

Olivia Ernst

Mrs. Housepian

English 2H; Period 5

22 January 2015

Decency Should Make Us Samaritans

Is it one's ethical responsibility to help someone in need? In Jay Sterling Silver's article, "Can the Law Make Us Be Decent?" he argues that an individual who knows another is in danger and fails to help should be punished. Those who do not render minimal assistance to someone in need should be punished. By helping, easily preventable deaths can be avoided and better ethics are demonstrated.

Individuals who choose to not assist someone in need should be punished because helping can prevent deaths. In the article, "Ill-Equipped Rescuers Dig Out Volcano Victims," the author discusses the tragedy of Armero, stating, "Residents who survived said the loss of life could have been prevented... officials failed to react fast enough to evacuate the town" (Graham 4). Easily preventable deaths occurred because officials were too slow to tell the town to evacuate. The officials chose to not help by not acting fast enough to save the town, and caused preventable deaths. As a result, these officials should be punished. Additionally, in the short story "And Of Clay Are We Created," the narrator tries to save Azucena, a young girl affected by the tragedy of Armero: "I called all the important people in the city... begging them for a pump to remove the silt, but obtained only vague promises" (Allende 158-162). The narrator tried to find someone to help her save Azucena by providing a pump, but no one wanted to help, resulting in Azucena's death. The people that the narrator reached out to did not help and therefore caused Azucena's death, which could have been easily prevented with a simple pump. For that reason, these people should be punished. Therefore, because helping

someone in need can prevent deaths, those who do not help should be punished.

Another reason why those who do not help others in need should be punished is because helping is the more ethical thing to do. In the article, “If Decency Doesn’t, Law Should Make Us Samaritans,” the authors argue that laws should be created throughout the United States requiring bystanders to act, claiming, “If each of us recognized a moral responsibility to come to the aid of others, we would all gain the benefits of a stronger and safer community” (Allred and Bloom 2). Once everyone realizes their ethical responsibility to help those in need, our community will become much safer. Since people who act to help others in need recognize ethical responsibility and demonstrate better ethics, those who choose to not help should be punished. Moreover, in the article, “Can the Law Make Us Be Decent?” the author argues that people should be required to help those in need: “A duty to help would not require bystanders to endanger themselves and provide help beyond their abilities... it would require us to accept our fundamental moral duty to help those in grave peril” (Silver 2). Helping out others does not mean bystanders need to put their life at risk, but they need to accept their ethical responsibility to do something to help. Therefore, since helping others in dire situations requires morals and good ethics, those who do not help should be punished. People who do not help others in need should be punished because it is more ethical and humane to help.

Those who choose to not help someone in a dire situation should be punished, because helping demonstrates higher morals and prevents deaths. Ethical responsibility should be taken into account each time one encounters someone in need.

Rubric rating submitted on: 1/29/2016, 12:09:23 PM by c.smart@ggusd.net

	5	4	3	2	1
Overall Description of what each	A 5 essay demonstrates a clear	A 4 essay demonstrates proficient	A 3 essay demonstrates developing	A 2 essay is seriously flawed.	A 1 essay demonstrates fundamental

score looks like; this row is for informational purposes only. See YOUR score below. Your score:	competence in writing. It may have some errors, but they are not serious enough to distract or confuse the reader. (A 6 essay is superior writing which meets the criteria of a Score of 5, and is especially distinctive in its exceptionally coherent and well-developed argument, thorough development of analysis of specifics related to the prompt and text(s), and impressive control of language.)	writing. It may have some errors that distract the reader, but they do not significantly obscure meaning.	competence, but is flawed in some significant way(s).		deficiencies in writing skills.
Statement of Purpose/Focus (a-b) Your score: 4	(a) Claim is clear, focused, and maintained. [if applicable: (b) Alternate or opposing claim(s) are adequately addressed.]	(a) Claim is clear, and for the most part maintained, though some loosely relevant material may be present. [if applicable: (b) Alternate or opposing claim(s) are introduced.]	(a) Claim may be clearly focused, but is flawed in some significant way(s). [if applicable: (b) Alternate or opposing claim(s) are unclear or unfocused.]	(a) Claim is unfocused and/or insufficiently sustained. [if applicable: (b) Alternate or opposing claim(s) are unclear or not present.]	(a) Claim may be confusing or ambiguous. [if applicable: (b) Alternate or opposing claim(s) are not present.]
Organization	(c) Consistent	(c) Adequate	(c) Inconsistent	(c) Limited use	(c) Few or no

(c-e) Your score: 5	use of transitional strategies. (d) Logical progression of ideas from beginning to end. (e) Effective introduction and conclusion for audience and purpose.	use of transitional strategies with some variety. (d) Adequate progression of ideas from beginning to end. (e) Adequate introduction and conclusion.	use of basic transitional strategies with little variety. (d) Uneven progression of ideas from beginning to end. (e) Introduction and conclusion are present.	of basic transitional strategies with little or no variety. (d) Unclear progression of ideas from beginning to end. (e) Introduction and conclusion are attempted but insufficient.	transitional strategies are evident. (d) Has a major drift in the progression of ideas/completely off topic. (e) Introduction and/or conclusion may not be present.
Elaboration of Evidence (f-g) Your score: 5	(f) Relevant evidence from a sufficient amount of sources is effectively integrated with appropriate citation. (g) Effective use of elaborative techniques ("means/matters").	(f) Relevant evidence from a sufficient amount of sources is integrated, though integration may be slightly awkward, general, or imprecise. (g) Adequate use of some elaborative techniques. ("means/matters")	(f) Evidence from sources is weakly and awkwardly integrated and citations, if present, are inconsistent. (g) Marginal or inconsistent use of elaborative techniques ("means/matters").	(f) Evidence from sources, although included, is insufficient and inappropriately integrated or cited. (g) Elaborative techniques are weak.	(f) Use of evidence from sources is minimal, absent, in error, or irrelevant. (g) Elaborative techniques are absent.
Language, Vocabulary (h) & Style Your score: 5	(h) Proper use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is appropriate for the audience and purpose. Proper voice, tone, and perspective is used. Distinct writing style is	(h) Use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is generally appropriate for the audience and purpose. Mostly the proper voice, tone, and perspective is used. A	(h) Use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary may at times be inappropriate for the audience and purpose. Voice, tone, and perspective	(h) Use of academic and domain-specific vocabulary is largely inappropriate for the audience and purpose. Voice, tone, and perspective is inappropriate	(h) Uses limited academic language or domain-specific vocabulary and has little sense of audience and purpose. Voice, tone, and/or perspective is

	used.	distinct writing style is attempted.	may be inappropriate or inconsistent. Writing style is vague or overly simplistic.	or causes major inconsistencies in the paper. Simplistic writing style limits effectiveness of paper.	confusingly inconsistent or inappropriate. Writing style is unrecognizable .
Conventions (i-j) Your score: 5	(i) Demonstrates some syntactical variety, and has limited or no errors in grammar, usage, and sentence formation. (j) Standard use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.	(i) Some errors in grammar, usage, and sentence formation may be present, but no systematic pattern of errors is displayed. (j) Some errors in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.	(i) Frequent errors in grammar and usage may obscure meaning. (j) Frequent errors in punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.	(i) Frequent errors in grammar, usage, and sentence formation obscure meaning. (j) Frequent errors and/or limited use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.	(i) Errors in grammar, usage, and sentence formation are frequent and severe, and meaning is often obscured. (j) Inappropriate or incorrect use of punctuation, capitalization, and spelling.

Comments:

5-