

---

Subject: Re: This is how we treat child-killing criminals

Posted by [Hydra](#) on Mon, 21 Aug 2006 21:02:52 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

The system works well for cases against first-time offenders who maintain their innocence. What outrages me is the treatment it often gives for repeat offenders and those who openly confess their crimes.

You older folks might remember a guy named Ray Donovan, the Secretary of Labor for the Reagan administration. He is famous for asking the question, "Where do I go to get my reputation back?" to a swarm of news reporters outside the courthouse where he was acquitted of all charges of racketeering, bribery, and perjury, (if I remember correctly).

Even before the judge could hand him his official acquittal, even before the trial ever took place, he was already found guilty in the eyes of the media. Even without any evidence whatsoever, the media destroyed his public image and reputation.

In his case, he maintained his innocence and had been convicted of no previous high crimes; though he was considered "innocent until proven guilty" by the law, the media felt differently.

(/me wonders if I explained all that clearly enough.... I guess I'll find out....)

I feel it should be somehow different for repeat offenders and "first-time confessors." For someone who had already been tried, convicted, and released (after serving their sentence) for a violent felony like assault or armed robbery, they should not receive the same benefit of the doubt from the law since they already have a violent past (note: I do not know that much about law in general, but something tells me that something like this might already exist; it's only logical that it would, anyway).

Same should go for people who openly confess to crimes, like this guy right here. Why should he receive any special treatment when he's already confessed to murdering a child? This should be an open-and-shut case. Cage him up on the flight over, Then sit him in a prison cell with someone who will "love" him the way he, apparently, WANTS to be "loved." I can understand why they would treat people who openly confess to crimes a little differently--to encourage other criminals to save the cops the hassle of tracking them down and turn themselves in--but frickin' champagne? That's just going overboard right there.

Warranto: Why do you think he would confess to it if he didn't actually DO it? Cover someone else's ass, or could it just be insanity?

---