

# Capital punishment summary



**ASSIGN  
BUSTER**

The issue of capital punishment abolition has raised opposing viewpoints from Members of Parliament in the argument on the morality of capital punishment and its value as a deterrent to murder. Griffiths, with the Police Federation, declares that the abolishment of capital punishment has caused an increased in crime rates as life imprisonment is not an effective deterrent. Contrary, Hattersley defends and argues that there is no evidence to support that capital punishment is a deterrent itself.

He further explains in the comparison on crime rates of other countries before and after abolition, there is also no affirmation to prove that execution reduces the murder or crimes of violence. Hattersley also insist that if people who are to vote for capital punishment, and are accepted, they have to be sure it deters and also not execute innocent individuals. Griffith's statement on the abolishment being ineffective can be proved where there now increased in the use of firearms in crimes.

Read also this Summary – Brent Staples “ Just Walk On By”

Compared to police officers before the abolition, police today have lost their powers. Criminals now can choose to either surrender or kill the police to eliminate witness and runaway. If they get caught, they go to prison or sometimes with remission other than death penalty. He also claims that all these causes a new balance of risk for police officers, where they hesitate to tackle armed criminals because they are not protected by the “ invisible bullet-proof waistcoat” of the capital sentence.

However, Hattersly suggests that the cause of crime rates is not because of the abolishment but violence has grown with the society for various reasons.

<https://assignbuster.com/capital-punishment-summary/>

Moreover, legalising capital punishment would only make Britain not more than a peaceful nation. Hattersly strongly emphasise that “ by killing murderers, we become like murderers themselves” and “ nothing but vengeance” and asserts that it has “ no moral or philosophical justification”. but this does not differ from killing using firearms. According to Griffiths, it is not only the debate but also to find a way to protect the society.