

QUESTION  
By JAMES W. HARKLEROD

QUESTION - Does the government err in considering crimes of violence to be more serious than financial crimes? Or in punishing financial crimes to a lesser degree than violent crimes?

Generally, a violent crime is "one-on-one" with subsidiary victims being family and/or friends. Localized.

From a public relations perspective, however, severe punishment for violent crimes benefits the politicians. Because everybody is afraid of violent criminals.

Financial crimes, on the other hand, affect the local community, geographic, state, national and/or international areas.

From a public relations perspective, however, they also frighten only those few who have an obvious financial risk/loss.

Of course, laws are written and enforced, as a rule, for the benefit of those who have power. Laws that provide varying ~~to~~ levels of punishment for the same crime permit the imprisonment

of the lower classes while permitting limited punishment for the upper class.

One punishment for all crimes (Life Supervision - with varying levels of supervision) permits limiting of the punishment of the upper class while providing more options (less use of imprisonment) in the punishment of the lower classes.

(The author is a former (1971, 1972) Death Row resident.)