

THE DOOMSDAY MACHINE: PROPORTIONALITY, PUNISHMENT AND PREVENTION

1. Introduction

Much of the philosophical discussion of punishment has focused on its justification. Consequentialists argue that punishment must be justified by its future consequences. Retributivists argue that punishment must be justified by the ill-desert of the one punished. And there are several philosophical positions on the justification of punishment in between these two: for example, weak or teleological retributivism, which justifies particular instances of punishment by both their consequences *and* the desert of the offenders, and positions which distinguish between the institution of punishment (justified by consequences) and specific instances of punishment (justified by desert).

All of the above philosophical positions have assumed that there is one specific practice—punishment—that must be justified. I shall attempt to show, however, that there are two distinct moral enterprises that frequently overlap in the punishment of criminals. I shall attempt to show further that each of these enterprises has its own separate justifying principles, although these principles may all be derived from a more general principle or set of principles. The two enterprises are *preventing intentional violations of rights* and *giving people what they deserve* (*prevention* and *retribution*).¹ I shall argue that where the former enterprise is involved, punishing criminals is more closely related to placing valuables in a safe or locking a door than to giving the wicked their due. Where the latter enterprise is involved, punishing criminals is related more closely to distributive justice than to crime prevention. Distinguishing the two enterprises and their justifying principles, while it will not eliminate the wealth of philosophical problems surrounding punishment, will at least resolve some of those problems and clarify others. Moreover, it may have as a policy implication the reconsideration of the proportionality limitation on punishment and defense of rights.

It is important to state at the very outset that I am not going to consider any purely consequentialist account of punishment of criminals, that is, any account that is purely forward-looking. (A principle such as “always strive to see that everyone gets what he deserves” I do not deem to be purely forward-looking.) In the first place, it is not clear that consequentialism can even give a coherent account of what punishment is and how it differs from other deliberate inflictions of harm without somehow incorporating the retributivist concept of ill-desert. Wasserstrom, pp. 300–05. Moreover, it is

clear that there is nothing distinctive or particularly problematic or interesting about punishment within a purely consequentialist system, except that punishment is one of many acts and institutions that involve creating unpleasant consequences.

The most salient feature of consequentialism's inattention to desert is its condonation of punishing (or "telishing") those innocent of wrongdoing and punishing the guilty out of proportion to their wrongdoing. Ezorsky (1972), pp. xiv-xvii; Hospers (Cederblom, et. al.), pp. 34-35. Even if there is a "duty" to promote the best consequences, blaming or punishing the violator of that duty—and only the violator, and only to the extent of his desert—may not promote the best consequences and thus may be forbidden. Devine; Gallagher. (What kind of "duty" is it that can be violated without blame?) Rule-consequentialism, if it does not collapse into act-consequentialism on the one hand or into incoherence on the other (Lyons (1965), pp. 62-160; Gendin, p. 10; Wasserstrom, p. 305), does not in principle forbid rules mandating punishment (or "telishment") of the innocent or punishment out of proportion to desert. Hospers (Cederblom, et. al.), p. 34; Hospers (Barnett, et. al.), pp. 200, 202; Lyons (1969), pp. 649, 659-60; Bernstein, pp. 145-66; Radin, pp. 1050-52. Rawls' injunction to maximize the position of the least advantaged without regard to considerations of desert could conceivably result in punishment of the innocent and reward of the guilty (and others who might threaten to breach duties or shirk responsibilities in order to demand greater wealth, etc.)—in general, punishment and reward out of proportion to positive or negative desert. Rawls, pp. 310-15; MacKenzie; Singer, pp. 301-04; Lessnoff, pp. 68-69; Ake; Note (1977), p. 706. At least this seems to be the logical implications of Rawls's banishment of desert and its consequence that harms (and benefits) to the innocent and guilty are morally indistinguishable, although it is not clear that Rawls accepts the implication. Rawls, pp. 310-15. (See also Sterba, pp. 355-61; Morris (1974), pp. 1178-79; Richards, pp. 202, 238-39, 242-45.)

In this Article we shall take the criminal's desert seriously. As we shall see, however, taking desert seriously does not entail that all punishment of criminals is part of the enterprise of retribution.

2. *The Enterprise of Retribution*

A. The Enterprise and Its Supporting Arguments

Retributivists argue that giving people what they deserve, even if what they deserve is punishment, is justifiable. Retributivists divide into several camps depending upon whether they believe punishment of wrongdoers is *mandatory*, *permissible without additional justification*, or *permissible with additional justification*. All retributivists insist that wrongdoing cannot be dispensed with as a basis for punishment.

There is considerable support in most persons' intuitions and practices for some version of the enterprise of retribution. First, on the metaethical level, to call an act morally wrong is to imply a condemnatory attitude toward those who perform the act. One need not maintain that the meaning of moral terms is exhausted by statements about attitudes to accept that part of the meaning of moral terms does relate to attitudes. The statement, "X is morally wrong, but I shall not condemn you if you engage in X," sounds extremely odd and cries out for an explanation (for example, that perhaps I do not regard the listener as a responsible agent if he engages in X).

Further, the condemnatory attitude implied in statements such as "X acted immorally" carries with it a desire that the actor suffer for his wrong. We would think it quite odd to hear someone say, "X acted immorally, and I condemn him for it. But I will never tell him so, for fear it might cause him pain." Thus, the enterprise of retribution appears to be imbedded inextricably in the practice of morality itself. Atkinson, p. 84; Becker, pp. 49–50; Kleinig, p. 67; Lemos, p. 62; McDermott, pp. 637–38, 640–41; Morris (1976), pp. 93–108; Richards, pp. 197, 240–41; Strawson; White, pp. 20–27.

Additional support for the enterprise of retribution can be found in our moral aversion to punishing those innocent of wrongdoing. Bedau, p. 57. According to the retributivist, that aversion stems from combining the injunction not to give people worse treatment than they deserve with the proposition, "those innocent of wrongdoing do not deserve punishment." Our aversion to punishing the innocent would be inexplicable if we believed either that the innocent did deserve punishment or that not deserving punishment carried with it no mandate to refrain from punishing. And, says the retributivist, if it is wrong to punish the innocent because they do not deserve punishment, then if it is ever permissible to punish anyone, it is permissible (or mandatory) to punish the guilty precisely because (and to the extent) they do deserve punishment. Wasserstrom, pp. 309–10.

There are other supports for retributivism in our practices and intuitions in addition to those already mentioned. For example, many believe that those who attempt crimes are deserving of as much punishment as those who accomplish them, at least if the former did all they believed necessary to accomplish the crimes. Although there may be consequentialist reasons in support of punishing attempts and successes the same, those reasons are problematic; further, it is unlikely that the intuition in favor of equal punishment would dissipate upon disproof of good consequences. The intuition is much more likely to be based on the retributivist intuition that all of the morally guilty deserve punishment, punishment that is commensurate with their moral guilt. Hospers (Barnett, et. al.), p. 205; Morris (1976), pp. 117–18.

Finally, desert-based intuitions regarding distributive justice—for example, that those who expend more effort in socially useful pursuits deserve

more wealth and other benefits than do the lazy or the self-centered—appear to support parallel retributive intuitions.

B. Problems in the Practice of Retribution

1. The grounds and measurement of retributive desert

Despite the strong support from our moral intuitions for the enterprise of retributivism, essential components of the enterprise—that we be capable of distinguishing relative ill-desert among those who deserve punishment and distinguishing between those who deserve punishment and those who do not—raise considerable philosophical difficulties.

The amount of undeserved harm caused by a person's acts is not a measure of his desert. Persons of low or no culpability may cause considerable harm to others. Conversely, persons of great culpability (for example, those who attempt murder) may never cause harm at all. Harm caused appears to be a matter of luck, and luck and moral desert are thought to be unrelated if not antithetical. Feinberg (1977), pp. 310–12; Rawls, pp. 311–12; Nagel, p. 25. (*See also* Morris (1976), p. 42.)

But if luck cannot determine the existence and degree of ill-desert, then several philosophical problems arise. The free will/determinism debate and the questions of whether determinism and moral responsibility are compatible and what kind of free will is necessary for moral responsibility surely bear on the enterprise of retribution as they do on moral practices generally. If my character and acts as well as their consequences are all the products of my “luck”—whether the luck be that of determinism (Rachels, p. 157; Nagel, pp. 32–37; White, pp. 20–27) or that of pure freedom (Sprigge, pp. 82–83)—and not “me,” then I cannot deserve anything by virtue of them. *But see* Wolf.

Similarly, the problem of akrasia bears on the determination of retributive desert. If ignorance excuses and thus eliminates culpability—and if all immoral choices are based on ignorance—then no one is culpable because of wrongful choices. Note (1975), pp. 1519–20 n.7. (*Cf.* Gardiner; Young.) Of course, I may now be ignorant of correct values because of my past choices, which formed my present character. But those past choices will have either been unlucky—again negating present culpability—or themselves based on ignorance, thus involving one in a regress.

If akrasia is to be explained, not by ignorance, but by inability to resist desires that others are capable of resisting, culpability remains problematic. Either one's inability to resist is a matter of luck, or else it is a product of past choices, which in turn were the products of ignorance or inability to resist, and so on. *Cf.* Watson, p. 334.

Related to the problem of akrasia is the problem of excuses such as duress, insanity, and irresistible impulse. Arrington; Zaw; Slote; Morris (1976), pp. 77–87. There are cases where the strength of one's desire to act in a particular way does not *justify* the *act*—because, for example, the likely

harm to the actor if he does not act is outweighed by the harm likely to result from the act—but purports to *excuse* the actor. An objective standard for what constitutes excusing pressure to engage in immoral acts—a standard unrelated to the history and attributes of the particular actor—again appears to make culpability depend on luck. However, a subjective standard leads to luck as well through the corridors of akrasia or determinism.

Related to the above problems are the issues of whether retributive desert is ultimately to be premised on a person's acts or on his character, and what is the relation between acts and character. Many assume at first that one's ill-desert is a product of specific wrongful acts, such as an act attempting murder. However, most people also assume that the culpability of the agent is affected by his motives, the pressures acting upon him, and so forth. Surely, for example, the murder erroneously believed to be required by patriotism, or the murder committed because of threats to one's family, is less culpable than the cold-blooded murder for gain. Thus, the act, specified without mention of motives, history, or circumstances, appears to be merely the touchstone for assessing the desert of the agent, the true basis of which is his character.² Gross, pp. 29, 77, 142; Morris (1976), pp. 1–29; Fletcher, pp. 444–49, 459–66, 799–802. One could therefore have the character and hence the desert of a murderer and yet because of luck never have attempted an act of murder. Feinburg (1970), pp. 191–92, 220–21. Cf. Morris (1976), pp. 118–27.

Acts, therefore, rather than constituting the basis for desert, appear to have only epistemic relation to the true basis—character. The only way of limiting the basis of ill-desert solely to wrongful acts that is at all plausible is to relate ill-desert to the concept of forfeiture and to say that whatever the maxims of will expressed in one's acts, one cannot complain when others act towards him based on the same maxims. Goldman (1979), pp. 44–45; Snare, p. 307; Rachels, pp. 154–55; Bedau, p. 61; Williams (1978); Pilon, pp. 354–57. (*But see* Sher (1977), pp. 162–63.)

How is one to describe the maxim of will and hence what is forfeited? Does one transgression forfeit all rights? For example, does one who commits a small moral transgression, such as stealing a small sum, forfeit all rights because he has willed the maxim "It is permissible to violate moral rights"? Is he estopped from claiming he is being punished more than he deserves because he has willed the maxim "It is permissible to treat people worse than they deserve"? In other words, under a forfeiture theory, are moral transgressors "outlaws," unprotected by any moral rights limiting how they may be dealt with by others?

On the other hand, if the maxims of will are specified richly enough, so that they contain references to the actor's history, motives, and circumstances, desert based on such maxims might be indistinguishable from desert

based on character. Thus, basing desert on the maxim of one's will rather than on one's character requires the maxim to be characterized quite generally, such as "so act as to kill unjustifiably," and the actor would, of course, have to be aware that such a maxim was implicit in his act. Such a maxim might succeed in divorcing act from character as the desert basis, and it would allow us to distinguish between, say, cold-blooded murderers and those who mistakenly believed murder was morally justified. On the other hand, it would force an either/or treatment of those who believed their murder, say, was justified, but whose belief itself reflected a vicious character; and it would not allow us to distinguish between the provoked and the unprovoked murder, for example. Nor would it allow us to say that those who would have acted on an evil maxim had the circumstances arisen—or who went so far as to prepare to commit a crime before a fortuitous event caused them to desist—are less deserving than those who would not have.

Alan Goldman responds to the question, "Which rights are forfeited in violating rights of others?" with the answer, "just those rights that one violates (or an equivalent set)." Goldman (1979), p. 45. If Goldman's definition of violation of rights for purposes of punishment is that of *attempted violation of rights*—with an attempted violation defined as the last step the actor believes necessary to accomplish a violation—so that forfeiture turns on the harm intended the victim, not the greater or lesser harm that actually befalls him, then Goldman's forfeiture approach will avoid the problems of punishment based on vicious character traits. On the other hand, Goldman's approach does not allow us to consider, in assessing the proper measure of retribution, factors that relate to the viciousness of the crime but not to the importance of the right violated. We could properly punish murder committed in the heat of passion as much as murder committed cold-bloodedly. Psychological factors might totally excuse a violation; they could not, logically, mitigate one.

Character thus appears to be the proper basis for ascriptions of desert. Character, for example, provides us with the personal continuity necessary for ascribing to the agent at present time₂ the desert merited by an act at earlier time₁. We assume the act reflects relatively stable character traits existing at both times. A radical change in character between the two times might reflect the emergence of a new person, one who does not deserve the punishment due his predecessor. Williams (1973); Haksar, pp. 114–18; McShea, p. 391; Simon, p. 115. And it is the relation of acts to character traits persisting through time that allows us to say that X, a person at present time₂, is responsible for an act at earlier time₁. (*But see* Gross, p. 30.) The radical freedom that is necessary to produce an act totally "out of character" is also sufficient to make holding the actor responsible quite problematic.

(See generally Morris (1976), pp. 85–87; McShea, p. 391; Simon, p. 115; Strawson; Parent (1979), p. 147. *But see* Foot, pp. 448–49.)

We are thus led back into the dilemma about how to rid desert of the element of luck. If our desert is based on our character, but our character is based on our luck (our genes, environment, and so forth), then our desert is (improperly?) based on our luck. Campbell; Rachels, pp. 156–59; Nagel, pp. 32–37; Fletcher, pp. 805–06; Sankowski; Parent, p. 147. It must be the case, therefore, that such aspects of our character as constitute proper bases for desert must not themselves be the products of luck. They must, it appears, be the products of our responsible acts. We must be able to create our character. Thus, the true bases for the desert reflected in our acts is the desert ascribable to earlier acts, those acts that formed the character reflected in the later acts. Our character and thus our desert would be based on our “whole life.” Ezorsky (1972), pp. xxiv–xxvi; Ross, pp. 58–59; Gardner, pp. 804–05; Parent (1976). That is, of course, assuming that our “whole life” is *our* whole life.

The regress is now apparent. Ultimately desert traces back to some freely chosen act the desert of which can be specified without any knowledge of the actor, or it traces back to some primordial character traits that are proper desert bases despite their being solely the results of the actor’s fortune.³ (*Cf.* Zaitchik.)

There is one final problem in assessing retributive desert to which I must allude. It is generally accepted that given identity of motives, history, and circumstances, desert varies with the amount of unjustified harm intentionally inflicted or attempted. In other words, the amount of unjustified harm reflects the viciousness of character that serves as the basis for desert. Many commentators have discussed the problems of relating the harm, say, of rape, to some unit of punishment. The problem I wish to mention is that of assessing the viciousness of character of one whose intended harm is, for example, violation of a bare property right, or is mere illegality. How vicious is one who intends to violate a law or break a promise but pay his victims for all losses? How vicious is one who takes my property without my consent but who intends to pay me for all losses, psychic included? Suppose that he is violating a moral side constraint *a la* Nozick, albeit a minor one, but that he intends to pay me for all losses and is violating the side-constraint in order to save a drowning child. One need not deny that such acts can be morally wrong, or deny that the agent is truly culpable and not merely misguided, to realize that the “harm” upon which wrongfulness and culpability are premised is difficult to translate into desert.⁴

2. The retribution/desert relationship: Is ill-desert a necessary, necessary and sufficient, or mandatory basis for punishment?

Retributivists divide into three major camps. Goldinger, pp. 7–8; Lemos, pp. 62–63. Weak retributivists hold merely that ill-desert is a necessary condition for justifiable punishment. Brandt, p. 81; Hospers (Barnett, et. al.), p. 192; Ezorsky (1978). Moderate retributivists hold that ill-desert is both necessary and sufficient for justifiable punishment. Extreme retributivists hold that ill-desert compels punishment. Kant, p. 102; Wasserstrom, p. 309; Ezorsky (1978); Note (1975), p. 1560.

Implicit but rarely mentioned in the disagreement among weak, moderate, and extreme retributivists on the relation of ill-desert to punishment are two sub-issues. The first concerns whether judgments of desert are comparative or noncomparative or both, and if the last, the nature of the relation between comparative and noncomparative desert. Feinberg (1974); Sher (1979); Montague; Browne. Weak and moderate retributivists might be maintaining, in opposition to extreme retributivists, that desert is a noncomparative, cosmic judgment. If an offender gets the (cosmic, noncomparative) punishment *he* deserves, he has no moral complaint when other, equally deserving offenders get less punishment than they deserve. In other words, treating all or only some persons *better* than they deserve in a cosmic sense wrongs no one and may be justified by, say, efficiency. Lemos, p. 63.

The extreme retributivist may be arguing on the other hand that desert is essentially comparative. To give one offender less punishment than is given another, equally culpable offender is to give the latter worse than he deserves. Or the extreme retributivist may be maintaining that desert has both a comparative and a noncomparative side, and that although giving all persons better than they deserve in a cosmic, noncomparative sense wrongs no one, in fact giving some better than their noncomparative desert always upsets their proper comparative relation with others and is for that reason unjust.

Alternatively, extreme retributivists might be arguing that desert is noncomparative, but that according each person his desert, good or bad, is a basic moral duty. It is not clear to whom such a duty would be owed, however.

(The moderate retributivist, whom I have been lumping with the weak retributivist in the foregoing discussion, might be instead an extreme retributivist on the issue of what just deserts require, but one who believes other considerations can override considerations of justice.)

If extreme retributivism were correct, especially if it also held desert to be noncomparative, there could be no upper limit except the gravity of the offense on the amount of punishment we would be required to mete out. Ezorsky (1978).

The comparative-noncomparative issue regarding just deserts of course bears on more than whether remitting punishment or other sanctions out of mercy or for some other reasons—for example, because of race or

productivity—is just; it also bears on the justice of allowing undeserved gifts or of foregoing redistribution of luck. Ezorsky (1978); Montague; Heyd.

A related sub-issue is whether there is a single continuum of desert, or whether instead there are two types of desert—positive (which is relevant to distributive justice) and negative (which is relevant to retributive justice). Hare, pp. 119–20; Browne. One might hold that there is only one continuum of desert but maintain either that it is essentially comparative or that it is essentially noncomparative. Or one might hold that positive and negative desert are distinct, and that the former is comparative and the latter noncomparative, or vice versa, or that they are both comparative or both noncomparative.

Positive desert usually is regarded as comparative. (*But see* Browne.) Moreover, the comparison tends to be restricted to members of the same generation or even the same society. If comparisons were made transgenerational, so that they spanned eras with markedly different resources available for distribution, the desert judgments would look noncomparative. For example, if virtuous individual A_1 in poor society S_1 receives X amount (limited by S_1 's resources), vicious individual A_2 in wealthy society S_2 can receive only $X - Y$ amount, *even if resources are left undistributed*. Otherwise, comparative justice would be upset.

If both positive desert and negative desert are essentially noncomparative, but no one is presently getting worse than he deserves positively or negatively, then the weaker forms of retributivism would be supportable regardless of whether positive and negative desert are distinct forms. But if positive desert is comparative based on whatever resources are available, the weaker types of retributivism are supportable only if positive and negative desert are distinct and the latter is noncomparative. For example, positive desert could be comparative but unrelated to virtue, while negative desert could be noncomparative. (*Cf.* Zaitchik.) In this way perhaps punishment could be justly remitted for those whose punishment would cause disastrous effects on others. Ezorsky (1972), pp. xix–xxii. (Extreme retributivism, with its mandate to punish the guilty, could result in disastrous consequences for the innocent, unless positive and negative desert are on a single continuum, in which case the effects on the innocent would be relevant to the justice of punishing the guilty. Ezorsky (1972), pp. xxi–xxii.)

All of these difficulties might be avoidable if desert were not based on vicious or virtuous character traits, but were instead based on specific acts and the maxims of will contained therein. We could assume a distribution of rights unrelated to desert at all (at least desert based on character traits). Offenders would be those persons whose acts reveal that they accept maxims approving rights violations. Such persons would forfeit those rights the violations of which their maxims approve. Goldman (1979), pp. 44–45; Bedau, p.

66. Their rights would thus not be violated if they were acted upon as they had willed towards others. On the other hand, no one's rights would necessarily be violated if some offenders were not punished at all.⁵ Note (1975), pp. 1573–74.

Of course, the notion of forfeiture of rights is problematic. If we do not employ Goldman's version of forfeiture, we are left with the problem of what right(s) does a particular wrongful act forfeit. And there are other problems as well. How is forfeiture different from "deserving to lose," and how is the latter different from desert based on character? Who has the right to benefit from the forfeiture of the offender's rights? (For example, if punishment took the form of forced labor and produced a surplus over that required to compensate victims, who—victims or society in general—would be entitled to that surplus? Does the answer depend upon whether there is a positive duty to aid uncompensated victims, from which might follow a reciprocal claim by all to share in the surplus produced by punishment?) Who can forgive the offender and restore his rights? May one offender be treated worse than another, although no worse than his forfeiture of rights would entail, because he is liked, is productive, or is White?

3. *The Enterprise of Prevention and the Principle of Proportional Response*

The enterprise of retribution has, as we have seen, an array of philosophical difficulties. What is the proper basis of retributive desert—act or character—and what is the role of luck in that basis? Does ill-desert permit, justify, or compel retribution? Is retributive desert comparative or non-comparative, and is it distinct from positive, distributive desert? And there are other difficulties, to only some of which I have alluded. But despite those difficulties, the intuitive support for the enterprise of retribution remains strong, especially for two related principles of the enterprise on which all retributivists agree: no punishment of the innocent, and no punishment greater than culpability. The two are related if culpability is a matter of degree; once one is punished to the extent of his culpability, further punishment is "undeserved" and thus tantamount to punishment of the innocent.

The principle forbidding punishment greater than culpability, which I label the *principle of proportionality*, will be the focus of this section of the Article. It is a principle that is important not only for its role in the retributivists' attack on excessive punishment, but also for its role in the American legal system's limit on the amount of force that can be used to defend rights. I intend to demonstrate, not that the principle of proportionality is mistaken, but rather that it is often invoked where it does not in fact apply. In short, although some instances of "punishment" are in fact applications of the *enterprise of retribution* and thus limited by the principle of propor-

tionality, other instances are applications of the *enterprise of prevention*. In the latter enterprise, the principle of proportionality in its ordinary form plays no role.

I begin my discussion of the principle of proportionality by asking the reader to consider an example commonly used by retributivists to demonstrate the concept of excessive punishment violative of the principle of proportionality—the example of hanging pickpockets in Victorian England. (I really don't know or care if they did hang pickpockets, or cut off their hands, or what, but the example is a good one, fictitious or not.) Was such punishment for the minor crime of pickpocketing excessive, if one assumes that the punishment did have some deterrent effect? (If it had had a perfect deterrent effect, of course, it would not have been a problem, as it would never have been used.)

If the reader feels that hanging pickpockets was excessive—and most people I have polled feel that way—I now ask the reader to consider a product solely of the imagination. Assume there is a super-sophisticated satellite that can detect all criminal acts and determine the mental state of the actors. (The society that has invented this device has made criminal only those acts that are clearly violations of the moral rights of others.) If the satellite finds that the actor knew his act was a crime, that he had no recognized excuse or justification for committing it, that he was not acting in the heat of passion or under duress, and that he was not too young, enfeebled, mentally unbalanced, and so forth to be deemed without capacity to commit a crime, the satellite immediately—and without regard to the seriousness of the crime—zaps him with a disintegration ray. Once the satellite detects the crime, it is impossible to prevent punishment of the criminal, no matter how merciful the authorities might feel. The definitions of crimes and the punishments attached thereto can be changed only prospectively. The entire population is informed of the existence of the satellite and what it does.

Now, if, as hypothesized, the punishment of pickpockets is regarded as excessive, is the punishment meted out by my imaginary device (the Doomsday Machine, I call it⁶)—obliteration for all crimes committed with certain mental states, right down to intentional overparking—excessive?

At first the reader might feel that the Doomsday Machine is indistinguishable from the practices of Victorian England, and so, for consistency's sake, answer that its punishment *is* excessive. But something about the Doomsday Machine example as it relates to the notion of excessive "punishment" is no doubt unsettling (aside from the idea of being obliterated by a ray for a parking ticket). So consider some further hypotheticals.

Suppose a man receives a phone call from a burglar who says, "I've been spying on you and know you're going out tonight. I plan to burglarize your house in order to steal your valuables. But I want you to know that I have a

very bad heart, and if you hide your valuables, I might very well suffer a heart attack by expending a lot of energy and suffering anxiety in looking for them. So please leave them in plain sight; for I am definitely going to enter your house and look for them until I find them or drop dead." The listener hangs up the phone, takes his valuables, hides them on the very top shelf of his closet, and leaves. He returns home and finds the burglar, dead from a heart attack, on the floor. Excessive punishment for a non-violent burglary?

Consider some other examples that I feel are parallel. What if a man keeps a moat to protect his castle (or an electric fence to protect his house), and he receives a letter from someone who says that the first time the castle (house) is deserted he will attempt to enter it; and because he cannot swim (is not shockproof), his death will be on the owner's hands if the moat is not drained (the current not turned off). Is there a duty to drain the moat (shut off the current) in order to avoid excessive punishment? And what if one hides his jewels on top of an unscalable cliff after having been told by a thief that the latter would attempt to climb it if the jewels were placed there?

I might go on in my hypotheticals to drag out vicious dogs, crocodiles, and spring guns to protect persons from petty crimes, and pit these devices against petty criminals, whose common denominator is that they all know of the certain consequences of their acts, know that their acts are illegal, are determined to proceed with them anyway, and are acting premeditatedly without any recognized legal excuse, justification, or incapacity. (In all of my hypotheticals the protective devices are somehow programmed, like the Doomsday Machine, to be absolutely no threat to anyone acting in ignorance of their existence, or on a mistake of law or fact, or with a legal excuse, justification, or incapacity.)

At this point I expect a certain response to materialize among most of the readers. Most will not feel the above examples involve excessive punishment. Indeed, many are probably unsure whether the examples involve "punishment" at all. Perhaps only a few readers will maintain that in the examples one has a duty to render a violation of his rights reasonably safe in the face of a violator's threat of, in effect, suicide.

But if these examples do not involve excessive punishment, then the Doomsday Machine does not mete out excessive punishment either. The structure of the Doomsday Machine hypothetical and the other hypotheticals is the same. A person bent on violating another's moral rights is fully aware of a condition that renders such an attempt life-threatening to him but not to others who might have an excuse or justification or who might be unaware of the dangerous condition. There is a trap, but it is only one for the wary. And once the violation occurs or reaches a certain stage, no human intervention will be effective to prevent the threat from being carried out.

But if the Domsday Machine does not mete out excessive punishment, then perhaps neither did those oft-maligned judges in Victorian England. Does the Domsday Machine differ in any relevant respect from an ordinary system of criminal law that imposes harsh sentences, if the harsh sentences are imposed only under the same conditions as restrict the Domsday Machine?

Well, one difference surely is that getting caught and severely punished are never certainties for criminals facing an ordinary system of criminal law. Indeed, my Domsday Machine and other hypotheticals all made the choice to commit a criminal act indistinguishable from the choice to commit suicide. In the real world, the chances of escaping detection or conviction are substantial.

Most people I have polled, however, when asked whether it would make any difference to the question of excessive punishment if the Domsday Machine were imperfect and could detect only, say, one out of three crimes (or the moat were swimmable, the shock survivable, the cliff scalable, and so forth, one in three times), replied that it would not. I concur. The difference, if any, between Domsday Machine "punishments" and ordinary harsh punishments must lie in something other than the chance of escaping them.

One difference between the Domsday Machine and ordinary harsh punishments lies in the Machine's infallibility in detecting all the factors relevant to guilt, in contrast to the fallibility of even the most enlightened criminal justice system. But fallibility, logically, has more to do with whether we should punish at all, or how harsh our harshest punishment should be (Black, 1974), than with whether our punishments should be scaled according to the gravity of the crime and should not exceed the supposed "desert" of the criminal (assuming we have not been fallible in assessing it). We are equally as fallible in determining who is guilty of petty larceny as we are in determining who is guilty of murder. If the former crime but not the latter were punishable by death, fallibility would be as great but no greater a concern.

Another difference between the Domsday Machine and ordinary harsh punishments lies in the fact that the punishment the former metes out occurs substantially contemporaneously with commission of the crime. However, when I reprogrammed the Domsday Machine to mete out the punishment a day, or six months, or a year after the crime, none of the participants in my informal polls felt that the change was morally significant, especially after I replaced, in my other hypotheticals, my moats, fences, dogs, crocodiles, and so forth, with snakes whose venom took a year to kill.

Another possible distinction between some of my hypotheticals, although not my Domsday Machine, and ordinary harsh punishments is that the former involve a danger that materializes *before* the criminal

achieves his aim. The heart attack, the drowning in the moat, the shock from the electric fence—all occur before the criminal makes off with the booty and thus look like true instances of prevention. The Doomsday Machine and the Victorian punishments occurred *after* the crime and thus look like excessive punishment. This distinction is only apparent, however. First, in all of the hypotheticals a violation of a right had already occurred when the violator triggered the death-dealing mechanism. True, in some of the hypotheticals, the triggering violation—for example, trespass or breaking and entering—was but a means to a further, and usually more serious, violation—for example, theft. But in all cases there was *some* prior violation. Moreover, if attempted violations suffice to trigger just punishment, then whether the “excessive” punishment meted out in the hypotheticals occurs before or after a consummated violation appears to be irrelevant so long as there is an attempted violation.

If violations have occurred in all the hypotheticals, perhaps the hypotheticals can be distinguished on a different though related basis. In some of the hypotheticals, the criminal’s death, though it occurs after he violates the victim’s rights, nonetheless prevents a further or more serious violation. In the examples of the Doomsday Machine and the hanging of pickpockets, there may be no further or more serious violation contemplated by the criminal to be prevented by his death. (An extreme example where the death of the criminal cannot prevent the harm of a violation is that of the diamond that carries the notice, “Anyone who reads and understands this notice and who, without excuse or justification, attempts to steal this diamond, will be blown up by a bomb inside it.” Because the explosion will destroy the diamond along with the thief, it will not prevent the harm.) Thus, although in all the examples the *threat* is designed to *prevent the harms of violations*, in only some, not including the Doomsday Machine, is the *consummation of the threat* designed to *prevent the harms of violations*.

I confess that although I perceive the distinction just described, I fail to perceive its relevance to the question of whether the threatened injury is excessive, that is, morally impermissible. If the potential victim is willing to create a particular risk to *his* rights in order to increase the threat to violators and thus to decrease the overall risk to his rights, I see no valid moral objection on behalf of the violators.

The only remaining difference between the Doomsday Machine and ordinary harsh punishments that might be deemed significant is that the Doomsday Machine, unlike ordinary punishment, requires no human intervention between the criminal act and the punishment. (Indeed, in my hypothetical, human intervention to prevent the punishment is ineffectual.) Is our moral compunction against imposing harsh punishment, despite such punishment’s deterrent value, related to our inability to make the punishment

automatic and not subject to our control after the criminal act? Is the relevant analogy to a judge in a regime of harsh punishment that of a person returning to his castle to find a forewarned trespasser in the middle of the moat being attacked by crocodiles that the owner can call off by means of a whistle? Would the owner be morally compelled to call them off? If so, then perhaps we have a great incentive for building a Doomsday Machine.⁷ If not, then the Doomsday Machine example draws into question the whole concept of excessive punishment and our adverse moral reaction to it.

Once it is clear that it makes no difference whether the disproportionate harm befalls the criminal before or after he succeeds in violating another's rights, so long as he is threatened with the harm before he acts, we can see that the electric fence, the moat, the cliff, and so forth, on the one hand, and harsh criminal punishment administered by human beings on the other, as well as the Doomsday Machine programmed for either instantaneous or delayed zapping, are all related phenomena. They are all instances of the *enterprise of prevention*, an enterprise that I maintain appears to be morally justifiable when conducted according to certain principles, among which is *not* the principle of proportionality. The principles which are germane to proper conduct of the enterprise of prevention are the principle that requires that the person threatened with the harm have no right to engage in the act which triggers the harm (the *wrongful act principle*) and the principle that requires adequate notice of the threat before it may be carried out (the *notice principle*).

Once these two principles are complied with, a harm disproportionate to ill-desert may be imposed on an actor, even if it is more harm than is necessary to effect a similar degree of prevention of the act in question. Thus, the sheriff of a small town where the courthouse lawn is trespassed upon by five hundred sitting sunbathers need not restrict himself to force proportionate to the wrong of trespassing in order to remove the trespassers. Nor need he restrict himself to the least force sufficient to remove them. He might, for example, be able to carry them off bodily through extreme physical exertion on his part, or by severe depletion of the town's budget to hire deputies to carry them. But he need not choose these minimally harmful (to the trespassers) options. He may, instead, place a machine gun on the roof of the courthouse, inform the sunbathers that the machine gun is programmed to begin spraying the lawn in five minutes, and leave. In other words, he may set up a sort of Doomsday Machine and avoid the expenses of less draconian measures. Once the trespassers have been warned (the *notice principle*), and because they have no right to be trespassing in the first place (the *wrongful act principle*), they have no right to demand proportional response if that is more costly in terms of other values. Moreover, if the sheriff can set up the *automatic* machine gun, then conceivably it would follow that he could man the machine gun;⁸

and if he could man the machine gun, then it would seem to follow that the town council could pass a new trespass ordinance mandating death by machine gunning as the punishment (to become effective at a time when the trespassers have had notice of the new ordinance and a reasonable time to get off the lawn). *When "punishment" of criminals is in pursuance of the enterprise of prevention, it does not conflict with but rather supersedes the enterprise of retribution and the latter's principle of proportionality.*⁹

4. Difficulties in the Enterprise of Prevention

A. Difficulties Related to the Wrongful Act Principle

Before the disproportionate harm may be imposed under the enterprise of prevention, it must be established that the subject of harm has no right to undertake the act. After all, is it not wrong almost by definition to impose a risk on people in order to deter certain acts where the people have a right to engage in those very acts?

Consider, however, people who mistakenly but sincerely believe they have a right to perform an act that in fact violates the rights of others. They may be conscientious objectors, morally-motivated revolutionaries, ordinary soldiers on the wrong side of a war, or other "innocent" aggressors. Let us suppose that they are all violating rights but do not believe they are and do not merit ill-desert under the enterprise of retribution. (Indeed, were their desert all that mattered, they might be deserving of positive benefits.)

Now it is one of the virtues of positing a legitimate enterprise of prevention that can supersede the enterprise of retribution and its restrictive principle of proportionality that it appears to give us a moral basis for punishing the morally righteous offender.¹⁰ Thus, we can say that so long as the moral offender is in fact offending and has in fact been warned of the consequences in store for him, he may be punished despite his not "deserving" (retributively) any punishment.

Although I do believe the enterprise of prevention has less difficulty with the punishment of the moral violator than does the enterprise of retribution, I am not convinced that it is totally free from difficulty. It is one thing to say we need not sacrifice time, energy, or expense to avoid harsh preventive measures where ordinary violators of our rights are concerned. But is that true where our threat is directed toward making more costly a choice that a violator believes (mistakenly) he has a moral duty to make?¹¹ Should we not rather be forced to sacrifice at least some of our interests in order to avoid a greater sacrifice by the offenders who are the victims of a moral error; that is, should we not consider their error a form of bad luck that should be redistributed so that everyone sacrifices to some extent?¹²

I leave this difficulty with the enterprise of prevention, a difficulty that may after all apply to only a small minority of offenders, and turn to a related difficulty. Sometimes it is deemed advisable to prevent or to reduce by threat of harm the frequency of a particular act even though the act will sometimes be morally permissible or even morally required. Placing speed bumps in roads to harm would-be speeders harms those who are morally required to speed (for example, because they are carrying a very ill person to a hospital). Wertheimer (1976), pp. 196, 197 n.46. Defining criminal acts overbroadly threatens harm to actors whose acts would be permissible or morally required. The speed bumps obviously cannot make exceptions (although speeders with excuses might be compensated for damages). But neither can the authors of overbroad laws make exceptions in many cases—for example, those cases in which narrowing the law would render it too vague to give adequate notice, to be efficiently administered, or to check abuses of discretion, or those cases in which it is expected and desirable that some persons violate the law. (For example, laws forbidding poaching are often intentionally more restrictive than desirable because some degree of noncompliance is expected. Note (1977), pp. 696–702.) These examples illustrate that within any moral theory that assesses acts by their consequences, it is possible that the correct act for A to undertake is to impose harm on B because of B's undertaking what was the correct act for him.¹³ Because the practice of prevention is consequentialist, it will on occasion run into this philosophical difficulty, that is, on those occasions where the wrongful act is wrongful only because it falls under an optimistic proscription, but not because of *its* consequences (or the consequences intended by the actor).

Finally, strict liability and negligence as bases for criminal punishment raise similar difficulties for the wrongful act principle. There is one good consequentialist reason, that is also the reason for overbroad laws and for not allowing conscientiousness as an excuse, for having some strict liability and negligence crimes: namely, reducing the total number of violations of the rights of the innocent, even if punishing the strictly liable or the negligent is in fact punishment of the innocent.¹⁴ Note (1975); Coleman, pp. 170–71; Coleman (1974), p. 481; Sartorius, pp. 136–37; Greenawalt, pp. 965, 967. However, what makes punishment based on strict liability and negligence more problematic is that although the person who is punished for violating an overbroad law or a law to which he morally objects at least knew that he was risking punishment for his particular act, the strictly liable and the negligent are innocent in a more basic sense: they have no notice that their act is triggering punishment.¹⁵

Whichever one decides is the correct way of dealing with the difficulties of the wrongful act principle—the difficulties of conscientious objectors, overbroad laws, strict liability and negligence—there are a vast number of

acts the wrongfulness of which is unproblematic. The difficulties with the other principle of the enterprise of prevention—the *notice principle*—are philosophically more formidable.

B. Difficulties Related to the Notice Principle

The notice principle appears crucial to the justifiability of imposing disproportionate harm under the enterprise of prevention. Where it is quite clear that the actor is knowingly undertaking a risk he has no right to undertake, we feel no regret in creating the risk. But when may actors be said to undertake the risk such that we do no wrong in creating it?

For example, must the actor be aware of the specific term of punishment he faces (5 years in prison, a fine of \$500, and so forth)? Or must he be aware only that there is a *chance* that he might receive a particular punishment, and if so, does it matter that he underestimates the chance? Suppose he underestimates the chance of the contemplated punishment because he underestimates the odds of getting caught, or the odds of having the punishment imposed once caught (because he is ignorant of the frequency of imposition,¹⁶ or because he just does not believe what he has been told). In the enterprise of retribution, notice is relevant only insofar as it bears on our assessment of the character of the actor.¹⁷ In the enterprise of prevention, however, notice performs an entirely different function. In the latter, the notice we require is that which we require generally when we say of a gamble that, whatever its payoff, it was fair.

It is not my purpose here to resolve the philosophical difficulties regarding the notice requirement of a fair gamble. All that I wish to maintain is that there are such things as fair gambles, that it is therefore humanly possible to give the notice required for a fair gamble, and that there is no reason in principle why that notice cannot be provided within the enterprise of prevention.

5. *Prevention, Gambles, and Justice*

I said at the outset that the enterprises of retribution and prevention may be related under a higher level principle or principles. It is, of course, possible to stipulate without further explanation that the enterprise of retribution and its principle of proportionality just do not apply when the notice principle allows the enterprise of prevention to be invoked.¹⁸ But I believe that a further explanation can be provided, one that subsumes both the enterprise of retribution and the enterprise of prevention under more general *principles of justice*. The principles of justice include respect for autonomy. Respect for autonomy in turn requires that we allow fully competent adults to renounce, give away, contract away, *or even gamble away* that which they deserve,

retributively or distributively, because of their acts/character. The enterprise of prevention allows us to structure the world so that wrongdoing represents a poor gamble. The wrongful act and notice principles, if complied with, allow us to set up poor gambles that are, nonetheless, fair gambles. And if the wrongdoer receives worse under the enterprise of prevention than he deserves under the enterprise of retribution by having undertaken a poor but fair gamble, what he receives is just under the principles of justice.

If a person were not permitted to make himself worse off as the result of a fair gamble than he otherwise deserved, then he would not be permitted to keep the gains of any such gamble. And since the losses and gains of gambles would be socialized, only those gambles approved of by the state would be allowed. (Of course, if a person engaged in a prohibited gamble after announcing that he would accept whatever losses materialized, he might not deserve retributive punishment for engaging in the prohibited gamble. And if he did not deserve retributive punishment, then the only means the state would have to prevent unapproved gambles would be by means of an “undeserved” but fair threat—a gamble! If the state were not allowed to prevent gambles by imposing gambles, it would have to do so by making the world gamble-proof, an absurd idea.)

A Rawlsian would have to concede the justice of allowing a competent adult to gamble away at least the primary goods guaranteed him by the second of Rawls’ two principles (the Difference Principle). Rawls, pp. 302–03. The liberty to gamble away, as well as to give or contract away, primary goods must be part of the liberty protected by the first principle (the Principle of Maximum Equal Liberty). For it would be odd indeed if the paradigm of fairness from which the two principles of justice are derived in the original position—the fair gamble by autonomous agents—were not itself allowed under those principles. Rawls, pp. 85, 120, 126.

We have no duty under most circumstances to interfere with normal adults who wish to undertake fair gambles. Nor do we have a duty to make the world risk-proof for such adults, or to compensate them for all injuries occasioned by undertaking risks.¹⁹ Moreover, most people would deny a duty to compensate for all injuries stemming from risks undertaken in ignorance of the true odds, especially if it were wrong to undertake the risk in the first place. But may we alter the world to make some fair gambles riskier than they would otherwise be? Yes, if the gambles are wrong to undertake in the first place; and most criminal acts are gambles that are wrong to undertake.

Are there limits to the risks we can impose to prevent wrongful acts by competent adults? A risk severe enough to effect perfect deterrence is, of course, no problem, since no one will ever suffer the harm. What of some draconian harm which deters all but one criminal? Do we weigh the harm to him in excess of his retributive desert against the benefits to would-be victims

of deterrence? What if his harm is less than their benefits in the aggregate, but greater than the benefit to any one of them? Does the fact that he risked the harm in a fair gamble make any benefit gained by setting up the gamble morally weightier than any loss to the criminal?

I am not sure what, if any, moral limits there are in setting fair gambles in the path of wrongful actors. I am reasonably sure, however, that the harm to the gambler, when weighed against the benefits to would-be victims, is discounted considerably by the fact that he voluntarily undertakes the gamble. To deny this would be to leave us powerless against the really determined wrongdoer, the one who cannot be stopped by harm proportionate to his desert.²⁰

Will not punishments in excess of retributive desert, even if imposed only on wrongdoers who undertake fair gambles, fall selectively on the foolhardy sub-class of the class of wrongdoers, those wrongdoers prone to underestimate risks? This objection appears at bottom to amount to a denial that either fair gambles or the autonomy presupposed by fair gambles exists where wrongful acts are concerned. It is similar to the argument regarding akratic behavior that one cannot act autonomously and at the same time realize the wrongfulness of his act—that all immorality is really ignorance. If one assumes to the contrary that undertaking a wrongful act in the face of a risk of punishment *can* be a fair gamble, the objection dissipates.

Finally, when the imposition of the threatened harm is within our power after the wrongdoer has taken the risk (committed the wrongful act) and lost (got caught), and the threatened harm is greater than his retributive desert, may we act as we have threatened and impose the harm? Even if we are permitted to restructure the world to make it riskier for wrongdoers, leaving the last act necessary for bringing about the harm up to them, may we “program” ourselves to undertake the last act necessary to impose the harm in response to the wrongdoer’s act? The objection to imposing the harm ourselves may go like this: Where imposition of punishment greater than retributive desert is within our control *after* the wrongdoer acts, we cannot say the punishment was a risk undertaken, for that is to take a third-person view of our imposition of punishment. Imposition of the punishment is not a “risk” from our perspective; we either impose or not, and either choice is within our control. The “odds” of the gamble are fixed by us *after* the act, and to do so renders the imposition of grave harm attributable to us, not to the gamble.

On the other hand, the objection might go like this: There is a natural resistance to imposing harm on wrongdoers greater than they retributively deserve. Wrongdoers will tend to believe, therefore, that punishers will be unlikely actually to impose severe punishment in excess of retributive desert if punishment is within their control. If the punishers in fact impose severe

punishment, the wrongdoers will have underestimated the risk in a way that renders the gamble unfair.

I am not going to attempt to deal with either of these objections, objections that might underlie the objection to ordinary excessive punishment like that administered by the Victorian judges. The objections raise profound issues with which I am not prepared to deal. If these objections are well-taken, however, then they provide an incentive to remove punishment under the enterprise of prevention from ordinary human hands and to place it in the hands of monsters or Doomsday Machines.²¹

6. Conclusion

The costs of crime, including the costs of the criminal justice system set up to deal with it, are enormous. The costs are not just monetary costs to taxpayers and costs in terms of lives and property to victims. The psychological, social, and political costs of insecurity and distrust are perhaps even greater. One way to reduce crime and its costs is to raise the odds the fully competent criminal faces when he gambles on a criminal undertaking. We have been restricted in doing so by the principle of proportionality, a principle expressed in our legal system through judicial interpretation of the Eighth Amendment²² and through principles and rules governing the amount of force that can be used to protect lives and property and apprehend criminals.²³ So long as we believe that only one set of principles can govern our treatment of criminals, then the principles of the enterprise of retribution, with all of the philosophical difficulties that plague that enterprise, are the most eligible, deeply embedded in our basic moral outlook. But if we deny exclusive jurisdiction to the enterprise of retribution, and allow room for the enterprise of prevention and its two governing principles, we can avoid the restrictions of proportionality and make a crime a fair, but extremely risky, gamble. If justice *permits* us to do so, and doing so, by reducing the costs of crime, allows more people to get what they deserve, then perhaps justice *requires* us to do so as well.²⁴

Lawrence Alexander

University of San Diego

NOTES

1. I restrict the first enterprise to prevention of intentional violations to avoid the issue of the justifiability of strict criminal liability and punishment of inadvertent negligence. I do not mean to imply that I believe punishing the negligent or the strictly liable cannot be justified. But excising such punishment from the more inclusive

enterprise of *preventing violations of rights*, leaving us with the more restricted enterprise of *preventing intentional violations of rights*, will render more plausible my suggestion in the last section that the latter enterprise and the enterprise of *giving people what they deserve* are both derived from common desert-focused principles.

There is a case, however, for deriving the more inclusive enterprise of *preventing violations of rights* and the enterprise of *giving people what they deserve* from common, desert-focused principles, as well. But doing so requires desert-focused principles that permit *deliberately giving known individuals* worse than they deserve in order that ultimately more people get what they deserve. Such principles may be more difficult to come by than, for example, principles that permit acts and practices that create a *risk to statistical persons* that they will get less than they deserve. *But see* Sartorius, pp. 136–37; Ezorsky (1974), pp. 111–12; Note (1975), pp. 1564–70. Consider, e.g., *procedures* which risk punishment of the innocent. Gross, p. 188; Wertheimer (1977). Nozick would appear to distinguish between (1) deliberately violating rights of known individuals in order to minimize rights violations and (2) risking rights violations with respect to statistical persons. *Compare* Nozick, p. 30, with *id.*, pp. 96–108.

2. It is not apparent, even if character is the correct basis of desert, how to measure the desert of various types of bad character; nor is it apparent what the relative virtue is among those who love others, those who love duty, those who love neither but who resist temptation, and the immoral amoralists—those who love neither others nor duty and who do *not* resist temptation. *See* Sapontzis, pp. 51–52.

3. On the complexity of the act/character relation, see Henberg; Sher (1978).

4. *See also* Bedau, pp. 66–67.

5. *But see* Lemos, pp. 60–61 (where failure to act on the forfeiture is argued to be unjust).

Query: Would persons who acted on supererogatory maxims of will have cause to complain if others did not so act towards them but merely respected their rights?

Nozick, for whom distributive justice is a matter of rights, not desert, nonetheless seeks to limit the amount of punishment that can be inflicted on rights violators. Nozick, pp. 59–63. To do so he must either divorce punishment from desert yet limit punishment by some concept like forfeiture, or else he must maintain a radical distinction between positive and negative desert and also prevent the “whole life” desert of the offender from effecting a redistribution of wealth through the practice of punishment. *See* Ezorsky (1972), pp. xviii, xxiv–xxv; Parent (1976); Gardiner. *See also* Rabinowitz, p. 88 n74.

6. James Buchanan has conjured up a similar device, which he calls an “automatic enforcer,” perhaps because technically a “Doomsday Machine” is a device programmed to destroy everyone, not just particular individuals. Buchanan, p. 13.

7. *See* the text accompanying note 21 *infra*.

8. *But see* the text accompanying note 21 *infra*.

9. For a good example of confusing the two enterprises, see Hospers (Cederblom, et. al.), pp. 46–47.

10. Others have noted the problems raised by morally worthy wrongdoers. *See* Brandt, pp. 74 n6, 80; Goldinger, p. 9; McCloskey, pp. 119–20, 128–29, 130–36.

11. Of course, if we make the threatened punishment severe enough, the conscientious violator’s moral principle may excuse him or require him not to violate. It is possible that, for example, religious objections to laws may be handled, not by making exceptions on free exercise grounds, but by making the consequences of violation sufficiently severe so that the objector is excused *by his religion* from resisting. The danger in this approach is that some objector will not feel excused despite the high penalty and will go ahead and violate the law, which is to say that draconian penalties

are only moral problems when their threat fails to effect perfect deterrence and they must then be imposed. See MacCallum, pp. 145–51.

12. We might, for example, quarantine moral offenders, as we do lunatics, and then make the quarantine pleasant enough so that we have sacrificed as much satisfaction as they. See Alexander, pp. 411–12 n7.

The question of what risks it is fair to impose on morally innocent persons, including risks of accidents, pollution, unavoidable sacrifice of life, limb or property, and even of erroneous imposition of criminal or civil liability through imperfect procedures, as well as risks of punishment because of moral views in opposition to those of the rest of society, is one of the most difficult questions in social philosophy.

13. This is just one example of the general problem of thoroughgoing consequentialism in producing coherence between acts and attitudes, a problem not solved in my opinion by rule-consequentialist variations. Consequentialists ultimately cannot give satisfactory accounts of rights and rules, of praise and blame, of moral virtues, or of the ability of their moral theory to be publicized and taught. See Goldman (1977); Piper; Devine; Williams (1973), pp. 118–25; Lyons (1965), pp. 119–60; Ralls. See also Dworkin.

14. For an attempt—unsuccessful, in my opinion—to distinguish punishment for negligence from strict liability, see Richards, p. 207.

15. One cannot properly characterize the acts that give rise to strict criminal liability or punishment for inadvertent negligence as knowing violations of rights on the ground that one “knows” when he engages in any activity that he runs the risk that he is inadvertently neglecting some specific risk to another’s rights or that he is in fact bringing about a violation of rights. Coleman, pp. 70–71; Coleman (1974), p. 481; Greenawalt, p. 965. When I speak of “knowing” violations of rights, I use “knowing” in the more natural sense of being aware that one *is* violating or *is* unreasonably risking violation of another’s rights—intentional and reckless violations, in other words.

15. The punishment might be to subject the offender to a kind of lottery, e.g., based on whether he is found to be unproductive, or “dangerous,” or rehabilitated, the result of which lottery is more severe punishment for some than for others. See, e.g., van den Haag, pp. 242–45. Punishment in our society is meted out according to the “lottery” of how much harm was caused (e.g., felony-murder rules, lesser punishments for attempts than for successes, collections of uninsurable damages). Are lotteries such as, say, punishment based on productivity “unfair” to the unproductive because the odds of the criminal gamble are worse for them than for the productive, if we assume no one has a right to undertake the gamble in the first place (the *wrongful act principle*). Are the lotteries unfair if they benefit the least advantaged among those who do not undertake wrongful acts?

17. Thus, the punishments at Nuremberg, objected to by many because of the lack of previously promulgated laws criminalizing the conduct, may have been proper under the enterprise of retribution. Objections based on lack of notice—e.g., objections to vague or ex post facto laws—would have been pertinent to punishment under the enterprise of prevention.

18. Such a stipulation would not, of course, satisfy those who have expressly rejected the contention that the enterprise of prevention and its principles are sufficient without more to justify severe punishments. See, e.g., Goldman (1979), pp. 54–56; Wertheimer (1975), pp. 415–16; Lackey, p. 438.

Goldman is the only one of the three I have cited to attempt to justify the rejection. Thus, he writes at p. 55:

My warning you that I will assault you if you say anything I believe to be false does nothing to justify my assaulting you, even if you could avoid it by saying nothing. A society’s giving

warning that it will cut off the hands of thieves does not justify its doing so. In general, having warned someone that he would be treated unjustly is no justification for then doing so, even if, once warned, he could have avoided the unjust treatment by acting in some way other than the way he acted. The harm imposed must be independently justified. Once we have determined the proper amount of punishment for wrongdoing (I have argued that it is determined by social utility up to the equivalence limitation), adequate warning is normally a further necessary condition for just imposition. That criminals could have avoided punishment by having acted differently is again one reason why we are justified in punishing them at all. It does not justify excessive punishment.

It is clear, however, that in the quoted passage Goldman has done nothing more than assert the relevance of proportionality to prevention. He has not proved it. His example of threatening assault for *believed* false speech is irrelevant because the wrongful act principle is not complied with in the example. The rest of the passage is nothing *but* assertion, and examples such as those in this piece are nowhere else considered by Goldman.

19. Cf. Wikler, pp. 387–92.

20. It would rule out imposing even minor harms on wrongdoers if the wrongful act were even more minor; for example, it would rule out spikes at parking lot exits.

21. A similar argument is made regarding nuclear deterrence, viz., that such deterrence, the optimistic consequentialist policy, requires that we program ourselves or others to be non-consequentialists. See Kavka. See also Wertheimer (1976), pp. 189–90; Devine.

22. See, e.g., U.S. v. Weems, 217 U.S. 349 (1910).

23. Fletcher, pp. 859–60, 870–74.

24. Alan Goldman points out that if retributivism and the principle of proportionality are followed in punishment, and if punishment thus imposed fails to deter, a dilemma results. We can either respect the criminal's rights (defined by the principle of proportionality), or we can respect the victims' rights to have crime reduced. Goldman (1979). Because Goldman rejects the solution I have offered here (see footnote 17, *supra*), he is unable to provide a solution to his dilemma.

I would like to thank Michael Bayles, Larry Hinman, Gregory Kavka, Gerald Postema, Alan Wertheimer, and Ken Winston, as well as Eugene Freeman of *The Monist* and my wife, Elaine, for their many helpful suggestions.

TABLE OF SOURCES

Christopher Ake, "Justice as Equality," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 5 (1975), pp. 69–89.

Lawrence Alexander, "Self-Defense and the Killing of Noncombatants: A Reply to Fullinwider," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 5 (1976), pp. 408–15.

Robert Arrington, "Practical Reason, Responsibility and the Psychopath," *Journal for the Theory of Behavior*, 1 (1979), pp. 71–89.

Max Atkinson, "Interpreting Retributive Claims," *Ethics*, 85 (1974), pp. 80–86.

- Lawrence Becker, *Property Rights: Philosophic Foundations* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London: 1977).
- Hugo Bedau, "Concessions to Retribution in Punishment," in J.B. Cederblom and William Blizek, *Justice and Punishment* (Ballinger Pub. Co., Cambridge, Mass.: 1977), pp. 51–73.
- Richard Bernstein, "Legal Utilitarianism," *Ethics*, 89 (1979), pp. 127–46.
- Charles Black, *Capital Punishment: The Inevitability of Caprice and Mistake* (Norton, New York: 1974).
- Richard Brandt, "Retributive Justice and Criminal Law," in Thomas Beauchamp, ed., *Ethics and Public Policy* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: 1975), pp. 66–84.
- Derek Browne, "Nonegalitarian Justice," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 56 (1978), pp. 48–60.
- James Buchanan, *The Limits of Liberty* (Univ. Of Chicago Press, Chicago: 1975).
- C. A. Campbell, "Is 'Free Will' a Pseudo-Problem?," in Bernard Berofsky, ed., *Free Will and Determinism* (Harper & Row, New York: 1966), pp. 112–35.
- Jules Coleman, "Justice and the Argument for No-Fault," *Social Theory & Practice*, 3 (1974), pp. 161–80.
- Jules Coleman, "On the Moral Argument for the Fault System," *Journal of Philosophy*, 71 (1974), pp. 473–96 (cited without year of publication).
- Philip Devine, "The Conscious Acceptance of Guilt in the Necessary Murder," *Ethics*, 89 (1979), pp. 221–39.
- Gerald Dworkin, "Non-Neutral Principles," in Norman Daniels, ed., *Reading Rawls* (Basic Books, New York: 1974), pp. 124–40.
- Gertrude Ezorsky, "The Ethics of Punishment," in Gertrude Ezorsky, ed., *Philosophical Perspectives on Punishment* (State Univ. of New York, Albany: 1972), pp. xi–xxvii.
- Gertrude Ezorsky, "Punishment and Excuses," in Milton Goldinger, *Punishment and Human Rights* (Schenkman Pub. Co., Cambridge, Mass.: 1974), pp. 99–115.
- Gertrude Ezorsky, "The Right to Punish," in Elsie Bandman and Bertram Bandman, eds., *Bioethics and Human Rights* (Little, Brown and Company, Boston: 1978), pp. 251–52.
- Joel Feinberg, *Doing and Deserving* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, N.J.: 1970).
- Joel Feinberg, "Noncomparative Justice," *The Philosophical Review*, 83 (1974), pp. 297–338.
- Joel Feinberg, "Economic Income and Social Justice," in Thomas Mappes and Jane Zembaty, eds., *Social Ethics* (McGraw-Hill, New York: 1977), pp. 306–15.

- George Fletcher, *Rethinking Criminal Law* (Little, Brown and Company, Boston: 1978).
- Philippa Foot, "Free Will as Involving Determinism," *The Philosophical Review*, 66 (1957), pp. 439–50.
- Neil Gallagher, "Utilitarian Blame: Retrospect and Prospect," *Journal of Value Inquiry*, 12 (1978), pp. 13–22.
- P. L. Gardiner, "On Assenting to a Moral Principle," in Judith Thomson and Gerald Dworkin, eds., *Ethics* (Harper & Row, New York: 1968), pp. 305–26.
- Martin Gardner, "The Renaissance of Retribution—An Examination of *Doing Justice*," *Wisconsin Law Review*, 1976, pp. 781–815.
- Sidney Gendin, "A Plausible Theory of Retribution," *Journal of Value Inquiry*, 5 (1970), pp. 1–16.
- Milton Goldinger, "Punishment and Morality: the Basic Issues," in Milton Goldinger, ed., *Punishment and Human Rights* (Schenkman Pub. Co., Cambridge, Mass.: 1974), pp. 1–15.
- Alan Goldman, "The Paradox of Punishment," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 9 (1979), pp. 42–58.
- Alan Goldman, "Can a Utilitarian's Support of Nonutilitarian Rules Vindicate Utilitarianism?" *Social Theory & Practice*, 4 (1977), pp. 333–45.
- Kent Greenawalt, "'Uncontrollable' Actions and the Eighth Amendment: Implications of *Powell v. Texas*," *Columbia Law Review*, 69 (1969), pp. 929–79.
- Hyman Gross, *A Theory of Criminal Justice* (Oxford Univ. Press, New York: 1979).
- Vinit Haksar, *Equality, Liberty, and Perfectionism* (Oxford University Press, Oxford: 1979).
- M. C. Henberg, "Impartiality," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 8 (1978), pp. 715–24.
- David Heyd, "Ethical Universalism, Justice, and Favouritism," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 56 (1978), pp. 25–31.
- John Hospers, "Punishment, Protection, and Retaliation," in J. B. Cederblom and William Blizek, *Justice and Punishment* (Ballinger Pub. Co., Cambridge, Mass.: 1977), pp. 21–50.
- John Hospers, "Retribution: The Ethics of Punishment," in Randy Barnett and John Hagel, eds., *Assessing the Criminal: Restitution, Retribution, and the Legal Process* (Ballinger Pub. Co., Cambridge, Mass.: 1977), pp. 181–209.
- Immanuel Kant, *The Metaphysical Elements of Justice* (trans. John Ladd) (Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis: 1965).
- Gregory Kavka, "Some Paradoxes of Deterrence," *Journal of Philosophy*, 75 (1978), pp. 285–302.

- John Kleinig, *Punishment and Desert* (Martinus Nijhoff, The Hague: 1973).
- Douglas Lackey, "Ethics and Nuclear Deterrence," in James Rachels, ed., *Moral Problems* (Harper & Row, New York: 1979), pp. 426–42.
- Ramon Lemos, "A Defense of Retributivism," *Southern Journal of Philosophy*, 15 (1971), pp. 53–65.
- M. H. Lessnoff, "Justice, Social Contract, and Universal Prescriptivism," *Philosophical Quarterly*, 28 (1978), pp. 65–73.
- David Lyons, *Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism* (Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1965).
- David Lyons, "On Sanctioning Excuses," *Journal of Philosophy*, 66 (1969), pp. 646–60.
- MacCallum, "Law, Conscience, and Integrity," in Norman Care and Thomas Trelogan, eds., *Issues in Law and Morality* (Case Western Reserve Univ. Press, Cleveland: 1975), pp. 141–59.
- Phillip Montague, "Comparative and Noncomparative Justice," *The Philosophical Quarterly* (forthcoming, 1980).
- Nollaig McKenzie, "An Alternative Derivation of the Difference Principle," *Dialogue*, 13 (1974), pp. 787–93.
- H. J. McCloskey, "The Morality of Punishment of the 'Moral' Criminal," in Milton Goldinger, ed., *Punishment and Human Rights* (Schenkman Pub. Co., Cambridge, Mass.: 1974), pp. 117–40.
- Michael McDermott, "How to Preach," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 8 (1978), pp. 633–52.
- Robert McShea, "Human Nature and Ethical Theory," *Philosophy & Phenomenological Research*, 39 (1979), pp. 386–401.
- Herbert Morris, *On Guilt and Innocence* (Univ. of California, Berkeley: 1976).
- Norval Morris, "The Future of Imprisonment: Toward a Punitive Philosophy," *Michigan Law Review*, 72 (1974), pp. 1161–80.
- Thomas Nagel, *Mortal Questions* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge: 1979).
- Note, "Criminal Liability Without Fault: A Philosophical Perspective," *Columbia Law Review*, 75 (1975), pp. 1517–77.
- Note, "Laws That Are Made to be Broken: Adjusting for Anticipated Non-compliance," *Michigan Law Review*, 75 (1977), pp. 687–716.
- Robert Nozick, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (Basic Books, New York: 1974).
- William Parent, "The Whole Life View of Criminal Desert," *Ethics*, 86 (1976), pp. 350–54.
- William Parent, "Fried on Rights and Moral Personality," *Ethics*, 90 (1979), pp. 141–56.
- Roger Pilon, "Criminal Remedies: Restitution, Punishment, or Both?," *Ethics*, 88 (1978), pp. 348–57.

- Adrian Piper, "Utility, Publicity, and Manipulation," *Ethics*, 88 (1978), pp. 189–206.
- Joshua Rabinowitz, "Emergent Problems and Optimal Solutions," *Arizona Law Review*, 19 (1977), pp. 61–157.
- James Rachels, "What People Deserve," in John Arthur and William Shaw, eds., *Justice and Economic Distribution* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: 1978), pp. 150–63.
- Margaret Radin, "The Jurisprudence of Death: Evolving Standards for the Cruel and Unusual Punishments Clause," *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 126 (1978), pp. 989–1064.
- Anthony Ralls, "Rational Morality for Empirical Man," *Philosophy*, 44 (1969), pp. 205–16.
- John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass.: 1971).
- David Richards, *The Moral Criticism of Law* (Dickenson Pub. Co., Encino, Calif.: 1977).
- W. D. Ross, *The Right and the Good* (The Clarendon Press, Oxford: 1930).
- S. F. Sapontzis, "Are Animals Moral Beings?," *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 17 (1980), pp. 45–52.
- Rolf Sartorius, *Individual Conduct and Social Norms* (Dickenson Pub. Co., Encino, Calif.: 1975).
- George Sher, "An Unsolved Problem About Punishment," *Social Theory & Practice*, 4 (1977), pp. 149–65.
- William Simon, "The Ideology of Advocacy: Procedural Justice and Professional Ethics," *Wisconsin Law Review*, 1978, pp. 29–144.
- Marcus Singer, "The Methods of Justice: Reflections on Rawls," *Journal of Value Inquiry*, 10 (1976), pp. 286–316.
- Edward Sankowski, "Freedom, Determinism and Character," *Mind*, 89 (1980), pp. 106–13.
- Michael Slote, "Understanding Free Will," *The Journal of Philosophy*, 77 (1980), pp. 136–51.
- Frank Snare, "Dissolving the Moral Contract," *Philosophy*, 52 (1977), pp. 301–12.
- T. L. S. Sprigge, "Punishment and Moral Responsibility," in Milton Goldinger, ed., *Punishment and Human Rights* (Schenkman Pub. Co., Cambridge, Mass.: 1974), pp. 73–97.
- James Sterba, "Retributive Justice," *Political Theory*, 5 (1977), pp. 349–62.
- P. F. Strawson, *Freedom and Resentment and Other Essays* (Methuen & Co., London: 1974), pp. 1–25.
- Ernest van den Haag, *Punishing Criminals* (Basic Books, New York: 1975).

- Richard Wasserstrom, "Some Problems in the Definition and Justification of Punishment," in Alvin Goldman and Jaegwon Kim, eds., *Values and Morals* (D. Reidel Pub. Co., Dordrecht, Holland: 1978), pp. 299–315.
- Gary Watson, "Skepticism About Weakness of the Will," *Philosophical Review*, 86 (1977), pp. 316–39.
- Alan Wertheimer, "Deterrence and Retribution," *Ethics*, 86 (1976), pp. 181–99.
- Alan Wertheimer, "Punishing the Innocent—Unintentionally," *Inquiry*, 20 (1977), pp. 45–65.
- Alan Wertheimer, "Should Punishment Fit the Crime?," *Social Theory & Practice*, 3 (1975), pp. 403–23.
- James White, "Making Sense of the Criminal Law," *University of Colorado Law Review*, 50 (1978), pp. 1–27.
- Daniel Wikler, "Paternalism and the Mildly Retarded," *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 8 (1979), pp. 377–92.
- Bernard Williams, "A Critique of Utilitarianism," in J. J. C. Smart and Bernard Williams, *Utilitarianism: For and Against* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge: 1973), pp. 77–150.
- Peter Williams, "Losing Claims of Rights," *The Journal of Value Inquiry*, 12 (1978), pp. 178–90.
- Susan Wolf, "Asymmetrical Freedom," *The Journal of Philosophy*, 77 (1980), pp. 151–66.
- Robert Young, "Autonomy and the 'Inner Self,'" *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 17 (1980), pp. 35–43.
- Susan Zaw, "'Irresistible Impulse' and Moral Responsibility," in Godfrey Vesey, ed., *Human Values* (Humanities Press, Atlantic Highlands, N.J.: 1978), pp. 99–134.