

# Chemical castration of sexual offenders



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

Sexual offences seem to be among the offences, considered worse by humankind. In the past, sexual offenders have been serving jail terms just like other criminals in jail. However, countries that have a high number of sexual offenders have recently resolved to castration as a tool to eradicate sexual offenders. Examples of such countries include Czech Republic, Poland, Denmark and France. In recent times, states in the U. S. have also legalized the use of chemical castration to sex offenders. This castration is either physically or by use of chemical injections. Although surgical castration received a lot of criticism on its credibility as a punishment, chemical castration is even more debated on than surgical castration. This procedure uses chemical hormones that reduce the production level of testosterone and finally makes the offenders impotent (Bailey 3). This paper argues out the pros and cons of chemical castration and presents evidence that, indeed, chemical castration is the best solution of eradicating sexual offences in the society.

In such a debate, human rights become the basis of evaluating the credibility of such a procedure. It is evident that castration denies sexual offenders their basic human rights that are within the constitution of a country. The practice denies offenders right to reproduce in future after rehabilitation and transformation. This denial of rights affects the offender in his entire life. Castration also denies rights to treatment. An offender is regarded as a sick person, whose treatment ought to be rehabilitation towards the stop of the criminal offence. However, castration denies one a chance to reform but rather subjects one to an eternal punishment. Castration also violates the right to equality. The procedures laid in the castration of sexual offenders

are skewed and seems to be sterner on males than females. The process also denies a victim any chance of redress. An example is a person who undergoes castration and latter proves his innocence through DNA tests. Such persons will have no option of reversing the situation but to serve a lifetime punishment for the acts they never did. Since castrated offenders find their way out upon castration, this may be a tool of use for sexual offenders to find their way out of jail. Such people still need rehabilitation, thus, leaving them to the public is still risky as they may lay out plans for other sexual offenders to partake their mission in a form of revenge. Castration ought to be a voluntary activity and not a force to sexual offenders. Rehabilitated offenders who feel they need to get rid of their sexual urges to avoid future offences ought to take personal decision with their families involved (Spalding 8).

However, supporters of chemical castration also have their point of argument in relation to human rights. Chemical castration of sexual offenders ensures victims have their rights through justice. The process, therefore, puts the victims' rights ahead as compared to the rights of the pedophiles. Chemical castration is a fair process that ensures the negatively affected have their rights first. The idea of viewing castration as being a barbaric act to offenders has a contrasting perception with the supporters of castration. Failure to castrate sexual offenders is barbaric to victims of sexual abuse. The acts of sexual abuse are the most barbaric and cause much more pain than chemical castration. Therefore, such acts need a more permanent solution to avoid any recurrence and to give justice to the victims. Since sexual offenders do inhumane acts, they ought not to be given

human rights that they do not deserve. Chemical castration not only ensures that castrated victims do not repeat sexual offences but also serves as a lesson to other sexual offenders who might be harboring plans of sexual offence.

Another line of argument lies on the analysis of castration as an effective means of eliminating the crime. Critics of chemical castration point out Czech Republic that has seen castrated offender, arranging for serial rapes and murder upon leaving the jail. This shows that forced chemical castration does not rehabilitate offenders but creates an enormity between victims and culprits. Another failure from chemical castration arises from the fact that sexual offenders do not commit their offences, while in search of sexual satisfaction but are driven by physical domination. Chemical castration, therefore, only changes the mode of sexual offences. This even makes the situation worse since the chemically castrated sexual offenders will resolve into using harmful tools to carry out their offences, thus, more pain to the victims. Sexual organs do not make the offenders to commit these acts but their minds. It is proven that an individual does not necessarily require an erection to rape. One might use other body parts, which are even more painful than the use of sexual organs. Sexual offenders can also use other chemical and drugs to reverse the castration, thus, recycling the problem back to its original state.

On the same line of the effectiveness of chemical castration, supporters believe that chemical castration reduces the chances of such offenders from repeating the offences in considerable amount. A report, carried out in Denmark, stated that the rate of sexual offenders, repeating their acts, <https://assignbuster.com/chemical-castration-of-sexual-offenders/>

reduced drastically from 83% to 2.3% upon the introduction of chemical castration. Chemical castration is also a permanent solution that ensures offenders have no desires that would drive them into repeating the acts. This is unlike jail terms, which are temporary and do not provide an assurance of whether a person is rehabilitated or is pretending to be rehabilitated, only to repeat the acts upon his release (Kinnear 4).

Critics claim that chemical castration is a penalty that does not fit the crime committed. On the contrary, chemical castration surpasses the required punishment. Most of sexually abuse victims undergo medication and counseling, thus, regaining their normal life after few years. Chemical castration, on the other hand, gives the offender an irreversible punishment. The process is cruel and inhumane, thus, not a viable option of punishment. Rehabilitation is not supposed to be viewed in terms of public safety but in terms of offender's transformation into a new normal life. Chemical castration causes a new but abnormal life that is irreversible and full of misery. It makes the offenders to be unwilling to face the society because of their malfunctioning states (Kinnear 4).

However, sexual assault is among the worst kinds of offences that deserves the worst kind of punishment. Chemical castration becomes the most appropriate mode of punishment that fits such offenders. Such punishment is reserved to notorious offenders, thus, fair and appropriate. The purpose of a chemical castration is to help the offenders but not to hurt them, as its critics may perceive it (Meisenkothen 33).

Critics also use the side effects of castration to argue the irrelevance of the process. Research has shown that chemical castration causes side effects such as cancer and other diseases that not only affect the targeted organs but also affect other body parts. Side effects of chemical castration include gallstones, diabetes, and hypertension. This is a double punishment that puts the offender's life into a dangerous state. The process is also less effective than psychotherapy. Psychotherapy ensures offenders resist from carrying out the offences as a personal decision, thus, ruling out any probable repeat of the offence. Comparing chemical and surgical castration is comparing two wrongs that need avoidance. Neither of the two methods is humane, thus, all need eradication. Chemical castration does not ease tension, when the individual comes back to the society. Such individuals still have their physic and their rough characters that are still a threat to the society.

Noteworthy, chemical castration frees those, involved from any urges, thus, more important than the minimal side effects, raised by critics. Some sexual offenders have performed self-castration, thus, an indication that chemical castration is not only supported by the victims but also by the offenders who are willing to stop their acts. The issue of voluntary and forced chemical castration is about who is willing to be castrated and who is not. The difference between the two groups of offenders is that those who are willing to be castrated have an urge to stop the act, while those who are unwilling do not want to stop the act. Castration is humane and a better alternative than life imprisonment. Chemical castration provides offenders with the

freedom they require to run their daily life as opposed to life imprisonment that denies one his freedom (Spalding 23-24).

Chemical castration is exactly what the globe has been waiting for ages to eradicate sexual offences. Results for this act are observable in Czech Republic, where a massive 83% of sexual offenders shunned off sexual abuse upon undergoing chemical castration. A case study of Denmark indicates that out of 48 males who had been charged for sexual offences for a couple of times, only 8 repeated the act after castration. Not only victims of sexual abuse support chemical castration but also culprits of the crime support the act. An example is James Jenkins, a sexual offender, who castrated himself and announced to be free from sexual desires after the castration. This study shows that chemical castration will free the society from fears of sexual attacks, when implemented in every society.