


3-30-2001

Trends. Death Penalties for Purveyors of Death? Not for Many Terrorists

Editor

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp>

 Part of the [Criminal Law Commons](#), [Defense and Security Studies Commons](#), [Human Rights Law Commons](#), [Legal Theory Commons](#), [Military, War, and Peace Commons](#), [Other Psychology Commons](#), [Peace and Conflict Studies Commons](#), [Social Influence and Political Communication Commons](#), and the [Terrorism Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Editor (2001) "Trends. Death Penalties for Purveyors of Death? Not for Many Terrorists," *International Bulletin of Political Psychology*: Vol. 10 : Iss. 11 , Article 5.

Available at: <https://commons.erau.edu/ibpp/vol10/iss11/5>

This Trends is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Bulletin of Political Psychology by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact commons@erau.edu.

International Bulletin of Political Psychology

Title: Trends. Death Penalties for Purveyors of Death? Not for Many Terrorists

Author: Editor

Volume: 10

Issue: 11

Date: 2001-03-30

Keywords: Death Penalty, Deterrence, Terrorism

How best to deter terrorism? How best to minimize untoward consequences of terrorism--especially the political sequelae that are the ultimate telos of terrorism? Some terrorism experts answer both questions by advocating the killing of terrorists through summary execution or as the penalty after conviction through a legal trial. However, killing has a significant downside.

First, killing precludes terrorists from being an ongoing source of information about their terrorism-related knowledge and from indirectly contributing to antiterrorism and counterterrorism initiatives. Second, killing often facilitates the reification of terrorists as martyrs and nurtures terrorist recruitment and terrorist motivations. Third, killing often nurtures witting and unwitting support activities for terrorism--including the increase of mass media coverage, propaganda effectiveness, political support, and fund solicitation. Fourth, killing even models the notion of violence as political solution that can undermine rationales against terrorism and increase the incidence and prevalence of political violence. Fifth, killing can elicit revenge killings.

While there is some psychological research suggesting that the death penalty and its implementation may deter some terrorist killing and other types of political violence, one might hesitate to support policies and laws that require the penalty across the board. (See Clinton, W.J. (April 24, 1996). Statement on signing the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996. *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*, 32, 719-721; Eisenman, R. (1993). Why we need the death penalty. *American Journal of Forensic Psychology*, 11, 61-64; Idelson, H. (June 15, 1996). Provisions of terrorism law. *Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report*, 54, 1713-1714; Radelet, M. L., & Borg, M. J. (2000). The changing nature of death penalty debates. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 43-61; Ross, S.D. (Winter 2001). In the shadow of terror: The illusive First Amendment rights of aliens. *Communication Law and Policy*, 6, 75-122.) (Keywords: Death Penalty, Deterrence, Terrorism.)