

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
that some may say by doing this	
justice is no better than the criminal	
By implication we are then normalising	
this <u>behaviour</u> and making it seem	A
acceptable. Furthermore this may make the	
criminal frustrated and lose faith in	
the justice system causing them to	
act out, and committing more crimes.	
One way of retribution would be	
capital punishment which which is used	
for <u>more</u> serious crimes such as	
murder. A moral issue arising from	K
this is that killing is wrong and	
this creates a vicious cycle of killing,	
preventing the <u>criminal</u> the chance of	A
volunteering and <u>changing</u> .	
Some Christians would argue	
for retribution as a purpose of	
punishment quoting "an eye for	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
	K
	A

an eye a tooth for a tooth". This could be interpreted to suggest that whatever ~~that~~ someone does should be done back to them.

A disadvantage of this is that it doesn't teach anyone right from wrong. Instead ~~it~~ it just suggests what they done wrong is acceptable if the law are doing it against them.

I agree with the statement 'Retribution is as morally acceptable as any other purpose of punishment' to a small extent as a number of moral issues has been dismissed and taking revenge on someone is not always the right thing to do.

The next purpose of punishment is ~~the~~ Deterrence. This means to

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

would be pointless and worthwhile.

A benefit of Deterrence as a purpose of punishment as it is a good way to scare people and stop them from committing more serious crimes. For example if someone sees that murder could result in capital punishment it is likely that this will deter them from doing it.

After analysing the moral issues of Deterrence I agree with the statement 'Retribution is as morally acceptable as any other purposes of punishment' to an extent as it is evident that Deterrence has moral issues just as bad as Retribution.

The next purpose of punishment is protection. This means to ~~prevent~~

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN

punish criminals in order to protect the greater society. The most common way to do this would be by putting the criminals in prison.

A moral issue arising from this would be ~~that~~ who protects the criminals, it could be argued that criminals are often their own worst enemy and without the right help and chance to reform they might be a danger to themselves.

~~Furthermore having convictions all in one place might add~~

Christians would agree that Jesus worked with the outcasts in society and that although they have made mistakes they should not be punished in a way which will harm them.

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>An implication of protection as a purpose of punishment is that having all criminals in one place actually may be putting society in greater danger as they are able to learn new the tricks and ways from other criminals. Consequently when they are released if they have not been returned these new ways will be put into practice again putting society in danger.</p> <p>With regards to protection I disagree with the statement 'Retribution is as morally acceptable as any other purposes of punishment' as the moral issues arising from retribution is not more serious to the individual than what harm of protection are.</p>	A

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
<p>The last purpose of punishment is Reformation. Reformation is to change someone for the better returning returning them into a better person person. An example of K this working was in America when 'Tooki' was imprisoned as a result of with links to numerous murders as part of his gang. Tooki was given a second chance chance and was able to better himself. When he was later let out of prison he wrote childrens books and became a a huge part in educating children on gangs. This shows that people are in fact able to be reformed and it is not impossible for people to change, meaning the arguement that people should be given the opportunity for a</p>	

ENTER NUMBER OF QUESTION	DO NOT WRITE IN THIS MARGIN
second chance.	
A moral issue arising from	
Retraction as a purpose of punishment	
is that it can be argued	
'a leopard doesn't change its spots'	
This can be interpreted to suggest	
that people are not capable	
of change and no matter what	
will always be the same. This	A
is a moral issue because it	
people cannot change after	
time and effort there is no	
point investing so much into	
it. Furthermore people may be able	A
to manipulate us into thinking	
they have changed in order to	
benefit themselves. This is a moral	
issue as society is then again	
put in great danger.	A

ENTER
NUMBER
OF
QUESTION

DO NOT
WRITE IN
THIS
MARGIN

With regards to Retention I again disagree with the statement 'Retribution is as morally acceptable as any other purpose of punishment' as the moral issues arising from Retention are not as bad from those from ~~the~~ Retribution.

In conclusion I disagree with the statement 'Retribution is as morally acceptable as any other purpose of punishment' as it is evident from this essay that Retribution is the most morally wrong.

K 9
A (8) 5
E 0

14