Some people would argue that each crime deserves specific punishments. Other say that when handing out punishments, it is necessary to consider under which conditions and inducements, each crime commits. I agree with this because some situations make people to do illegal activities.

On the one hand, some people hold the view that painstaking punishment should be given to offenders. They believe this because it can deter potential offenders from becoming actual offenders. For example, if a person knows that shoplifting could send him 3 years to the prison, he or she probably will think of it, and possibility of committing it would be decrease. To sum up, although it is logical that exact punishments for each crime could decrease offences, in practice it has another outcomes.

On the other hand, others hold the opinion that it is beneficial to consider an individual’s circumstances and motivations while deciding punishments. Circumstances like mental illnesses and living in a community that has a high crime rate often leads people to commit a crime. For example, an individual who suffers from Schizophrenia has hallucinations which makes him or her to do illegal activities. So in this case, it seems to be more rational to place him or her in a treatment facility instead of sentencing to a prison. I agree with this view as it could help judges to take the better decisions.

In conclusion, there are valid arguments on both sides of the controversy; however, it is my firm conviction that it is beneficial to consider circumstances and motivations when a judge is handing down a sentence.