

Task 2:

The federal government is thinking of the most reasonable option for offences by criminals. It is thinking that capital punishment will deter criminals but it is too harsh to implement. They are also weighing the pros and cons of life imprisonment.

Please write 150-200 words providing your opinion on the selected option

A: CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

B: LIFE IMPRISONMENT

Chosen opinion: LIFE IMPRISONMENT

Brainstorming - 2/3 minutes:

B1: people get to live (ethical)/loved ones can keep connected

B2: the country can be seen as barbaric/easy way out

Template 1:

The idea of employing punishment **has sparked recent debate and controversy**. **I opine that** life imprisonment **is a more apropos option due to** certain social factors.

Conspicuously, since life imprisonment allows offenders to survive, it is a less harsh way to chastise them which speaks to human rights and ethics. **Furthermore,** it gives room to maintain and effectively grow family bonds. **For example,** since these criminals are not put to death penalty, they can still accommodate

family visits, keeping their relationships and the spirit of love alive, as long as they live.

Nevertheless, capital punishment **may not serve a valuable purpose**. **Due to** the reputation of our country, it is imperative that we are not seen as barbaric, nonetheless, this outdated method will accomplish exactly that. **Another indisputable fact is that** putting criminals to sleep permanently may be seen as an easy way out compared to a lifetime of imprisonment; this may not deter criminals from offences.

Based on the aforementioned reasoning, I still stand by my stance. That is, capital punishment **is not a suited option considering** the complications.

Proofread - 2/3mins

Opinion: Capital punishment

Brainstorm:

B1: no expenditure of tax money

B2: harsh punishment can deter criminals

Template 2:

The idea of employing punishment **has sparked recent debate and controversy**. **I (personally) opine that** death penalty **is a more apropos option due to** the optimistic current and future outlook.

Conspicuously, since capital punishment simply ends a life, the expenditures of that person do not need to be accounted for. **Further to this,** their food, shelter or any therapeutic supplies would not be a source of draining budgets since they themselves will cease to exist. This kind of thinking or approach towards criminals may be seen as amoral in a plethora of cultures, nevertheless, the practicality of the given measures and resulting savings, in terms of fiscal numbers, is quite significant.

Interestingly enough, the concept of reward and punishment applies here. **Due to** such a brutally applied penalty, criminals will perceive it as an apparent deterrent to crime; valuing their lives over existing urges to commit crime will aid in inevitably lowering crime rates.

Based on the aforementioned reasoning, I still stand by my stance. That is, capital punishment **is clearly more feasible considering** monetary and crime-related pros.

Proofread - 2/3 mins