### CRIME AND PUNISHMENT: THE MEANS OR THE END?

One of the most controversial issues in the society that has prevailed over the attempts of many debaters is the choice between which one is more important: the means or the end. This debate has been often tackled in various ways, and it is reflected in the actual society settings, as well as in classic literature and movies. Such a dramatic display of both sides of the debate of the issue proves that this issue it impacts the society in more ways than youone might initially realizeguess. UponAt closer investigationlook, however, youone will learnrealize just how important a rolemuch this debate plays into even the everyday lives of people worldwide.

Many famous people and figures in history and literature provide cThe classic examples of this issue include famous people and figures in history and literature. Who can forget Napoleon, a man who thought that hewho failed to believe that he was not wrong in the moral sense? He attempted to justifyied his actions by saying declaring that he was somehow above society's the moral restrictions, society and its moral restrictions. Being Napoleon felt that the fact that someone who washe was given a significant role in the society, to Napoleon, this somehow excused him from the societal rules that bound everyone else. We can also see this issue. This issue is also evident in Victor Hugo's, Les Miserables, when. Jean Valjean s, in his hunger and desperation, stole teals a loaf of bread out of hunger and desperation and iwas punished gravely for it. However, who can say that the punishment did not fit the crime, given that , when he really actually stoledid steal, which was against the law? Wals his desperation a valid reason for him to steal? In slightly the same lightSimilarly, Robin Hood stole from the rich to help the poor. Which should be a valid basis for the judgment of one's acts, the means or the end?

Given all these examples, there is no one that probably dramatically emphasizes this debate better than Rodion Romanovich Raskolnikov, the broken hero of

Fyodor Dostoevsky's Russian philosophical novel, Crime and Punishment. In histhe novel, Dostoevsky makesde several allusions to Napoleon as Raskolnikov triesed to justify the crime that he hased committed. Raskolnikov was a student who lived in extreme poverty in St. Petersburg and. He murdered an infamous pawnbroker. He, stoletook her money to solve his financial problems, and at the same time, believedthought that he was doing the world a favor by killing a hated individual. However, in the process of the murder, the pawnbroker's sister arrive<mark>se</mark> at the scene and also ha<mark>se</mark> to be killed. Throughout the novel, Raskolnikov justifiesed thehis murder of the pawnbroker based on the reasons fact that he did it, not only for money for himselfthe money for himself, but also for the common good. It is the The incidental death of the pawnbroker's sister that wreaksed havoc on his conscience, and drove him tocauses him a mental anguish over the morality of what he did not intend to do. As he battlesd with his conscience, he slowly came close tostarts to loseing his sanity. With the help of Sonya, a prostitute he lovesfell in love with, Raskolnikov eventually confessesd the crime and iwas imprisoned in Siberia, as apunishment.

Beyond the surface of the story, however, the novel providesgives insight into the deepest realms of the psychology behind an appalling crime that was driven by a good endgood intentions. The novel highlightsed the emotional and mental effects of a crime on the murderer himself. Nowhere else is the debate over which has more weight, the means or the end, more dramatically and profoundly expresseddelved into than in the novel. It is to be noted, however, that Raskolnikov believed that the means, no matter how bad, justified the end. He believed this until the very end of the novel. The only source of his anguish was over his murder of the pawnbroker's sister, an innocent victim who he never did not meantintend to kill. On the other hand, he was at peace with what he did to the pawnbroker, and never once agonized over the intentional crime. As a whole, H however, he had to confess and accept his take a punishment because his actions were not justified. A, after all, because he also took an innocent life in the process. Although he was imprisoned after he confessing his actionsed what

he did, Raskolnikov's true punishment was thehis psychological anguish he suffered over whether his actions were or were not justified. or not.

Crime and Punishment still givescontinues to provide several an insights into criminal psychology in the modern setting. The novel's depiction of a motive behind the crime, and how a criminal viewsees his actions can lend very important insights to the current justice system nowadays. Again, we see this debate epitomized in the real-life crimes such as of stealing, killing, and even terrorism. Most robberies are driven by a desperate need of money, and terrorists justify their actions by saying-claiming that they are fighting for a certain particular cause. Some murderskillings are driven motivated by psychological problems. One such example is the infamous zodiac killer, who left cryptic letters for the police to find. These letters, which led them to the conclusion that the killer was psychologically incapacitated. Who, then, can judge his actions when everyone knew that he was not in the correct frame of mind to understandknow what he was doing? In his mind, what he was doing washe justified his actions by whatever reasons his incapacitated mind providedgave him.

In *the novelCrime and Punishment*, Raskolnikov was eventually punished by the justice system through anand imprisonedment. He was not excused for his crime, and the good end to which it led was not accepted taken as a valid reason. In today's the world of crime and punishment today, how do we really evaluate a person's ene's guilt? Are criminals really bad people? Another question also follows: how do we determine an appropriate ene's punishment?

In By evaluating past crimes and the ensuing punishments they led to, it seems that the winning side of the debate appears to haves been determined. The morality in the issue involves winning the battle. No crime is justified by a good intention. No means is justified by a good end. The means outweigh over the end.

However, another issue can be linked to this debate. The controversy over the justification of <a href="mailto:the">the</a> death penalty as a criminal sentence can be closely associated with this debate. Ironically, <a href="mailto:when you studylooking at">when you studylooking at</a> both issues carefully, <a href="mailto:the">the</a> death penalty <a href="mailto:appearsseems">appearsseems</a> to <a href="mailto:reveal\_show">reveal\_show</a> the other side of the debate. <a href="mailto:DThe">DThe</a> death penalty has an honorable <a href="mailto:good">good</a> end: to punish a criminal in the same <a href="mailto:mailto

The "means or <u>the</u> end" debate still prevails as—some people continue to <u>look</u> at<u>investigate</u> both sides of the story. Why is it that these criminals, —who performed contemptible acts that were driven by an <u>honorablegood</u> purpose, are almost always depicted as heroes? We can see this in the <u>aforementionedgiven</u> examples, such as Napoleon, Robin Hood, Jean Valjean, and Raskolnikov. Even if <u>modern\_our\_society</u> shows us that <u>a\_crime\_should\_beis\_sourcedgiven</u> punished <u>regardless\_ofno\_matter\_the\_what\_goodhonorable\_motives\_that\_may\_be\_behind\_it, history\_and\_literature\_seems\_to\_tells\_us\_otherwise.</u>