Death Sentence Essay, Research Paper

Almost 90 percent of all convicted killers who are released, kill again. I think that all states should have a mandatory death sentence for certain crimes. It was accepted in the past, but recently certain states have decided against it.

The death penalty was widely accepted throughout the early United States, but not everyone approved of it. As time went on, opposition to the death penalty grew. By the mid-nineteenth century a few states had abolished the practice altogether. Soon other states began to think the same way. These states decided that they would send a capital offender to life imprisonment rather than to death. They thought of executions, as barbaric and said law should forbid them. Some of the ancient methods of execution included: stoning, burning, breaking on the wheel, drawing and quartering, beheading or decapitation, shooting and hanging. I agree, these types of punishments are cruel and unusual, but more humane and less painful methods are currently in practice. Today the death penalty is currently authorized in one of five ways: firing squad, hanging, gas chamber, electrocution, and lethal injection; gas chamber and lethal injection being the only ways enforced in recent years. These methods of execution compared to those of the past are not meant for torture, but meant as equal punishment for the offender?s crime.

If all states had a mandatory death sentence for certain crimes it would do more than rightfully punish criminals who break these laws, but it would also serve as a deterrent to all people contemplating committing such serious crimes. The fear of death should deter people from committing such crimes. Surely if a criminal knows in their mind that they will be killed them selves for the crime they are about to commit; and they decide to follow through then they were a lost cause to begin with.

Some political groups say that capital punishment should not be allowed because it can?t be reversed, and that it doesn?t give the criminal an opportunity to rehabilitate. They believe that the life-sentence presents the convict with the possibility of rehabilitation, even though convicted murderers who are released are proven to murder again. Rehabilitation is supposed to correct people, to return them to the right path. I believe that an actual rehabilitation is impossible; if a person is demented enough to take another person?s life, they were never on the right path to begin with. So why should we waste money to try to help a lost cause.

To sentence a person to life imprisonment is an expensive thing to do. Not only do you have to build facilities to house these criminals; you also pay to provide for them, keep the place running, and hire a staff. There are many other ways these funds could be more effectively utilized. So much money is wasted on rehabilitating lost causes; we could use the money for schools, Medicare, city maintenance, or even paying restitution to the victims.

In conclusion, I feel strongly toward using the death penalty as punishment for unspeakable crimes. I feel that it is a deterrent for criminal activity because of its severity and it will never allow a murder to kill again. The death penalty is not a problem if all avenues have been investigated and nothing is questionable. I do, however, feel that restrictions should be put on its uses. Not all crimes deserve the death penalty. I say, let the punishment fit the crime. It is that simple. If the convicted offender shows no remorse for his actions, then the decision should be even easier. People who enjoy killing do not deserve rehabilitation or the right to live. We should quit wasting space and get rid of these criminals once and for all.