

Research Paper

Should parents be held accountable for criminal acts of their children?

Recently, it has been stated that youth gang connected attacks have been occurring, with some even causing deaths, such as the killing of a college student at Suburbs East. Such occurrences have made a lot of people to wonder at the origin of those violent actions, with no lesser extent of guilt being put on the parents of such adolescences. Nevertheless, one has to question if the parents have to be penalized for the offenses of the kids.

Recently, it has been stated that youth gang connected attacks have been occurring, with some even causing deaths, such as the killing of a college student at Suburbs East. Such occurrences have made a lot of people to wonder at the origin of those violent actions, with no lesser extent of guilt being put on the parents of such adolescences. Nevertheless, one has to question if the parents have to be penalized for the offenses of the kids.

From the beginning, some people believe that they should be held responsible for the criminal acts of their offspring because parents are mostly accountable in place of the education of their kids and frequently impact the actions and behavior of the child when he or she is mature. This is because they are always the first ones that a kid know after his or her birth plus they use much of the time with them when they are growing. As such, it is believed that parents start influencing the ethical range of the child from a young age and one's ethical remit are critically impacted by the way parents act and their personality (Gratz, 169).

Disgruntled customers, activists or even the government may file lawsuits against unethical business practices that the company may be involved in. The company, therefore, would have to incur costs in terms of paying for legal support employed in settling the lawsuit. This would however not be the case were the company to follow a strict code of ethics consistently hence we can conclude that ethical principles help business organizations to avoid unnecessary costs.

It makes them responsible for their children when they do wrong later on because they are understood not to have raised their child in the right way. Furthermore, there exists an argument that children are completely controlled by their parents as they are apt to want to make their parents happy and they would, therefore, listen to whatever they are told to do or how they are told to behave (Michael, Andrew and Michael, 4). It in return makes many people think that parents are always the ones to be blamed due to the criminal acts of their children as they believe that they have the power to warn and control them.

Parents are also held accountable since some people trust that they should be the blames after their offspring commit crimes as the guilt can simply be suitably placed on the parents. It mainly because of the belief that a teenager is the outcome of his or her childhood and that someone should take accountability for the destruction and trouble caused by the offspring. Because of all these causes, many think that they should be accounted for their children's offenses (Valentine, 80).

However, this should not be so as not all parents are entirely responsible for those criminal acts. Although there are some parents who have not remained a good encouragement on their teenagers, it does not mean that all are a bad influence. Certainly, several children do wrong and show violence because their parents aggressively ill-treated them at their young age. Maybe their parents showed them that it is okay to commit crimes or they saw them doing crimes.

Nevertheless, in spite of that, there are still many parents who have properly raised their kids and even prevented them from committing crimes and still their children prosper in doing the acts. In such circumstances, parents should not be held responsible. As conflicting to what lots of people might believe, parents do not have thorough control over their youngsters and many are even not aware of what their children are capable of doing regardless of spending time with them (Valentine, 67).

An example would be a young girl from Japan who murdered her friend in 2004. This was because she was not happy with her because she was an average girl from an average family with a decent educational record. This murder explains that parents do not inevitably make the kid to do wrong. There are some circumstances where the parents are not completely to blame for their kid's misconducts as they have already done their part and what they can to teach their child correctly and offer them with the right ethical compass. It would, therefore, be wrong to blame all parents of triggering their children to commit offenses, and as such, not all parents ought to be accountable and as a result punished for their children's crimes (Gratz, 169).

Also, the influence of the parent is simply one factor that forms the right compass of a child, with other impacts counting, and not comprehensively, school, belief, and law. Other factors may make a child to commit a crime, so it is not only because of parental influence. For instance, of late there are a lot of violent games and cinemas that are being at large on the market, rarely with any practical, methodical limitations to stop the young from getting uncovered to such behavior. If these children watched such games that are violent from their childhood, there is a likelihood that they will ultimately learn their deeds from the games and demonstration like viciousness in their lives, possibly even to the degree of committing offenses.

In such a state, the major issue that has inclined the ethical compass of a child and made him or her to do wrong would be the means and consequently, the parents should not be merely responsible for the crimes committed by the kids. For example, in America, the sale of weapons is permitted. If the parents do not carefully preserve the weapons away, these hazardous arms could perhaps end in the hands of teenagers who are quiet too young and might not know the damage these firearms could bring (Arthur, 247).

If the kid ends up using the weapon to hurt anyone, the government should also be held accountable as it was the regulation that first delivered it to the youngster, though not directly, with comparatively easy contact to such hazardous firearms. Since there are some diverse features involved in triggering the child to wrongdoings, parents should not be merely rebuked for the offenses; instead, the punishment should be distributed among everyone who took part.

Moreover, on parental obligation laws in some countries, it is impossible to define the precise age of criminal accountability. Therefore, there are inconsistencies in evaluating the age of a child of criminal charge among many countries globally. For instance, in India and Thailand, the illegitimate obligation age is seven years, whereas, in China and Japan, it is fourteen years. This huge breach between the altered ages of criminal responsibility demonstrates that even the realm is not able to define precisely what age a child should be to be unlawfully responsible. Also, if this is not secure and a decision has not been made concerning it, then it should not be made a problem of the rule, which should be established and decided upon by most individuals.

As a result, I think that parents should never be punished under some laws that are grounded in such undecided and diverse years of criminal responsibility as it would cause conflicts in the penance of parents from several nations. For example, as for the case of the Japanese girl who murdered her friend, her parents could be held accountable because they are in Japan but would not be responsible if they are from India (Gratz, 169).

It demonstrates the conflict in a penalty of parents could come from the diverse ages of criminal liability in diverse states. Such laws blame parents and are displayed as wholly accountable for children below the age of criminal charge and chastised on behalf of their kids even though they had nothing to do with the crime. Such a law is also endorsed under the statement that there are no other subsidizing reasons to the acts of the child, which is not constantly the situation (Arthur, 236).

In my judgment, instead of holding parents accountable for the wrongdoings of their kids that are below the criminal liability age, they should be regarded as being acquitted till they are upheld guilty instead of being supposed to be responsible even before they are upheld to be. This puts parents in an underprivileged and prejudicial place.

As such, parents should not be held responsible for the crimes committed by their offspring unless proven guilty (Valentine, 69).

Additionally, parents should not be answerable and penalized for the wrongdoings of their children because the choice to commit the offense is made completely by the children without involving the parents. A kid has the decision as to whether to commit the offense before doing it, and if the child commits the wrongdoing, it displays that he or she choose to do it. Even though there was exterior stimulus, the final decision lies with the kid. Intrinsically, the parents should not be answerable or responsible for the wrong choices of their children. Some may then say that such an opinion would work if only the child is mature enough to make complete and healthy choices (Gratz, 169).

In conclusion, the projected fault of parents for their children who are below criminal accountability age and have done a crime is a means of directing all the responsibility to the parents. In the judgments of humanity, once such offenses are committed, a person requires to be prepared for compensation of the costs and the guilt. As the kids are thought not to be capable of real criminal acts and therefore not intricate in making a decision to commit the wrongdoing, parents are accused and chastised for being merely accountable for the kids (Arthur, 253).

In my opinion, a judgment of the sort should be altered as a kid's command of an offense is because of the discussed decision of a child and maybe the outcome of the impact of other aspects, taking the parents as not the only ones to be held accountable for the deeds of their children. As such, I disagree with the statement that parents should be merely answerable and chastised for the actions of their kids and other reasons should be considered when determining who to be held accountable.

Works Cited

Arthur, Raymond. "Punishing parents for the crimes of their children." *The Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 44.3 (2005): 233-253.

Gratz, Andrew C. "Increasing the price of parenthood: When should parents be held civilly liable for the torts of their children." *Hous. L. Rev.* 39 (2002): 169.

Michael, Katina, Andrew McNamee, and Michael G. Michael. "The emerging ethics of human centric GPS tracking and monitoring." *2006 International Conference on Mobile Business*. IEEE, 2006.

Valentine, Gill. "' Oh Yes I Can.'" "Oh no you can't": Children and parents' understandings of kids' competence to negotiate public space safely." *Antipode* 2: 65-89.