

Overview and Instructions

If you have not done so, be sure to read the **Case Analysis Structure Overview**.

In this case analysis you have five tasks:

1. Explain your understanding of the case.
2. Give a thorough, philosophical exegesis of the relevant aspects of the ACLU paper, Kant and Van den Haag's arguments
3. Present an argument applying the relevant philosophers to the case at hand. This should include an account of what each philosopher would argue should happen to Bob.
4. Present an argument explaining why one of the philosophers can be viewed as offering a more successful solution to the case at hand.
5. In ONE paragraph, explain how you think we should treat Bob.

Case

Consider Bob. Bob was raised by wolves (literally – don't ask me how). Although his IQ would probably be normal, there is no way to test it, since Bob doesn't speak or read any human language. One day, Bob emerged from the wilderness and ended up Downtown -- the snazzy part of the city. He was hungry (presumably) so he "found" some food in the normal wolf way: he stalked a mother walking her baby and, deciding it was easiest to prey on the weaker, killed and ate the baby. There's no question that Bob is "guilty" of the crime. He did it and there were lots of witnesses. What punishment should Bob get?

Upload your Capital Punishment Case Analysis here.