

Capital Punishment and Protection of Innocent Lives

Posted on August 27, 2021

Introduction

Capital punishment is just a response to murder. With the death penalty, some people may believe that an innocent life has been taken. However, without capital punishment, the whole society would face the certainty that more innocent lives may be taken. For a sound mind and conscience, the choice is clear. If the (National Research Council, 2012) [death penalty](#) is revived, there are more chances of innocent killings. It is an important issue raised by the writer due to its consequences. The purpose of the capital sentence is to deter people from committing serious crimes. There are polarized opinions regarding this decision; some people are in favour of retaining this act, while others want to abolish it. The USA is a Christian country; in reference to the Bible, there are certain crimes for which the [death penalty](#) has been set, so it is acceptable to God. It can maintain order and protection in society. In history, we have examined that punishment by death was for minor crimes like petty theft, denying the true god, pickpocketing, and so on. It became a controversial issue in the past. It has been accepted for major crimes like murder cases. Some people still believe that it has no place in a civilized society. They believe that it violates the 18th Amendment, which forbids the capital sentence, and is an un-Christian practice. I personally believe that for protecting the lives of innocent people, [capital punishment](#) is necessary. However, for minor crimes, it is against justice.

For a contrasting perspective, see [If Capital Punishment Does Not Discourage Crime, It Can Result in Innocent Lives Lost](#).

In this essay, I will critically analyze both arguments, and I will draw a conclusion of this essay. I will provide a summary of the author's thesis, and I will give my personal opinion about this case.

Major Arguments

In the second paragraph, the author argued against the counter-argument about capital punishment, that the state might execute innocent people. However, I firmly believe that this claim is false and illogical because the state provides a chance for the culprit to defend their case and provide evidence regarding their innocence.

In the fourth paragraph, it is discussed that some social goods, such as automobiles and other facilities, could cause the death of innocent individuals. It is asked that the government should ban even cars because they can harm innocent people. I personally believe that the nature of both cases

is different, and we cannot relate them.

Keeping a strict 40 miles per hour speed to prevent the deaths of innocent people should be implemented. It is the counter-argument to oppose capital punishment. In my opinion, this point is also weak because there are proper rules for traffic and penalties that can overcome the chances of accidents.

Critical Evaluation

When a murderer escapes from prison without any penalty, there are higher chances of recommitting the crime, and for more murders, the court will be responsible. For a murderer, there are two penalties: either a death sentence or life in prison. If this law is revived, there would be chances of more murders. With the fear of such punishments, people will think many times before killing their enemies. When killers are executed, they will never kill other innocent souls. Let the criminals live so some of them will recommit the same crime. The death penalty is banned in many countries, and they lock the murderers up for life; however, it has been noticed that some of the murderers escaped and killed more innocent people. Even some had killed the prison guards as well. Some of them had killed their inmates. Killers are the most dangerous people who can threaten the harmony in society. People feel insecurity and uncertainty in their lives in the presence of free-wandering killers. So I believe that there should be no mercy for the killers, and there should be a strict penalty for them.

Some people argue that capital punishment is that the state may execute some innocent persons. The case of murder is not as simple as we believe because it requires strong evidence. In some cases, the killer gets an advantage and goes free due to a lack of evidence against the culprit. In other cases, the innocent person is declared a culprit. However, it is about the evidence, and every culprit has the right to defend their case with the help of their lawyers. In my point of view, capital punishment should not be abolished for this reason. However, the culprits should be given a chance to defend their stance.

There are certain emotionally compelling arguments against capital punishment that are trying to abolish this penalty. However, I believe that it is intellectually and morally shallow. Maintaining peace and harmony in [social justice](#) and law enforcement is essential. For everyone guilty, regardless of their background, there should be strict penalties. The loopholes in a sentence would allow the criminals to get out of the deal in such serious and sensitive crimes. It would create more problems in society, and the common people would feel insecure about living in such a society where murderers are freely moving.

There is a counter-argument about the life sentence that there is no major social good that has not led to the death of innocent people. They further added that millions of people had lost their lives in car accidents, but still, we haven't banned cars. I believe that cars are not the culprit, but the drivers are for sure. If they are violating the speed limit and other safety measures, they are as guilty as

other killers are. For car accidents, there is a law that must be strictly followed, and if it is violated, there is a set of penalties. My personal opinion about this stance is that a guilty person must face the legal consequences, and the said narration in favour of murder culprits is vague and nonsensical.

The purpose of this essay is to save innocent lives; there are two causes of innocent deaths, such as murders by killers and the second is accidents. For the killers, we have a strong argument that they should be sentenced to death. The second cause of death is not intentional but due to some carelessness, for instance, overspeeding and violation of other safety measures. So we can consider both in the same category, and I partially agree with the counter-argument that roller coasters and drivers should follow safety measures; otherwise, they should be banned. We have observed that every highway has its speed limit, and that must be strictly followed; those who violate it must be fined.

The criteria for abolishing capital punishment to save innocent lives from killers are different from the deaths and injuries caused by overspeeding and roller coasters. There is a matter of intention; none of us allows others to take our lives, death caused by roller coasters and cars is a rare chance, and no one forces you to ride in a car or roller coaster that is certainly leading you to death. However, I believe that roller coasters, which are not safe and don't follow safety measures, must be banned. Even driving a car at 40 miles per hour is not safe; breaks are failed, or a [drunk driver is driving](#) it.

The abolitionists believe that capital punishment and many social policies can kill innocents, so why are only murderers facing a capital sentence? I believe that if we have one good rule to stop innocent killings, then why should we abolish it? In other cases, as discussed earlier, like accidents, these also need strict criteria and a certain set of reforms.

It is a fact that we all have to die one day, and there will be a certain cause of death; it may be a fatal disease, accident, or being killed by someone. Even the murderer has to die someday. It is stated that most Americans don't share their views regarding the capital punishment of a killer is either moral or immoral. They have an emotional opinion about it, which is intellectually dishonest, that the killer has the right to live because it was the fate of an innocent person to die. However, it is logically wrong, maybe emotionally right, because it can disturb the harmony and peace in society.

Here, the counter-argument is that far more innocent persons died not because of murderers; there are many other reasons for their deaths. So, only the capital sentence policy can't protect them from death. Here, I would say that for every cause of death, there are certain protective tools and measures that can reduce the chances of death; for instance, diseases have their treatments, and to avoid accidents, there are safety measures and rules. Moreover, murder is not only the cause of death, but it is also a social issue that challenges peace and harmony in society.

Some murderers are professional, and they even kill their fellow prisoners to seek the possibility of escape from jail. Resuming capital punishment can even hurt more innocent lives because the murderers see the possibility of escape from prison. So this premise defends our conclusion that capital punishment is the only solution to this problem.

I believe that when a murderer kills more people after his capital punishment is abolished by the advocates of capital punishment, the blood is definitely on their hands. Giving a chance to someone guilty of killing innocent people to survive is not out of danger.

It is my moral responsibility to raise my voice against any innocent killings, and I am a proponent of capital punishment. Those who advocate capital punishment may have good faith behind their stance, but I maintain a polarized opinion. However, I respect their opinion too.

Summary

Our premise is that capital punishment should be continued to overcome cases of innocent killings. It is supported in the 2nd paragraph, which refers to the right to defend their case in front of the court. The court's decision is completely based on evidence and proof. The culprits have time to defend their case and get free from prison. In the fourth paragraph, the counter-argument raised an issue of deaths caused by automobiles and asked to ban automobiles as well; however, that stance was illogical because the nature of both cases is completely different. Automobiles are made to facilitate us; however, in rare cases, due to our carelessness, we have certain accidents. In the 5th and 7th paragraphs same issue was discussed to reduce the speed limit of the automobile and shut down all the roller coasters. My response to this argument was that we already have a certain set of rules for traffic and roads to avoid accidents, and there are penalties if someone violates these rules. The 10 paragraph supports our premise, as it states that if the murderers are not executed, they can kill innocent people in jail to escape from there. So it is concluded that capital punishment is the only effective solution to protect innocent lives. (Gross et al., 2014)

Conclusion Diagram A

Premise 1: In the second paragraph, the author argued about the counter-argument about capital punishment, that the state might execute innocent people.

Premise 2: In the fourth paragraph, it is discussed that some social goods, such as automobiles and other facilities, could be a result of the death of innocent individuals. It is asked that the government should ban even cars because they can harm innocent people.

Premise 3: In the fifth paragraph, it is argued that keeping strictly to a 40 miles per hour speed limit to prevent the deaths of innocent people is the counter-argument to opposing capital punishment.

Conclusion

In light of the above premise, I conclude that capital punishment is the only solution to save innocent lives from murderers. Premises 1, 2, 7, and 10 support my conclusion. The writer's argument of the

writer was inductively weak and does not support the abolishment of capital sentences against murder. While premises 3, 4, and 5 were distracting from the idea of abolishing capital punishment, their evidence was not logical and made no sense. Some of the evidence was deductively weaker, for instance, that automobile accidents also threaten the lives of innocents, so it should also be banned. These premises discussed that there are many other reasons that could hurt their lives, such as accidents, diseases, suicide, etc. However, murder is the only cause that creates a sense of insecurity and injustice in society.

Conclusion Diagram B



References

National Research Council. (2012). Deterrence and the death penalty. The National Academies Press. <https://www.nationalacademies.org/read/13363>

Gross, S. R., O'Brien, B., Hu, C., & Kennedy, E. H. (2014). Rate of false conviction of criminal defendants who are sentenced to death. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(20), 7230-7235. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1306417111>