Francisco Duarte

Professor Sherri Agee

English 111

03 November 2017

Death Penalty

Should specific punishments be based on the crime committed and is the death penalty the answer to stopping future offenders from killing innocent people? Retrinutism suggests the death penalty for those who commit murder. The best argument suggests that execution might deter murders an if this argument is correct, then the death penalty should be enforced. The American society has more to gain and less to lose if the death penalty implied. By implying the death penalty and murderers, it may prevent some people from committing murder. By not punishing criminals accordingly, other offenders may be encouraged to carry on with their crimes.

I think that you should input some startling figure on murder rates to captivate the readers attentiion in the Introduction. Or perhaps a story about a poor young girl who was raped and murdered.

The retributivism theory states “Punishment is morally justified insofar as it is meted out as retribution for the offense committed” (Primoratz 86). Merely saying that when someone commits a crime, that person deserves to be punished. There should be a separation between offense and punishment through fines and prison terms. However, there should be more classifications disposable for those who kill others. As the biblical teachings and according to capital punishments out to be reestablished for the simple fact, “that justice is done in cases of murder, That murderers punished according to their desert.” (Kant 156). “ Because human life is invaluable and to take it entails the death penalty.” (Greenburg 26).

In the Wild West days, the lawmen just hanged a person who was convicted to die almost immediately after being sentenced. Today the law allows a period to elapse from the time of hearing to the time of execution. This period can often be prolonged many months and sometimes years, wasting valuable taxpayers money and government resources. After many court trials and appeals, the sentence could be switched to life in prison. As Nathanson principle of “An eye for an eye.” that punishment should be equal be equal to the crime. Imposing the fear of death would help make an impact on future offenders and help deter them from committing heinous crimes. Even though deterrence cannot be justified on the grounds of retribution, it also has not been discredited. If the law follows through promptly, people will consider the risk they could face before committing the crime of killing innocent people. One could disagree, but no human law could be one hundred percent accurate. There is also the risk of an innocent person being convicted of murder they did not commit and suffering the punishment of the death penalty. Criminal may be deterred if the death penalty is enforced and potentially saving many innocent lives.

I like how you addressed my doubts on rushing to decision but still not convinced on the 100% issue. Justice is making sure we fit the punishment for the crime. I am curious on the actual percentage of people that were actually innocent.

The eye for an eye theory is a compelling view that seems to be supported not only by moral common sense but also through tradition and philosophical thought. Kant’s view is first expressed by the principle of equality with the “belief that a person deserves is related to what he does” (Kant 156). All other acts of crime can take a literal application, requiring the government to tailor punishment to individual crime categories by fines and jail time. The proportionality principle can help play a legitimate role in our thinking about how punishment should be implied. Von Hirsch states if we want to enforce the commensurate deserts principle we should support it with information about what level of punishment would be needed to prevent the crimes.

The Best Bet Argument by Van den Hagg ensures that any policy that societies create is a gamble. There has not been any proof that deterrence of the death penalty works does not work, that being said, why should innocent people be at risk by murderers. Society should consider the potential benefits of taking criminal out of the streets thus protecting valuable innocent lives. Society should bet that it does work and value the saving of innocent lives more highly than the loss of the ones who commit the crime. It could be argued that the death penalty not deter as much as we would prefer due to the fact of its inconsistent and rare use today. If future criminals perceived the outcome of murdering the death penalty, wouldn’t they be more reluctant to kill others? Van den Hagg argues that we should follow the conventional sense, it teaches the higher the cost of something, it will decrease the number of people who choose to do it because murderers are not deterred by life in prison but are deterred by the death penalty.

It looks like you have not met the length requirements of the paper. I would work on constructing out your Introduction a little more with a vivid example. Some clear transition statements would be good for each part as well I was a little unclear what side you were taking in the meat of the paper. All in all a good start

In the case of Stanley Wiliams, it brought light to the public to reflect on the purpose of the death penalty. Is the purpose of the death penalty to remove from society someone who would cause more harm. Alternatively, is the death penalty to remove someone who is incapable of rehabilitation? Lastly, is the death penalty to deter others from committing murder (White). As of 2008, 58 countries worldwide have retained the death penalty for an ordinary capital crime, including the United States of America. The United States is the only westernized democracy not to have abolished the death penalty. Arguments commonly made to eliminate the death penalty is that it is cruel and unusual punishment, it is used disproportionately against lower-income demographics, and some religious groups such as the Roman Catholic Church oppose the death penalty as not being pro-life. As of 2008, 139 countries worldwide have abolished the death penalty based on moral grounds (White). There are many reasons why the death penalty should be abolished to include it is immoral, it does not deter murder and affects minorities disproportionately, and it is an economic drain on taxpayers. As of 2009, the state of California alone death row costs taxpayers $114 million a year. California has only executed thirteen people since 1976 which cost $250 million per execution.

The possibility of executing a murderer and saving innocent lives should be enough evidence to justify that the death penalty is the best bet. Other crimes should be punished accordingly for their acts but no exception for killers. Enforcing the death penalty will lead to fewer murders over time. Murderers will recognize that society has taken the death penalty more seriously and they will not be lucky enough to serve life in prison.
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