

Dialogue

✉ from: Andrew Rosindell to Andy Reed

✉ from: Andy Reed to Andrew Rosindell

subject: **Death penalty**



Andrew Rosindell
is Conservative MP
for Romford

✉ **ARo to ARe – message sent 3.19pm:**

A cold blooded murderer will never have the opportunity to kill an innocent person again if their own life has ended. That alone is good reason to support the re-introduction of the death penalty.

Our concern should be about the lives of the innocent, not those who choose to carry out acts of extreme wickedness. Those who contemplate killing another human being will also, in many cases, think twice before doing so, knowing that they themselves are likely to forfeit their own life as a result.

The mere knowledge that the death penalty is there to be used can act as a deterrent to a potential killer, thus allowing more innocent people to carry on living.

✉ **ARe to ARo – message sent 3.54pm:**

Surely the most cold blooded murder is for the state to take a life at a time and manner of its own choosing. Nothing could justify that. I believe that if you have any regard for the sanctity of life it is not for us as individuals or society to murder others for whatever reason we feel justified.

Just because I don't support state sanctioned murder does not mean that I am not interested in the victims or ensuring that the murderer receives the appropriate punishment.

You also know that the deterrent effect argument does not hold up in this area. Most murderers know their victims and have not set out to murder.

✉ **ARo to ARe – message sent 4.31pm:**

If you oppose in principle the idea that 'the state' should never be able to take a life, then what happens when we go to war?

I guess that also means we should give up on the war against terrorism, which under your rules we would have to do, because killing in the defence of the innocent would not be allowed.

✉ **ARe to ARo – message sent 4.54pm:**

I wasn't aware we had declared war on our own citizens for a long time. I don't think the comparison with war and premeditated murder of a fellow citizen is particularly valid or helpful.

We could debate my views on a 'just' war – but perhaps another day. There is a massive difference between self defence and premeditated state execution.

✉ **ARo to ARe – message sent 5.33pm:**

But we cannot allow innocent people to be put at risk by those who seek to destroy life. The job of government is to protect our people, and sadly there are circumstances when a life may have to be taken to ensure protection from those who would obliterate the lives of others.

As for a deterrent, of course there are many for whom the ultimate deterrent of death would not affect their desire to kill. However, there are some who would think twice and if the death penalty saves the life of even one innocent child, then it can be justified.

The re-introduction of the death penalty for the worst cases of pre-



meditated murder and the killing of a child would send out a message to all potential killers that in Britain, there is no escape from such evil deeds.

✉ **ARe to ARo – message sent 5.59pm:**

If you are accepting that the deterrent effect is in fact not very effective then what is your genuine motive in the state becoming a murderer? If you simply want to protect fellow citizens why can't life mean life for those who pose a genuine risk?

I assume that this all means you would be prepared to stand by a fellow human and inject them to kill them. I don't see how you cannot believe this is not cold blooded murder and I certainly wouldn't want the blood on my hands. Why would it make us any better than the original murderer?

Of course nobody condones premeditated murder but those on death row in the USA knew there was a death penalty – but it didn't stop them. Murder is not a rational act and murderers don't sit working out their odds. So it's not effective, it serves little purpose and as far as I can see is immoral. ■



Andy Reed is
Labour MP for
Loughborough