled to at

\(^{330}\) Id.
\(^{332}\) Dillon, *supra* note 331; Complaint at 3, Cheever, 2021 WL 1854198.
\(^{333}\) Id.
\(^{335}\) Id.
\(^{336}\) Id.
\(^{338}\) KY. DEPT OF CORR., POLICIES AND PROCEDURES, 10.2, SPECIAL MANAGEMENT HOUSING & RESTRICTIVE HOUSING 6, 19 (June 3, 2021), https://corrections.ky.gov/About/
least 10 hours of recreation time weekly. At least 22 hours per day are spent confined alone in 6.5x13 cells. Death row residents are able to congregate for religious observance. Death row cells have open bars and face an interior room, permitting conversation between some cells.

**La.**

**Status: Non-Solitary Death Row**

**Total Incarcerated:** 62 people

**Longest Current Incarceration:** 36 years (since December 25, 1985)

**Average Time In-Cell:** 20 hours daily

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed in segregated areas of Louisiana State Penitentiary (known as “Angola”) and the Louisiana Correctional Institute for Women (for the sole woman). Since 2017, Angola’s death row permits four hours of out-of-cell time per day, during which groups of up to 12 can use a common room or, twice a week, use a non-caged outdoor area. Residents can hold jobs and can use JPAY machines to email or download music; the warden has noted improved

---


339.  Id. at 19.


346.  O’Donoghue, supra note 128.
behavior since these changes were implemented. Prior to 2017, Angola's death row was locked-down roughly 23 hours per day.

**Miss. Status:** Permanent Solitary Confinement  
**Total Incarcerated:** 36  
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 45 years (since March 2, 1977)  
**Average Time In-Cell:** 23 hours daily

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed in segregated Unit 29 of Louisiana State Penitentiary (“Parchman”) and automatically categorized as the highest security group. For residents, at least 23 hours per day are spent in their 12x8 foot single-cells, which are designed to prevent inhabitants from seeing another resident. One hour per day, small groups are allowed to congregate out-of-cell or use an enclosed basketball court. Visitation is non-contact and religious services are allowed, but only between individuals and the chaplain.

---

350. Richard Jordan is the person longest on Mississippi death row. Id. Note that the Mississippi Department of Correction’s listed “entry” date for Jordan is used here, Id., rather than Jordan’s sentencing date due to a run of several resentencing, see Jordan v. Fisher, 576 U.S. 1071, 1071–74 (2015) (Sotomayor, J., dissenting from denial of certiorari).
353. Id.
354. Id.; INMATE HANDBOOK, supra note 351, at 5.
Mo. **Status:** Mainstreamed Death Row  
**Total Incarcerated:** 19 people[^355]  
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 37 years (since December 12, 1984)[^356]  
**Average Time In-Cell:** <20 hours daily

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced individuals are housed at Potosi Correctional Center for males and the WERDCC for women. Since January 8, 1991, people sentenced to death in Missouri have been assigned to housing using the same methods as the general inmate population.[^357] The majority of death row residents have actually been assigned to the low-security “honors dorm” and often share cells with non-death row inmates—and are able to access regular work and prison religious services.[^358] Six years into the program, a report described the program as producing “benefits not only for [death sentenced] inmates, but also for general population prisoners, staff, inmate’s families, corrections personnel, attorneys for both the state and the inmates, and Missouri citizens.”[^359]

Mont. **Status:** Non-Solitary Death Row  
**Total Incarcerated:** 2 people[^360]  
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 39 years (since March 22, 1983)[^361]  
**Average Time In-Cell:** 22+ hours daily (restricted)  
< 22 hours daily (privileged)


[^356]: The person sentenced to death in Missouri longest is William Boliek, Jr., who was sentenced to death on December 12, 1984. William Boliek, PHILLIPS BLACK, https://www.phillipsblack.org/boliek-william [https://perma.cc/SN24-24 ET].

[^357]: Lombardi, *supra* note 120, at 3.

[^358]: Id. at 4–5.

[^359]: Id.

[^360]: NAACP LEGAL DEF. FUND, *supra* note 3, at 37.

[^361]: Ronald Smith has been on Montana death row since March 22, 1983. Offender Search, MONT. DEPT’T OF CORR. (navigate to Ronald Smith’s page by entering his first and last name into the search), https://app.mt.gov/conweb/ [https://perma.cc/3H59-BXFX]; see also Smith v. Mahoney, 2007 WL 869624, *3 (D. Mont. 2007). The only other person on Montana death row, William Gollehon, has been on death row since March 16, 1992. Offender Search, *supra* (navigate to William Gollehon’s page by entering his first and last name into the search); see also Gollehon v. State, 296 Mont. 6, 8 (1999).
**Synopsis:** Montana has no formal “death row,” but people under death sentence in Montana are housed in the maximum security unit at Montana State Prison.\(^{362}\) Persons sentenced to death are automatically and permanently placed into administrative segregation (solitary confinement).\(^{363}\) All persons subject to administrative segregation, including death-sentenced inmates, are confined to their cell for at least 22 hours daily and permitted religious programs, three showers, and five hours of outdoor exercise weekly.\(^{364}\) Cells are 8×10, closed by a solid steel door, have a concrete bed with a mattress, a concrete desk, a toilet, and a sink.\(^{365}\) However, over time, certain basic privileges can be re-earned, such as time out of the cell in the “day room,” phone calls, and possession of books or magazines.\(^{366}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neb.</th>
<th><strong>Status:</strong> Non-Solitary Death Row</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Incarcerated:</strong> 12 people (^{367})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Longest Current Incarceration:</strong> 26 years (since February 21, 1996) (^{368})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average Time In-Cell:</strong> &lt;20 hours daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed in the segregated, solid steel door Cell Block F of Tecumseh State Correctional Institution, though females would be assigned to the Nebraska Correctional Center for Women.\(^{362}\)


\(^{366}\) Id.

\(^{367}\) NAACP LEGAL DEF. FUND, supra note 3, at 37; see also *The Inmates on Nebraska’s Death Row and Their Crimes*, OMAHA WORLD HERALD (July 1, 2022), [https://omaha.com/the-inmates-on-nebraska-s-death-row-and-their-crimes/collection_0975426d-fde7-501f-bed4-755fa540637f.html#10][JUX2-HV74].

\(^{368}\) The person on Nebraska death row the longest is John Lotter, sentenced in February 21, 1996. *Incarceration Records*, NEB. DEPT OF CORR., [https://dcs-inmatearchive.ne.gov/Corrections/COR_input.html][4H2B-TE72] (navigate to John Lotter’s page by searching his identity number: 47903); see also Lotter v. Houston, 771 F. Supp. 2d 1074, 1086 (D. Neb. 2011).
Women. Cells have small windows and TV access can be provided.

**Nev.**

**Status:** Non-Solitary Death Row

**Total Incarcerated:** 64 people

**Longest Current Incarceration:** 42 years (since June 25, 1979)

**Average Time In-Cell:**
- 23+ hours daily (restricted)
- < 19 hours daily (privileged)

**Synopsis:**

Death-sentenced individuals are housed at Ely State Prison and Florence McClure Women’s Correctional Center, and are automatically placed under maximum custody ("Restrictive Housing"), requiring strip searches when exiting or entering their single-cells. In restrictive housing, Ely death row residents can spend 23 or more hours in their cells, but residents can earn “cross-over privileges” which gives at least five hours out of cell daily and allows group activities in the common area or during exercise. As of 2019, 57 of 65 men on death row had cross-over privileges, and the cross-over privilege system has produced positive results, leading to Ely death row being “by far [the] best behaved” according to unit staff.

---


371. The NAACP reported 65 people as of January 1, 2022, and Timothy Webber died of natural causes in May 2022. NAACP LEGAL DEF. FUND, supra note 3, at 37; Nevada Killer Held on Death Row Since 2003 Dies at Hospital, AP NEWS (May 23, 2022), https://apnews.com/article/nevada-las-vegas-sexual-assault-40a5b5899264ea7ca7c7767ebe27f0d9cb7 [https://perma.cc/D7GZ-7HYS].


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Status: Semi-Reformed Death Row</th>
<th>Total Incarcerated: 135 people&lt;sup&gt;376&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Longest Current Incarceration: 36 years (since January 29, 1997)&lt;sup&gt;377&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Average Time In-Cell: 8 hours daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
<td><strong>Synopsis:</strong> Death-sentenced people are housed in Central Prison and the North Carolina Correctional Institution for Women (for the two women).&lt;sup&gt;378&lt;/sup&gt; Central death row is 24 solid-door cell blocks centered on a common dayroom accessible 7am to 11pm. Residents are permitted group meals, one contactless visit per week, may work paying jobs, participate in group exercise twice a week, shower three times per week, and participate in group Christian or Islamic worship.&lt;sup&gt;379&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td><strong>Synopsis:</strong> Death-sentenced individuals are primarily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>375</sup> Id.; see also Bill Leonard (Bill on Death Row), *Let Out of Solitary Confinement*, TUMBLR (Aug. 2, 2015), https://williamleonarddeathrow.tumblr.com/post/127465988427/let-out-of-solitary-confinement [https://perma.cc/6Y6S-3TWL] (“I have just found out that my crossover privileges have been granted. Next week I will be let out of solitary confinement after 22 years of isolation.”).


<sup>378</sup> *Id.* (click on Henry Wallace’s DOC # to see his sentence date).

<sup>379</sup> *Id.* (navigating the Death Row, while segregated, does not place greater restrictions on residents).


housed at the Chillicothe Correctional Institution and the Ohio Reformatory for Women (for the sole female). The Chillicothe death row has three units—DR1, DR2, and DR3—which are composed of two tiers of single-cells centered on common rooms with tables and recreation equipment (including TV, books, and board games). Unless specially classified, death row residents are afforded five hours of out-of-cell recreation and five showers per week and one contactless visit per month. At least two hours must be spent out-of-cell daily, unless residents are classified as a security threat, in which case they can spend 23–24 hours a day isolated.

Okla. Status: Permanent Solitary Confinement
Total Incarcerated: 41 people
Longest Current Incarceration: 37 years (since July 15, 1985)
Average Time In-Cell: 22–23 hours daily
Synopsis: Death-sentenced people are housed in Oklahoma State Penitentiary (OSP) A-Unit and H-Unit and the Mabel Bassett Correctional Center (for the sole woman). H-Unit is an underground facility where “yard time” is in a small underground area with a skylight and 23 or more hours per day are spent in-cell. The majority of OSP residents have “qualified” to move to

382. Death Row, supra note 380.
384. Ohio Admin. Code 5120-9-12, Inmates Sentenced to Death (2014); ROBINSON, supra note 383, at 100–05 (including responses indicating 5 hours of recreation weekly).
A-Unit, where they have access to yard time in an outdoor cage and some cells are double-cells, though 22–23 hours are still spend in-cell daily. There are no active religious services.

| Or. | Status: **Mainstreamed Death Row**  
Total Incarcerated: 25 people  
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 32 years (since May 1988)  
**Average Time In-Cell:** n/a |
| Pa. | Status: **Semi-Reformed Death Row**  
Total Incarcerated: 106 people  
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 36 years (since November 22, 1985)  
**Average Time In-Cell:** <18 hours daily |

**Synopsis:** The Oregon Department of Corrections has announced that death row will be closed and current residents will be distributed throughout the Oregon Prison System. The current death row at Oregon State Penitentiary will be converted to disciplinary segregation units.

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced men are housed at either State Correctional Institution Greene or Phoenix, while the Commonwealth’s sole woman sentenced to death is housed at State Correctional Institution Muncy. Recent changes as a result of a settlement agreement guarantee people on death row at least 42.5 hours a week out of their cells, 15 minutes of phone access each day, contact
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visits, outdoor exercise, daily showers, group religious services, jobs, and access to educational programs. The Commonwealth ended its previous practices of subjecting death-row prisoners to body cavity searches whenever they leave their cells and requiring 24-hour illumination of the prisoners’ cells. Previously, death-sentenced people automatically were placed into isolation for 22–24 hours a day inside a cell about 8×12 feet. Nearly 80 percent of those sentenced to death in Pennsylvania spent more than a decade in this form of solitary confinement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.C.</th>
<th>Status: Semi-Solitary Confinement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Incarcerated: 34 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longest Current Incarceration: 38 years (since September 17, 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Time In-Cell: &lt;22 hours daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced individuals are housed in a segregated area of Broad River Correctional Institution. In 2019, in the midst of a lawsuit, South Carolina ended its practice of confining death-sentenced people to 23 hours per day in windowless cells. Now, at least one hour per day may be spent in a common room socializing, group exercise is permitted, and eight non-contact visits per month are allowed.
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| S.D. | Status: **Permanent Solitary Confinement**  
Total Incarcerated: 1 person[^407]  
Longest Current Incarceration: 21 years (since January 19, 2001)[^408]  
Average Time In-Cell: 23+ hours daily |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis:</strong> Death-sentenced persons are housed at the maximum-security Jameson Annex of the South Dakota State Penitentiary, though the South Dakota Women’s Prison would house any females. Death Row is a segregated unit.[^409] At Jamison, residents remain in their cells 23 or more hours daily—45 minutes of recreation, which includes any time to use the phone or a tablet, and a fifteen-minute shower are the only time out-of-cell.[^410] Residents must eat in-cell, may not hold prison jobs, nor have direct contact with anyone other than prison officials.[^411]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Tenn. | Status: **Non-Solitary Death Row**  
Total Incarcerated: 47 people[^412]  
Longest Current Incarceration: 39 years (since February 7, 1983)[^413]  
Average Time In-Cell: 22–23 hours daily (restricted) < 16 hours daily (privileged) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synopsis:</strong> Death-sentenced individuals are housed in a segregated area of the Riverbend Maximum Security Institution and an unsegregated area of the Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Prison for Women (for the sole female), though residents are automatically maximum security. Riverbend death row operates with a three-tier system of behavior classification for residents—A, B, and C (from most to least privileged)—with “C” and “B” residents spending upwards of 22 hours locked in their cells and “A” residents spending up to eight hours a day out of their cell. Arrivals are automatically assigned to C. Every 18 months, they may be reclassified up or down.

**Tex. Status:** Permanent Solitary Confinement
**Total Incarcerated:** 195 people
**Longest Current Incarceration:** 44 years (since October 26, 1977)
**Average Time In-Cell:** 22–23 hours daily

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced people are housed in segregated areas of the Polunsky Unit and the Mountain View Unit (for the six women). The average Death Row cell is no bigger than 8×12 feet, with the majority having a small window high on the wall.


to administrative segregation conditions. Showers and outdoor exercise (where residents *may* be able to speak to each other from separate cages) are to be offered twice a week, but interviews suggest this is often not met. Meals are eaten in-cell, some radios are permitted in-cell, and contact visitation is forbidden. While they are locked behind solid steel doors, prison officials are able to directly observe the toilets. For 94% of their lives on Texas’ death row, residents are kept in total isolation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Utah</th>
<th><strong>Status: Semi-Solitary Confinement</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Incarcerated:</strong> 7 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Longest Current Incarceration:</strong> 36 years (since December 27, 1985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Average Time In-Cell:</strong> 21+ hours daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis:** Death-sentenced individuals are housed at the Utah State Prison (USP) for men, though women would be housed at the Central Utah Correctional Facility for women. People sentenced to death are automatically designated as maximum security and cannot be reevaluated. At USP death row, residents are isolated in a 14×7 foot single-cell for 21 hours daily, where meals are eaten. They are allowed up to three electrical appliances (e.g. fans or televisions) in-cell, non-contact visits are available on weekends, and residents may work
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for 40¢ an hour. A 10×12 foot concrete enclosure may be used during out-of-cell time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wy.</th>
<th>Status: Permanent Solitary Confinement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Incarcerated: 0 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longest Current Incarceration: n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Time In-Cell: 23+ hours daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Synopsis:** Nobody is sentenced to death in Wyoming. Any future death-sentenced individuals would be housed at the Wyoming State Penitentiary or the Wyoming Women’s Center. By statute, people sentenced to death must be kept in solitary confinement, with the exception of legal, religious, family, and physician visits.
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