

The that a society
that does not



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The question of whether or not Capital Punishment is ethical has been a problem society has faced for a long time. The death penalty is given to those who commit crimes so heinous, like murder, that society believes the criminal responsible deserves death as a punishment. A widely controversial subject, the death penalty ethical question is split among many people of differing ideas with some believing it is bad, and some believing it to be good. This essay will go over why the death penalty is ethical from the stances of Immanuel Kant, Utilitarianism, and Retributivism.

Immanuel Kant believed that the death penalty was morally justifiable in certain cases and insisted on the capital punishment for murders saying, "whoever has committed murder, must die" (Avaliani). He believed that a society that does not sentence someone who has killed people to death is just as bad as committing the crime itself. Kant criticizes the belief that no one has a right to deprive a person of a right to live. He believed that a state should have the right to kill a murderer.

Kant believed that capital punishment is justified only for serious crimes such as murder or anything that causes a very large amount of damage to society. He believed it was impossible to allow any type of situation where a murderer should be entitled to any legal rights and would be able to justify his actions. He also believed that we could not get rid of capital punishment and didn't know what could take its place if it was abolished. Kant thought that if a criminal is not punished then society has a controversial nature and undermines itself.

He also believed punishing an innocent man by accident was better than failing to punish someone who has committed a crime and believed a murderer sentenced to death shouldn't be allowed to appeal for a lighter punishment. Utilitarianism views the death penalty as being morally justifiable if it benefits society as a whole or promotes general happiness. So, if someone commits very serious crimes like murder then it would promote the general happiness of the public to have that person be punished with the death penalty. So, while even though punishing criminals might cause sadness and pain for them and the people who are close to them, these punishments will ensure the happiness of the society as a whole. It can be said that Utilitarianism support death penalty because, violating laws causes pain for the majority of the society so preventing this pain is necessary.

However, they don't believe it is all right to punish criminals in order to give them what they deserve or exact revenge or retribution on them. The problem with retribution, for utilitarianists, is that it promotes suffering without any gain in happiness. Utilitarianists also believe capital punishment is meant to deter many criminals from committing murder. The severity of losing one's life is intended to cause fear and consequently prevent crime. The death penalty is also better than life imprisonment because it prevents the criminal who committed such heinous crimes from being released from prison and committing them again. From this viewpoint, the taking of the criminal's life is justified because it prevents the taking of other, innocent lives. If decided that the permitting the criminal to live may result in

consequences of more terrible crimes, then capital punishment would be considered an appropriate alternative in that case.

These views show that the death penalty is an ethical solution to terrible crimes. All of these viewpoints state that the death penalty should only be used in scenarios where the criminal in question has committed the most heinous of crimes, murder. Kant states that if a criminal has killed someone then he forfeits his rights as a human being and his punishment should be equal to the crime.

Executing murderers prevents them from committing their crime again, and thus protects innocent victims. The good outweighs the bad, and the executioner is morally justified in taking the murderer's life. It is actually more morally wrong to simply incarcerate a murderer to a life of air-conditioning, television equipped prison where they get three free meals a day, recreational time, and visits from people close to them. Someone who murders another person can only be made to pay for their actions by forfeiting their rights and giving their life in place of the person they killed. It should be this way because a loss of freedom does not compare to loss of life.

If the punishment for smaller crimes such as theft is imprisonment, then the punishment for murder must be even more severe, because human life is much more valuable than any material item. For example, if a murderer took the life of a child and the criminal was only given a life sentence then, the family of the victim will be paying taxes for his meals and his television. And if he were to take the college courses that prison might offer him, the family of the victim would be financing that as well. This goes against Kant and

utilitarianism because it doesn't strip the criminal of their rights or punish them accordingly, but it also doesn't promote happiness to the victim's family. Many people also tend to claim that the death penalty is just a means of revenge. However, it is not while in reality, the murderer actually gets off fairly easy when they are sentenced to death. The murderer is often only injected with a lethal injection.

If a person is given the lethal injection they are put to sleep and then given a shot that will stop their heart. The criminal dies from overdose and respiratory and cardiac arrest while they are unconscious. The small amount of pain the criminal goes through does not even begin to compensate for the pain of the victims and their families.

The death penalty in the United States is reserved for only the most heinous of crimes. It is not a state-run lottery that randomly chooses people at random from among all those convicted of murder. Instead, it is a system that selects the worst of the worst. If you were to sentence killers like the ones previously described to a lighter punishment, such as a long period in prison, would be disproportionate to the severity of the crime. The Retributive Theory is a form of justice that comes from the old saying "an eye for an eye". The basic principles of it are desert and proportionality with desert referring to something which has caused a person to commit a crime. Proportionality refers to how much punishment the criminal should get according to the crime they committed. Retributivists do not punish a criminal for what they might do, but only for what the person has done for the whatever the person deserves.

In the retributivist theory, the punishment given out is seen as a form of retaliation for whatever crime was committed. Retributive justice tries to atone for the crime. The supporters of retributive justice say that criminals deserve punishment on account of their wrongdoing. If they deserve discipline, then justice demands we do so and injustice is done if we don't.

An advantage to this theory is that it targets punishment only for those who deserve it therefore, an innocent person can't be punished. For a punishment to be given out, a person must be found guilty of committing the crime they are accused of.