

Death penalty for terrorists

[Science](#), [Social Science](#)



DEATH PENALTY FOR TERRORISTS Argument for: Terrorists should be punished to deter future criminal conduct

In all the societies, if a person violates the laws he or she is supposed to be punished. According to Kant, the death penalty is supposed to be administered to prevent future criminal behaviors. He argues that every person is supposed to follow the law regardless of the social status.

Acting to satisfy one's self-interest is unacceptable

Kant argues that acting to satisfy one's interest is not acceptable. It is immoral to kill someone to obtain something is not morally upright. If the government decides to kill someone because he or she killed someone else, the action is moral. Terrorists take away the lives of the people. Thus, the government is supposed to protect the lives of the citizens.

Benefits the society as a whole

Utilitarianism believes that capital punishment is morally acceptable, and it benefits the society as a whole. If an action brings happiness to the whole society, then it should be carried out. Utilitarianism also states that if capital punishment causes pain to one person or only a few people in the society, then the action is not immoral. Additionally, utilitarianism aims at society's happiness and not individual happiness. If capital punishment will bring happiness to the society. Then it should be administered.

The law is supposed to be strictly adhered

Natural laws guide the individual's behavior. The natural laws are those that are innate. They are the rights that are given to us at birth. The rights are based on principles such as customs, beliefs and expression. If a person commits a crime, the rights are supposed to be adhered. The laws of most of

the states' state that if a person kills, the death penalty is supposed to be administered. Terrorist causes the death of many people. Hence, the death penalty is supposed to be administered.

Argument against:

Punishment and crime are inconsistent with happiness

According to the utilitarian philosophy, laws are supposed to be used so as to maximize the happiness of the society. Punishment and crime, do not bring happiness to the members of the society. Utilitarians have the belief that a crime-free society does not exist. They state that death penalty has consequences for both the society and the offender.

Death penalty does not prevent crime

Additionally, the total good produced through punishment, it is supposed to exceed the total evil. Death penalty will not prevent the terrorists from committing a crime. When one is killed because of terrorists' activities, it will not prevent the other terrorists from committing a crime.

Rehabilitation would do better

This is another of the utilitarian rationale for punishment. Rehabilitation aims at preventing future crime and giving the offenders ability to succeed within the confines of the law. Through rehabilitation, the offenders learn new ways to compete in the job market.

Life imprisonment is better than death penalty

According to Egoism, all the actions that a person decides to do has its motivation. The primary motivation for committing the criminal activities is self-interest. The terrorists carry out the terrorist activities out of self-interest. In Egoism, life incarceration is supposed to be an alternative to

the death penalty. Egoism states that both the just and unjust commit crime for self-interest. Thus, death penalty cannot be a solution to eliminate crime especially the terrorists' activities.