

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 01:34:06 GMT

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

---

<http://cnn.aimtoday.cnn.com/news/story.jsp?idq=/ff/story/0001%2F20041218%2F1711957901.htm&sc=1110&PhotoID=20041218MOMAF501>

What the hell went through this ladies mind?? This is a crime so violent and strange i just can't even wrap it around my head

I was amazed when i heard how it happened, but my jaw hit the floor and passed through the earth when i heard the baby was still alive and doing good.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 01:38:57 GMT

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

---

sicko, two words: Electric Chair.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 01:39:54 GMT

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

---

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]sicko, two words: Electric Chair.

nah that uses to much good electricity and time, appeals and such to make us pay for, i'd rather use one bullet to her ear.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [SuperFlyingEngi](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 02:28:06 GMT

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

---

A story just disgusting enough to make the major media.

Why, pray, did we ever need to hear about this?

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Hydra](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 03:30:50 GMT

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

---

Some people deserve to die in the most horrible and painful ways imaginable.  
Lisa Montgomery is one of them.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [icedog90](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 03:31:42 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

That's just plain wrong.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Jaspah](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 04:00:10 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

icedog90That's just plain wrong.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 05:19:06 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

tie her to a stump in the Everglades then?

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 14:21:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Amazing?

Please explain, because all I can think of is "sick", and "disgusting".

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 15:05:46 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

DaveGMMAmazing?

Please explain, because all I can think of is "sick", and "disgusting".

its amazing that the baby survived.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [addseale2](#) on Sun, 19 Dec 2004 23:42:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

It's been done before. Not so gruesome the second time around.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [MilkyLep](#) on Mon, 20 Dec 2004 22:18:13 GMT

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

---

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]sicko, two words: Electric Chair.

I thought they did away with that b/c some guy was but it in it and the chair didn't kill him.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Mon, 20 Dec 2004 22:57:47 GMT

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

---

She's obviously mentally unstable. She should be shipped to an asylum, and if deemed necessary, to prison for life.

Death penalties are merely legalized revenge, and are not justice. Remember, killing the killer doesn't bring anyone back to life. Therefore, justice cannot be served by killing them.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 02:20:36 GMT

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

---

Javaxcx

Death penalties are merely legalized revenge, and are not justice. Remember, killing the killer doesn't bring anyone back to life. Therefore, justice cannot be served by killing them.

If that was your wife, your daughter , sister w/e you wouldn't feel that way.

Just plain bullshit, she deserves death, i don't care if its the "correct" justice in your eyes or anyone elses, and i dont' really give a fuck if she's insane or not, she did waht she did. in ron whites words, "If she doesn't know whats going on and it makes me feel better, then what are we arguing about??"

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 03:41:30 GMT

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

---

cowmisfitIf that was your wife, your daughter , sister w/e you wouldn't feel that way.

Just plain bullshit, she deserves death, i don't care if its the "correct" justice in your eyes or anyone elses, and i dont' really give a fuck if she's insane or not, she did waht she did. in ron whites words, "If she doesn't know whats going on and it makes me feel better, then what are we arguing about??"

---

Amen.

Eye for an Eye. Price for murder should be death, price for rape should be death. Unless we legalize torturing them for the rest of their lives of course. Now i ask you, whats more of a deterrent, A long torturous death, or life in prison? Personally I think it would be cool if we could chain her to the ground and put a shotgun bullet in stomach and let her bleed to death over the course of two days. Or we could bring back the gallows!!!! Let'er Swing, that'd Git er Dun.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [addseale2](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 04:38:52 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Shotguns don't shoot bullets, they shoot shot.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 12:42:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

cowmisfitlf that was your wife, your daughter , sister w/e you wouldn't feel that way.

You're right. I wouldn't feel the same way. But that doesn't mean that it is any more right to take another life. Legalized revenge defeats the entire purpose of justice and the purpose of the courts. Remember, revenge and restitution are two entirely different things, and while it is impossible to fully retribute the life of the deseased, killing off the killer does not give restitution either. Therefore, (and thankfully Canada is smart enough to realize this) it is outside the purpose of the law to grant death to anyone.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 17:18:38 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

i know they only shoot shot but i thought that wouldve sounded weird. I even edited bullet to shot as a matter of fact, but i changed it back to bullet.

and java, the purpose of the law is to keep the peace, if if the murderous are lost to save the innocent, then the end justifies the means. Prisons can only hold so many people

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Javafx](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 18:18:35 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]and java, the purpose of the law is to keep the peace, if if the murderous are lost

to save the innocent, then the end justifies the means. Prisons can only hold so many people

The purpose of the law is to keep the peace, yes. It is also to be fair in its judgements. Furthermore, a COURT of law has the purpose to ascertain (from an unbiased perspective) guilt and to deal restitution fairly. A court of law does not (should not, I should say) deal out revenge. If it did, then I'm sure you'd be seeing some fairly ridiculous cases. Assault cases, for example. No competent court in the world would say "Well, you hit him, so by ruling of the court, he will hit you." The death penalty works the same way.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 18:55:29 GMT

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

---

its not all about revenge, revenge is a bi-product of what the death penalty is, Not the main purpose. The main purpose of the death penalty is the deterence of committing a murderous act. Do on to others as you would want others to do to you - you murder, you die. Simple as that. Makes abiding the law really easy doesnt it.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 20:36:08 GMT

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

---

Javaxcxcowmisfitlf that was your wife, your daughter , sister w/e you wouldn't feel that way.

You're right. I wouldn't feel the same way. But that doesn't mean that it is any more right to take another life. Legalized revenge defeats the entire purpose of justice and the purpose of the courts. Remember, revenge and restitution are two entirely different things, and while it is impossible to fully retribute the life of the deseased, killing off the killer does not give restitution either. Therefore, (and thankfully Canada is smart enough to realize this) it is outside the purpose of the law to grant death to anyone.

so what your trying to say is, if it was your mother daughter sister wife w/e , you wouldn't feel the same way about killing the person, but as long as its someone else who has been hurt by one of these types of crimes, you don't care.

I hope you get a brain and some feelings for another human life for chirstmas.

:rolleyes:

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 20:38:40 GMT

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

---

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]its not all about revenge, revenge is a bi-product of what the death penalty is, Not

the main purpose. The main purpose of the death penalty is the deterrence of committing a murderous act. Do on to others as you would want others to do to you - you murder, you die. Simple as that. Makes abiding the law really easy doesnt it.

Court rulings are not the "deterants" you claim them to be. They have deterrent properties, but that is the nature of the statement "don't do the crime if you can't do the time". When law makers sit down, they don't say "how can we make this law so damning that people won't commit the act?" If they did, it would defeat the entire purpose of fairness that a trial and a judgement are MEANT to have. One could potentially change petty theft into an offense punishable by death as a "deterent". But that isn't very fair, now is it? That is why you have judges ruling restitutions equal to that which is lost (with the exceptions of pain and suffering and other subjective claims) and not billions of dollars for a stolen baseball card.

Remember, you don't go to court for revenge, you go to court to get returned to you what is rightfully yours. In the case of death, no complete restitution can be arranged because we cannot raise the dead. Now, if that statement is true, then killing those who kill does not give anyone anything, because restitution is not revenge, and therefore is (supposed to be) outside the court's abilities.

Perhaps Warranto can explain to you what restitution is supposed to mean in a court of law, and what the purpose of said court really is. He's the lawyer in training.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 20:43:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cowmisfitso what your trying to say is, if it was your mother daughter sister wife w/e , you wouldn't feel the same way about killing the person, but as long as its someone else who has been hurt by one of these types of crimes, you don't care.

Not at all. Yet again, you misunderstand. Just because I feel something to be justified doesn't mean it is justified. Any person would feel that an eye for an eye is justified when it happens to them, but thankfully we (at least SOME of us) have the ability to reason why that is in fact not justified. The same goes for capital punishment. Cowmifit, You have an extremely blurred and narrow understanding of what the law is meant to be and what you assume it to be. I suggest you get a law book and start reading.

Quote:I hope you get a brain and some feelings for another human life for chirstmas.

Lose the ad hominem. It has no tangible bearing on this discussion.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 20:46:02 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I know the law, i know it must be followed, but i also know that sometimes common sense and morals overplay the law in this kind of a case, i suggest you go out on the street and talk to some normal blue collar folk (i don't know if it would work in canada as well asin america, but it might) and see what they think they woudl do if someone murdered there loved one, would they "follow the law" or want them to pay the price.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 20:53:28 GMT

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

---

Quote:I know the law, i know it must be followed

Quote:...and see what they think they woudl do if someone murdered there loved one, would they "follow the law" or want them to pay the price

Let me ask you this question. How do they "pay" the price? I mean, what tangible restitution does the victim's family get from killing someone off?

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Aurora](#) on Tue, 21 Dec 2004 21:52:25 GMT

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

---

amzaing

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 00:39:35 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxQuote:I know the law, i know it must be followed

Quote:...and see what they think they woudl do if someone murdered there loved one, would they "follow the law" or want them to pay the price

Let me ask you this question. How do they "pay" the price? I mean, what tangible restitution does the victim's family get from killing someone off?

Okay, i don't know why this is so hard for you but, i know you have to somewere in that head of yours know what im speaking of your just being technical.

These killers RUIN peoples lives. How do you think this womans husbands life is gonna be?? Every morning he wakes up, he'll think about it, every night he lays his head down to sleep, he'll think about it, everytime he looks at his child , he'll think about what this one stupid son of a bitch did to his wife his son/daughters mom. At least he could get SOME satisfaction knowing the person who took his wifes life is no longer breathing, no longer a threat, will NEVER have a chance at living a normal life again. In prision she will still have freinds, laugh and have some fun even, she doesn't deserve that, she deserves to die.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 00:58:15 GMT

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

---

So... not only can you not answer the question, but you've also reaffirmed your total ignorance to how the law works. Good work, kid.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 01:08:31 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxSo... not only can you not answer the question, but you've also reaffirmed your total ignorance to how the law works. Good work, kid.

No, im trying to instill some common fucking sense into your far left liberal fuckhead mind. You've already shown yourself to be a flip-flop and that you don't care about anyone else as long as its not you being affected, i think you are the one who's shown your ignorance.

Your one of these people who does EVERYTHING by the book, and because you want to do EVERYTHING by the book or you'll cry about it. A man has a gun, he points it at a cop, the cop shoots the man because his life is in danger. Most senseable people wouldn't say a damn thing, your the kind of person who would fight in the guys defense because he never shot his weapon. Rules have to be bent to get things done.

How do they pay the price?? With there life, an eye for an eye, as if that hasn't already been stated 20 times in this topic. :rolleyes:

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 01:38:17 GMT

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

---

cowmisfitNo, im trying to instill some common fucking sense into your far left liberal fuckhead mind. You've already shown yourself to be a flip-flop and that you don't care about anyone else as long as its not you being affected, i think you are the one who's shown your ignorance.

I'm not a liberal, I certainly haven't "flip flopped", and I in fact DO care about other people otherwise I wouldn't be against the death penalty in the first place. Oh, and your so-called "common sense" (or nonsense) is what causes the problems. The problem with right winged nut jobs such as yourself (although that accusation is a bit premature, because you're still to young to vote) is that you think with your guts and not with your heads. Which is fairly ironic, because it is usually the liberals that do that.

Quote:Your one of these people who does EVERYTHING by the book, and because you want to do EVERYTHING by the book or you'll cry about it. A man has a gun, he points it at a cop, the cop shoots the man because his life is in danger. Most senseable people wouldn't say a damn thing, your the kind of person who would fight in the guys defense because he never shot his weapon.

---



Nice try. When a cop is the kind of danger you've mentioned, he is authorized to kill in self-defence. So your little example doesn't do a thing for your argument.

Quote:Rules have to be bent to get things done

What are you, Nodbugger? The reason there are problems in the world is because of this very thing.

Quote:How do they pay the price?? With there life, an eye for an eye, as if that hasn't already been stated 20 times in this topic. :rolleyes:

Christ, you really ARE Nodbugger. What do the victim's family get when someone is killed for murder? The death of the murderer certainly isn't restitution. That is revenge. That is NOT the purpose of the court -- to deal revenge. As stated above, which you've conveniently chosen to ignore, Nodbugger, if the courts did deal in revenge, you would see ruling in assault charges that legally authorize the plaintiff to kick the defendant's ass.

I suggest you learn how to control your raging pubescent hormones as well. It'll get you quite a bit farther in life to think with your head. Which, in case you haven't been paying attention, you haven't.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [glyde51](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 01:46:44 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I concur with Javafx.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [cowmisfit](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 01:49:14 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

glyde51I concur with Javafx.

and no one cares Spammer

I've got to go to bed, i'll sleep on my comments to your post javax

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [DaveGMM](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 03:12:07 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

cowmisfitglyde51I concur with Javafx.

and no one cares

I do. Once again, I find myself in agreement with Javaxcx. It's an inevitability, everyone does eventually.

Although some people have to have it hammered into their heads...

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amazing things i've seen

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 03:34:18 GMT

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

---

DaveGMMcowmisfitglyde511 concur with Javaxcx.

and no one cares

I do. Once again, I find myself in agreement with Javaxcx. It's an inevitability, everyone does eventually.

I'm firm in this belief. I disagree with Java, and I always will. That doesn't make either one of us wrong, so don't even attempt to think/say that.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amazing things i've seen

Posted by [warranto](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 04:49:35 GMT

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

---

Quote:Perhaps Warranto can explain to you what restitution is supposed to mean in a court of law, and what the purpose of said court really is. He's the lawyer in training.

At the moment, this is the ONLY thing I am going to touch on this subject, simply because I was mentioned. Keep in mind, as for as "officialness" goes, I'm currently training to be a Legal Assistant, not quite a Lawyer yet.

Restitution in the court of law is tough as the purpose of the court is to 'restore' the person to a condition prior to the crime in question. Most often than not, it involves the loss of something that can not be gained back, in such cases the only recourse for the court is to offer something of equal value, usually being in the form of damages (money). That's all "restitution" is: restoring the person to the point they were at before the crime occurred.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amazing things i've seen

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Wed, 22 Dec 2004 08:59:12 GMT

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

---

gbullits not all about revenge, revenge is a bi-product of what the death penalty is, Not the main purpose. The main purpose of the death penalty is the deterrence of committing a murderous act.

---

Do on to others as you would want others to do to you - you murder, you die. Simple as that. Makes abiding the law really easy doesnt it.

Read it more carefully this time Java, Eye for an Eye. You Take a life, you give yours up. Sounds pretty fair, in no place did I say that petty theft should constitute death, but it should constitute a fine, which it does, equal to five times the amount stolen (my mom works as security, she told me so.). If you take a life, you better be ready to give yours. Deterent, I think so.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 05:47:30 GMT

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

---

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]gbullits not all about revenge, revenge is a bi-product of what the death penalty is, Not the main purpose. The main purpose of the death penalty is the deterence of committing a murderous act. Do on to others as you would want others to do to you - you murder, you die. Simple as that. Makes abiding the law really easy doesnt it.

Read it more carefully this time Java, Eye for an Eye. You Take a life, you give yours up. Sounds pretty fair, in no place did I say that petty theft should constitute death, but it should constitute a fine, which it does, equal to five times the amount stolen (my mom works as security, she told me so.). If you take a life, you better be ready to give yours. Deterent, I think so.

Now read more carefully what I spoke of when I said restitution. When you steal something, assuming what you say is correct, you pay five times more in restitution. When take a life, you don't pay with your life. No one "gains" anything (such the case where one regains money in place of goods) from taking a life. Therefore, since one doesn't gain anything by taking another's life, killing someone cannot possibly fulfill the goal of restitution in the courts.

Now, if you had read what I wrote carefully, I stated that it does have deterent properties. So arguing something we already agree upon is useless.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 12:56:12 GMT

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

---

Javaxcxl stated that it does have deterent properties

this is the point im trying to make, not that you get restitution, but it stops ppl who are thinking about doing it.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen  
Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 14:37:19 GMT

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

---

And you have done a poor job in supporting that argument. Read what I wrote several posts up.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 15:19:41 GMT

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

---

im sorry but a simple, "No one gets anything out of this deal" is not a case to boast about java. My case is that it is setting an example saying: If u kill, u will be dead". That in it self will stop potential murderers. Putting them in a prison does NOTHING. u give them free food, board, electricity, water. ITS A FREAKIN RETIREMENT HOME. They also get weights which i never understood. What do they need to weight train for, getting out of prison? Also, if they arent in the prison then taxpayers dont have to pay for them to live.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [warranto](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 23:18:54 GMT

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

---

Simple solution.

Have a death penalty, with the two conditions.

1. The standard of proof must be higher, from "beyond a reasonable doubt" to "absolute certainty". After all, if a mistake is made, it's much better to release a live person than to explain how you have killed an innocent person.

2. Have the jury (or Judge) personally responsible for the decision to put the accused to death. This way, if a mistake is made, the state is off the hook for the death of the innocent, and those responsible for putting him to death can take restitutive responsibility.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2004 23:20:10 GMT

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

---

I would agree with that warranto.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 01:39:37 GMT

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

---

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]im sorry but a simple, "No one gets anything out of this deal" is not a case to boast about java. My case is that it is setting an example saying: If u kill, u will be dead". That in it self will stop potential murderers. Putting them in a prison does NOTHING. u give them free

food, board, electricity, water. ITS A FREAKIN RETIREMENT HOME.

And here is another place where your argument falls apart. No one does in fact get anything out of killing the accused. You have repeatedly used this deterrent ideology to support the death penalty. You've also tied it into the "axiom" that says the punishment must equal the crime. Now, if that is true, then perhaps you would like to explain to me why punishments rarely, if ever equate to the crime. Oh, and before you start on a tangant that says "OMG I DIDNT SAY DAT JAVXI", it has been a constant implication I've inferred out of your entire argument.

Now I want you to consider the psychology of a murderer. Especially those who are habitual. Do you really HONESTLY think that legal deterrents will play any role in tempting one of these people to not commit the act? This woman in this case, if she is in fact guilty is a perfect example. Do you think she gives a damn that she could in fact be killed as a result of this murder? If you do, well, heh. I'm not sure what I can say to that. You would leave me speechless.

Furthermore, in relation to your free room and board argument: I'm sure you must be aware that people placed on death row stay and live in prison often for terms longer than a standard life sentence before finally being executed. The only difference between the death penalty and life sentences without parole is that you're in fact taking their lives in stead of allowing nature to do it. To put in current events terms, I think you're going to find that Scott Peterson will die in prison long before any death sentence can be carried out.

In an ideal world free of the hypocrisy of the purpose of the courts and the law, Warranto's second option is more logically feasible. That doesn't mean I support the taking of anyone's life in a meditated fashion (and yes, most murder and all capital punishment are premeditated).

On a side note, and this may not affect you directly, but it is targetted at those who have condemned this woman in question before she has even had a trial and in fact been PROVEN guilty (oh, and because our Nodbugger-in-training friend here will undoubtably jump to the inaccurate conclusion that I defend murders, I would like to remind you that your country, and mine both believe and practice the saying "Innocent until proven guilty"). More or less, this is targetted at those like Cowmisfit and his ilk: Why are you so eager to dish out death? It makes you wonder who really values what a human life is worth.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 14:17:49 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxAnd here is another place where your argument falls apart. No one does in fact get anything out of killing the accused. You have repeatedly used this deterrent ideology to support the death penalty. You've also tied it into the "axiom" that says the punishment must equal the crime. Now, if that is true, then perhaps you would like to explain to me why punishments rarely, if ever equate to the crime. Oh, and before you start on a tangant that says "OMG I DIDNT SAY DAT JAVXI", it has been a constant implication I've inferred out of your entire argument.

on the contrary, you are the one that believes in the punishment not equating the crime. They kill, so they should pay with their life. Sounds fair to me. Dont do the crime if you cant do the time,

and in a World with capital punishment, its an eternity.

JavacxNow I want you to consider the psychology of a murderer. Especially those who are habitual. Do you really HONESTLY think that legal deterrents will play any role in tempting one of these people to not commit the act? This woman in this case, if she is in fact guilty is a perfect example. Do you think she gives a damn that she could in fact be killed as a result of this murder? If you do, well, heh. I'm not sure what I can say to that. You would leave me speechless.

In this lady, possibly not. But if an example is made of her then it will deter future murders. Think 5 minutes past the present will ya? Not to mention Habitual murderers are the ones that CANNOT be cured of their own sick mind anyhow, so what is the purpose of keeping them in prison and making the taxpayers pay for them to live?

JavacxFurthermore, in relation to your free room and board argument: I'm sure you must be aware that people placed on death row stay and live in prison often for terms longer than a standard life sentence before finally being executed. The only difference between the death penalty and life sentences without parole is that you're in fact taking their lives in stead of allowing nature to do it. To put in current events terms, I think you're going to find that Scott Peterson will die in prison long before any death sentence can be carried out.

In no place did I say that i agreed with the way we handle the death penalty when it is dealt. I would rather have the murderer die the way they killed the day AFTER they are declared guilty. Hows that for fair.

JavacxIn an ideal world free of the hypocrisy of the purpose of the courts and the law, Warranto's second option is more logically feasible. That doesn't mean I support the taking of anyone's life in a meditated fashion (and yes, most murder and all capital punishment are premeditated).

No shit, how do think punishments should be carried out? without trial? of course capital punishment is pre-meditated, what other way is there to do it? You make it sound as if its the COURTS fault they decided on the death penalty when its the murder's decision ultimately.

JavacxOn a side note, and this may not affect you directly, but it is targetted at those who have condemned this woman in question before she has even had a trial and in fact been PROVEN guilty (oh, and because our Nodbugger-in-training friend here will undoubtably jump to the inaccurate conclusion that I defend murders, I would like to remind you that your country, and mine both believe and practice the saying "Innocent until proven guilty"). More or less, this is targetted at those like Cowmisfit and his ilk: Why are you so eager to dish out death? It makes you wonder who really values what a human life is worth.

I never said she didnt deserve a fair trial, everone is entitled to one, and I also never said you defended murders. I just said the way you think murders should be punished isnt fair. It isnt fair to those that were murdered. You think they got trial? You think they had a say in the matter on whether they would live or die? You dont defend murderers but i will say that they are the only people you think about, while I think about the victim. Thats the difference between you and me, but ill just leave you to think about that for a little while. Also, I dont know how to take that nodbugger thing since i dont know him, but i couldnt give a shit about what he thinks. I think for myself. Also, im not "eager" to dish out death, but I am eager to dish out justice. As far as valuing

a human life, try valuing the deceased, instead thinking of the murderer all the time.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [prox](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 15:56:59 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxcowmisfitNo, im trying to instill some common fucking sense into your far left liberal fuckhead mind. You've already shown yourself to be a flip-flop and that you don't care about anyone else as long as its not you being affected, i think you are the one who's shown your ignorance.

I'm not a liberal, I certainly haven't "flip flopped", and I in fact DO care about other people otherwise I wouldn't be against the death penalty in the first place. Oh, and your so-called "common sense" (or nonsense) is what causes the problems. The problem with right winged nut jobs such as yourself (although that accusation is a bit premature, because you're still to young to vote) is that you think with your guts and not with your heads. Which is fairly ironic, because it is usually the liberals that do that.

Quote:Your one of these people who does EVERYTHING by the book, and because you want to do EVERYTHING by the book or you'll cry about it. A man has a gun, he points it at a cop, the cop shoots the man because his life is in danger. Most senseable people wouldn't say a damn thing, your the kind of person who would fight in the guys defense because he never shot his weapon.

Nice try. When a cop is the kind of danger you've mentioned, he is authorized to kill in self-defence. So your little example doesn't do a thing for your argument.

Quote:Rules have to be bent to get things done

What are you, Nodbugger? The reason there are problems in the world is because of this very thing.

Quote:How do they pay the price?? With there life, an eye for an eye, as if that hasn't already been stated 20 times in this topic. :rolleyes:

Christ, you really ARE Nodbugger. What do the victim's family get when someone is killed for murder? The death of the murderer certainly isn't restitution. That is revenge. That is NOT the purpose of the court -- to deal revenge. As stated above, which you've conveniently chosen to ignore, Nodbugger, if the courts did deal in revenge, you would see ruling in assault charges that legally authorize the plaintiff to kick the defendant's ass.

I suggest you learn how to control your raging pubescent hormones as well. It'll get you quite a bit farther in life to think with your head. Which, in case you haven't been paying attention, you haven't.

In this case, revenge IS justice. No one gains anything out of imprisoning the accused for life. Putting Montgomery in jail for life isn't going to bring Bobbie Jo Stinnett back to life. So, what's the arguement here? Kill the bitch.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amazing things i've seen

Posted by [Javacx](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 17:34:13 GMT

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

---

on the contrary, you are the one that believes in the punishment not equating the crime. They kill, so they should pay with their life. Sounds fair to me. Don't do the crime if you can't do the time, and in a world with capital punishment, it's an eternity.

You didn't answer my question. But it further goes to prove my point. In the justice system WE HAVE TODAY, the punishment rarely, if EVER equates to the crime. A double standard is established in the courts, and thus, a double standard for justice is created. That itself isn't logical. Justice, among other things definitely should NOT be given a double standard. If it does, then justice is not a universal in the courts and the purpose of the courts is nothing more than a hypocrisy.

In this lady, possibly not. But if an example is made of her then it will deter future murders. Think 5 minutes past the present will ya? Not to mention habitual murderers are the ones that CANNOT be cured of their own sick mind anyhow, so what is the purpose of keeping them in prison and making the taxpayers pay for them to live?

I suggest you read this article. It gives very good information for both our arguments, and the effect of this so-called "deterrent policy".

Also see this article. And please, don't be like Cowmisfit or Nodbugger. Use your head. It would be refreshing to see someone actually do that.

Moving on... "Making an example" of someone is not something the court is meant to do. When you establish a kind of deterrent, it is supposed to be preventative, not effective only after the matter of fact. Now, as for that statement that habitual murders cannot be cured. I'll have to argue with that one as well. Habitual addictions are cured every day by different people with different problems. The only difference with murder is that it cannot be cured in a gradual way, like smoking. That doesn't mean it cannot be cured. I'll get into the psychological reasons why, but they don't really pertain to this argument so I'll save them unless you want me to discuss them.

In no place did I say that I agreed with the way we handle the death penalty when it is dealt. I would rather have the murderer die the way they killed the day AFTER they are declared guilty. How's that for fair.

And what if the courts are wrong? They can and have been wrong, you know. The way you want it, I promise you that you would be doing the very same thing that you are so against.

No shit, how do you think punishments should be carried out? without trial? of course capital punishment is pre-meditated, what other way is there to do it? You make it sound as if it's the COURTS fault they decided on the death penalty when it's the murder's decision ultimately.

From my OWN personal feelings and such, I don't believe the death penalty is valid at all. This seems to be the thing that you're replying to. There is a reason I haven't been voicing why it is immoral for me personally, because, like you and your arguments, it is only a feeling. The objective rationale behind it is not the same for you as it would be for me. So it is a useless



argument to make. But I feel it is necessary to call attention to this one:

Quote:You make it sound as if its the COURTS fault they decided on the death penalty when its the murder's decision ultimately

It IS the court's fault they decided on the death penalty. The very vocabulary you used proved that. They DECIDED on it. It is therefore their responsibility and their fault they chose it when they could have chosen life without parole.

Javaxcxl never said she didnt deserve a fair trial, everone is entitled to one, and I also never said you defended murders.

Read the first part of that paragraph again. I wasn't necessarily talking about you.

Quote:I just said the way you think murders should be punished isnt fair.

Before I voice my own opinion on this, let me ask you a question. What is a punishment? And don't cite me dictionary definitions.

Quote:It isnt fair to those that were murdered. You think they got trial? You think they had a say in the matter on whether they would live or die? You dont defend murderers but i will say that they are the only people you think about, while I think about the victim.

You're right, that IS the difference between you and I. I don't let my feelings cloud what should be an objective JUDGEMENT. Objectively, the victim doesn't exist anymore and the suspect does. Objectively, it is hypocritical of the courts to establish a double standard on this kind of case in the name of justice. Objectively, how much you hate the person mustn't allow you to seek hateful revenge instead of justice. What you and others don't seem to realize is that what I feel, you do NOT know. And for all you know, and it is probable, that I feel the same way about this woman as you do. I merely have the sense and patience to consider the situation from a hateless perspective. Something others here do not.

Quote:Also, I dont know how to take that nodbugger thing since i dont know him, but i couldnt give a shit about what he thinks. I think for myself.

I wasn't directing that at you. But I suggest you don't have a damn about what he thinks regardless.

Quote:Also, im not "eager" to dish out death, but I am eager to dish out justice.

Oh really? Your first post in this thread was:

Quote:sicko, two words: Electric Chair.

The woman didn't even have a trial yet and you were calling for her head. All of this based on a news article you read. You shot first and now claim to want to have asked questions later if at all in the name of justice.

Quote:As far as valuing a human life, try valuing the deceased, instead thinking of the murderer all the time.

Well, last time I checked, the deceased could not be brought back to life. The deed is done. The question is whether you are going to do the exact same thing and devalue a human life the way the murderer did. You are what you eat?

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [Jecht](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 18:39:45 GMT

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

---

JavaxcxAnd here is another place where your argument falls apart. No one does in fact get anything out of killing the accused. You have repeatedly used this deterrent ideology to support the death penalty. You've also tied it into the "axiom" that says the punishment must equal the crime. Now, if that is true, then perhaps you would like to explain to me why punishments rarely, if ever equate to the crime. Oh, and before you start on a tangant that says "OMG I DIDNT SAY DAT JAVXI", it has been a constant implication I've inferred out of your entire argument.

JavaxcxYou didn't answer my question.

Im sorry, where was the Punctuation that signifies the question? even so, They rarely equate to the crime because the law on Capital Punishment does not despose of Criminals the way the Criminals Despose of the Victims.

Javaxcxl suggest you read this article. It give very good information for both our arguments, and the effect of this so called "deterent policy".

Nice Article, for BOTH our arguments, no. But interesting to say the least and I'm sure the article has factual information and is not that bias(aside from some of the polls in it). I dont think you completely know where I stand on the Death Sentence. I hate our policy for the Death Sentence, I think its stupid to poke someone with a needle, and its all over. Wut i believe should happen is if you are convicted of murder, You are executed the way you killed and that it would be done the day after conviction. That would deter. I will admit that the needle does nothing, but say if you shot someone to kill them - u get shot. Also, you seem to miss the point that prison should not be a place for murderers, but for lesser crimes. Prison Costs the taxpayers money and to waste it on someone who is mentally incurable is absurd, axe him and be done with it.

JavaxcxAnd what if the courts are wrong? They can and have been wrong, you know. The way you want it, I promise you that you would be doing the very same thing that you are so against. warrantoSimple solution.

Have a death penalty, with the two conditions.

1. The standard of proof must be higher, from "beyond a reasonable doubt" to "absolute certainty". After all, if a mistake is made, it's much better to release a live person than to explain how you have killed an innocent person.

2. Have the jury (or Judge) personably responsible for the decision to put the accused to death. This way, if a mistake is made, the state is off the hook for the death of the innocent, and those responsible for putting him to death can take restitutive responsibility.

I said I agreed with this, and I wasn't kidding when I said it.

JavacxIt IS the court's fault they decided on the death penalty. The very vocabulary you used proved that. They DECIDED on it. It is therefore their responsibility and their fault they chose it when they could have chosen life without parole.

That's where you're wrong, the point I was trying to make was this: Upon killing someone they have decided that they should be executed.

JavacxBefore I voice my own opinion on this, let me ask you a question. What is a punishment? And don't cite me dictionary definitions.

Punishment (In my mind) is paying for a wrong you have committed. You can't do that in jail.

JavacxYou're right, that IS the difference between you and I. I don't let my feelings cloud what should be an objective JUDGEMENT. Objectively, the victim doesn't exist anymore and the suspect does. Objectively, it is hypocritical of the courts to establish a double standard on this kind of case in the name of justice. Objectively, how much you hate the person mustn't allow you to seek hateful revenge instead of justice. What you and others don't seem to realize is that what I feel, you do NOT know. And for all you know, and it is probable, that I feel the same way about this woman as you do. I merely have the sense and patience to consider the situation from a hateless perspective. Something others here do not.

Feeling is what separates you from the computer you type on. Also, a computer can be killed slowly by means of a virus. Other computers were used to make anti-viruses. Anti-viruses delete viruses so they don't hurt any other computers. Why do you say this? It's a metaphor for the court system run in its most efficient form and without feeling. The anti-virus is representative of the perfect court system and the virus that of the criminal. You see even judgement without feeling can determine that these people are hostile to the society, and should not be in it any longer. This may be cold, but it's the truth.

JavacxOh really? Your first post in this thread was:  
gbullsicko, two words: Electric Chair.

and yes my first post was that I thought she should get the death penalty, and that's the closest form of justice (although it's a long shot) that could befall her. And you very well know I meant after the trial. And are you stating that you don't think she did it? What's your evidence? And if it comes to be that she didn't do it, then whoever did should get the chair. You see how that works? I'm an equal opportunity justice distributor. You think I'm cold, that's your opinion.

JavacxWell, last time I checked, the deceased could not be brought back to life. The deed is done. The question is whether you are going to do the exact same thing and devalue a human life the way the murderer did. You are what you eat?

Try a better quote like "eye for an eye". And as I stated before, the courts don't devalue the life of the murderer, the murderer does when they commit the act.

With that, I'm going to leave this thread and let it die, seems this is going nowhere, if someone else wants to say something go ahead. Java, rebuttle if you want but I'm tired of talking to a

Machine. That's what you are when you don't let feeling take some part in your reasoning. You gave yourself that title, not me.

Javaxcxl don't let my feelings cloud what should be an objective JUDGEMENT. Objectively, the victim doesn't exist anymore and the suspect does.

---

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amazing things I've seen

Posted by [Javaxcx](#) on Fri, 24 Dec 2004 19:58:46 GMT

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

---

=[DT=gbull=[L]=]Im sorry, where was the punctuation that signifies the question? even so, they rarely equate to the crime because the law on capital punishment does not dispose of criminals the way the criminals dispose of the victims.

You obviously found the question yourself. Now, what you have just said does not change the fact that the punishment rarely ever equate to the crime. That is, when you steal a car, the government or the defendants do not get to steal YOUR car. However, when you kill someone, suddenly that statement rings true. Like I said before, you have a double standard for justice, and that does not make sense with what the courts are SUPPOSED to be.

Javaxcxl hate our policy for the death sentence, I think it's stupid to poke someone with a needle, and it's all over. What I believe should happen is if you are convicted of murder, you are executed the way you killed and that it would be done the day after conviction. That would deter. I will admit that the needle does nothing, but say if you shot someone to kill them - you get shot.

So you are in favour of legalized revenge? If someone tortures and kills someone, does that mean that the defendants should be given legal authority to do the same thing? That is not justice. I should remind you that the deceased are the actual and definite victims in a murder, and the defendants are those who substitute in his place and receive the reparations. "Fairness" the way you're suggesting it would only be valid if the deceased could kill the murderer. Which, we both know is ridiculous.

So maybe you would like to explain to me how it is "fair" for someone who is not the deceased to have the authority in ANY sense to take a life based on someone else's actions.

Quote:Also, you seem to miss the point that prison should not be a place for murderers, but for lesser crimes. Prison costs the taxpayers money and to waste it on someone who is mentally incurable is absurd, axe him and be done with it.

You are making the assumption that they are mentally incurable and cannot contribute to society in any possible way in prison. Something prisoners of all natures are allowed to do in controlled ways.

Quote:That's where you're wrong, the point I was trying to make was this: Upon killing someone they have decided that they should be executed.

No, you're not understanding me. When a jury suggests a sentence to a judge, they have the

option of killing a murderer or allowing him to go to prison for life with stipulations. It is this choice, like ANY choice, that bears responsibility and fault. Therefore, whether you want to acknowledge it or not, it IS the court's fault for sentencing a man to death. Just like it would be the court's fault for sending a man to prison, or setting him free. The FAULT is on the court.

Quote:Punishment(In my mind) is paying for a wrong you have committed. You cant do that in jail.

If you are paying for a wrong you have committed, then who gains something from your "payment"? Think about that one.

Quote:Feeling is what Seperates you from the computer you type on. Also, a computer can be killed slowly by means of a virus. Other computers were used to make anti-viruses. Anti-Viruses Delete Viruses so they dont hurt any other computers. Why do say this? Its a metaphor for the Court System run in its most efficient form and without feeling.

A court is not like a computer, and a computer is not like an objective body. A court, a judge, a jury and the lot are called to be an OBJECTIVE THIRD PARTY in a dispute. This means that while feelings and prejudices can play a part in a sentencing or verdict, they are not SUPPOSED to.

Quote:You see even judgement without feeling can determine that these people are a hostile to the society, and should not be in it any longer. This may be cold, but its the truth.

Actually, you're wrong. Judgement needs to be dealt without feeling. If it were, "feelings" can determine the severity of the punishment, and this is what is important: the lack thereof. That isn't fairness, or justice at all.

Quote:And are you stating that you dont think she did it? Whats you evidence?

I think it is probable that she did do it. Do I know for certain she did or she didn't. That is a matter for the courts to decide and my prejudices are irrelevant. Just like yours.

Quote:Try a better quote like "eye for an eye".

Who do you think takes the other eye and what do you think justifies that?

Quote:Java, rebuttle if you want but im tired of talking to a Machine. Thats what you are when you dont let feeling take some part in your reasoning. You gave yourself that title, not me.

I don't think of myself as a machine, so you must have given me that title yourself. I know what my feelings tell me, and I know that what I can reason goes beyond the trivial nature of those feelings. If you cannot seperate the two, well, I pity you.

---

Subject: This is one of the saddest and amzaing things i've seen

Posted by [tarsonis9](#) on Sat, 25 Dec 2004 04:03:23 GMT

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

---

Shotguns fire "shells"

Happy solstice all.

---