

Death penalty

[Law](#), [Capital Punishment](#)



Death Penalty In Taiwan, whether to abolish or retain death penalty was a big controversial question in recent years. The people who consent to abolish death penalty argue that it is an international trend to abolish death penalty because criminals like kill another person should still be protected by the Constitution, but the people who oppose to abolish death penalty believe that Taiwan's judicial system is tolerant enough towards the suspects.

Therefore, in consideration of social peace and how the victim's families feel, the criminals deserve the death penalty and it should not be abolished easily. Five years ago, Taiwan's Former Minister of Justice did not want to accept the laws to run the death penalty in the death row, and this thing caused big discussion between abolish or retain death penalty. The people in Taiwan think should not abolish death penalty for three reasons: to protect human rights, to abolish death penalty will cause an increase of crime, and to keep death penalty can reduce the social costs. There are three points of human rights about why should not abolish death penalty. First, each one of us is unique and special. Because we are all equal, why should the murderer not pay with his own life when he takes away his victims? People who commit a crime should shoulder their faults and judgment instead of asking for their life rights. When someone is sentenced to death, it means the crime that did is so serious and need to use his/her life to compensate. The pros of abolish death penalty think the death penalty will deprive the right to life of the death inmates, but the right to life of victims and other people should not be ensure? Second, every person has a right to safe living environment. If Taiwan abolishes the death penalty, it may seem that the government indirectly encourages people to kill others because the criminals do not need

to pay for what they have done. The satisfaction will make people live without a peace of mind. The Chinese have a saying, "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth." (Code of Hammurabi) The way of doing a thing can let people get a safe right of living environment. Finally, victims' families' needs are met by the death penalty. People must think about the lives that a murdered victim affected. Everyone has families, friends, relatives, and co-workers. The combined loss is incalculable. The death penalty is based on the requirements of justice, and gives a good way for the victims and their families. In short, we need to reserve the death penalty for reducing the dread of people of being killed, and protecting the human right of every victim. In addition to human rights, abolish in the death penalty will result in an increase of crime for three reasons. (Does Death Penalty Save Lives? A New Debate, New York Times, November 18, 2007) The strongest reason is that the death penalty can prevent others from committing crime because severe punishment can always frighten and hinder people doing illegal things, such as murder or serious sexual abuse. Also, if a small number of perpetrators who commit heinous crimes are not sentenced to death, the offenders may commit crimes to other people again. Finally, the government in Taiwan should offer a safe place to live. A lot of people say the death penalty should be preserved because people will be scared that they will become the next victims if that terrible killer is still around. People in Taiwan want a safe living environment. They do not want to abolish death penalty and let the crimes addition, and then they would not have a safe place to live. So if the government in Taiwan abolishes the death penalty, people who want to commit crime would think that even committed heinous crimes, they

can still escape death. Crime would be increase, so keeping the death penalty is necessary. The death penalty is cost-effective because the government does not need to spend a lot of money and materials to support the heinous. (To execute or not: A question of cost? MSNBC. Retrieved 5 February 2012) There are three points to support the reason. To abolish death penalty may make people lose confidence in the laws, might have caused the phenomenon of private revenge. If private revenge often happens, the social will become turbulent and need more money to keep social peace. Then alternative to the death penalty with life imprisonment will increase the prison costs. Why people should use the taxes to keep a serious fender? So, when the prisoners without the possibility of repentance and the absolute necessity of the society of lifelong isolation, to support the prisoners to die of old age is just to waste the national resources. Third, every national legal system is not the same. If the government in Taiwan rushes into abolishes the death penalty to line with international trends, it may result in confusion in the judicial system. Who will respond in the social costs? In brief, to abolish death penalty in Taiwan now will make people not believe the law, improve the cost of prison, and make social become not peace. To summarize, to protect the right of safe living in Taiwan, to prevent of crime increase, and to cost down the social costs. The death penalty in Taiwan should not be abolished.