

# Article

## An Overdose of Dangerousness: How “Future Dangerousness” Catches the Least Culpable Capital Defendants and Undermines the Rationale for the Executions It Supports

Meghan Shapiro \*

I.	Introduction .....	146
II.	Overinclusiveness of Dangerousness Predictions Undermines the Incapacitation Rationale of the Executions They Support.....	148
A.	Dangerousness has stretched far beyond that which the Supreme Court originally approved.....	148
B.	Over-prediction, inherent to the science of dangerousness prediction, is greatly amplified in the capital context. ....	152
i.	Common evidentiary rulings and refusals to provide limiting instructions increase the likelihood of over-prediction. ....	153
ii.	Current use of future dangerousness experts contributes to overprediction. ....	159
C.	Overinclusion undercuts the Supreme Court’s original affirmation of capital dangerousness statutes. ....	165
III.	Dangerousness Obscures Culpability, Undermining the Retributive Function of Dangerousness-Based Executions.....	167
A.	Dangerousness obscures the purpose of capital sentencing hearings, using fear to shift jurors’ attention away from any meaningful culpability determination.....	168
B.	Dangerousness catches defendants with low culpability and results in death sentences unsupported by a retributive rationale.....	172

---

\*J.D. 2009, University of Texas School of Law; B.A. 2006, College of William & Mary. This article is dedicated to Wilbert Lee Evans, who helped save the lives of correctional officers during a 1984 escape by other death row inmates; dedicated also to my father, Jonathan Shapiro, who represented Mr. Evans for eight years and stood by him the night he was executed by the Commonwealth of Virginia for posing a future danger to society. I am speechlessly grateful for Jordan Steiker’s and David Bruck’s tremendous generosity of time and ideas. Thanks also to Elizabeth Brummett, Hannah Miller, and Peter Walker.