

# Free creative writing on hit and run dilemma

[Life](#), [Friendship](#)



Best friend: (After hitting down and killing an old woman due to careless driving). You must promise not tell anyone about this incident.

Kant: A hit and run dilemma must involve an unlawful driving practice where the person liable for perpetrating or partaking in the accident declines to stop and assume accountability as required by the law. As opposed to adhering to the recommended procedure after such a misfortune or acting as recourse for any affected victim.

Hume: In your scenario, a hit and run incident arises since your colleague was accountable for the accident but decided to abscond the scene without complying with due process, and since the victim died, he should have called and waited for the authorities to record his statement and acquire personal information (Plato 1).

Rousseau: Unfortunately, if he could have adhered to the required due process and the authorities find away to prove that he violated traffic rules, he could have faced the relevant penalties including imprisonment.

Kant: In your position, you should have nevertheless convinced your friend to comply with the recommended due process before he fled away, which would have disqualified the accident from being a hit and run, to an unfortunate incident.

Me: I tried my best to advise my colleague to report the incident at the nearest police station immediately when we left the scene, but he was very categorical that we should keep it as a secret between us, and when I insisted he visible became irritated so I backed off.

Hume: Ethical concepts indicate that motive alone might not be enough to persuade the will, and instead it is the " slave of passions," therefore ethical

diversities can never be manipulated by rationality, but the moral thoughts (Plato 1).

This means that you should have, and can still successfully exploit the acquaintance between you and your colleague to persuade him into reporting the matter.

Me: You are absolutely right and I am even confused considering the moral perspective of the accident, since he particularly violated multiple traffic rules including running red lights along a dark avenue, and communicating on the phone while over speeding.

Rousseau: Knocking down a pedestrian might not be regarded as an illegal act specifically when it is an accident such as in your case, but the driver is nonetheless required to stop, offer necessary assistance to the victim(s), and report to as well as wait for the authorities (Thomas 1).

Kant: Your colleague was hence not liable for committing particularly a hit and run crime until the moment he decided to flee the scene without adhering to the relevant procedures.

Hume: While you as a passenger was not liable for equal accountabilities as the driver, who exhibited a lawful commitment to stop, provide aid, call and wait for the authorities.

Rousseau: A passenger or observer is not obliged by the constitution to avail information concerning the incident, but the commitment might be derived from the concept of observing decency.

Kant: Although there are grounds of criminal accountability that are relevant to other individuals aside from the actual culprit, such as the 'misprision' of an offense, where an individual has a prior knowledge regarding a crime but

is reluctant to report it to the police.

: You might therefore be apprehended for criminal responsibility as an “ accessory after the fact” that you were aware of the felony and facilitated your colleague’s effort to elude justice.

Hume: Second parties, such as you in this scenario, can as well be seized for facilitating and hiding a felony when you particularly agreed to assist or conspire with my colleague to evade the accident by, for example, helping to neutralize the evidence such as hiding the car.

Rousseau: But because in this case you are just an eyewitness, in absence of any involvement or assistance you cannot be rendered accountable for a crime (Thomas 1).

Me: You are right, therefore, I will definitely handover my colleague to the authorities if he fails to listen to my advice, though I will have to tread carefully and not to get into harms way by reporting the incident covertly without his knowledge or engaging a third party.

Me: I think that is a very inappropriate action. We should call the authorities immediately.

Kant: Your best friend should take the most appropriate action for reasons best known to him. If his decision is to speed off and pretend nothing ever happened, that decision should be respected.

Best friend: Yes, Kant is right. The major decision here is mine to take.

**Me: That argument is partly true, but the question of morality comes up in this situation.**

Best friend: What do you exactly mean?

Me: Leaving this woman here is after knocking her down is morally evil. If

you had been driving carefully, none of this would have happened. Since, you played the biggest role in this accident, you should take responsibility.

Rousseau: I agree with you. You should notify the authority about this incident. Your best friend should be responsible.

Best friend: Such a decision would be the worst mistake of my life. If I surrender myself to the authorities, I will be locked up in jail for a very long time. Since this kind of manslaughter is voluntary, I will be sentenced to more than ten years in jail (Findlaw).

Rousseau: I think you are only concerned about your well-being. You care less about the woman you have just killed by driving carelessly.

Roche foucauld: I fully concur with Roche foucauld's argument. Your opinion is influenced by the principle of amour propre also known as self-love (Roche foucauld). The action you intend to take is influenced by the love for yourself only. The best measure here is to take responsibility and report this incident to the authority.

Best friend: We hear of hit and run cases almost on a daily basis. In Los Angeles alone, 20,000 cases are reported annually (Laist). I find no reason to inform the authorities about this incident. We should let this incident pass just like the others.

Kant: Yes, that is true. The decision is yours to make. Morality is defined by reason. Your reason will dictate your action. If you decide to take no action, you have your reasons not to. People will pass your decision as morally upright. The rest of us should not judge your reasons and decision.

Rousseau: I do not agree with Kant's argument. If we choose to let people make decisions based on their reasons alone, we will be promoting evil in

our society. Everybody will justify his or her actions no matter how wrong those decisions will be. The incident we have here, especially, should be condemned to the toughest terms possible. The best friend was driving carefully. If he had been keen, this woman would probably be still alive.

Me: That is true. I challenge my best friend to assume the position of this woman's friend or relative. Would he be so kind to a careless driver who killed his friend or relative? I believe not. He should show the same responsibility that he would demand then.

Best friend: Majority of you fail to understand the fact that my future is at stake. If I surrender myself to the authority, I will have an uncertain future. I will lose my job and the trust of those I value most in my life. The underlying factor here is that this woman has passed away. Even if I surrender myself to the authority, she will still be gone.

Rochefoucauld: That is a very irresponsible statement. If we argue in that manner, we will be justifying the evil deeds of murderers and other criminals. We shall have a society with no rule of law. There shall be no justice for innocent victims, and evil doers will go unpunished. Your love and concern for yourself should not surpass the concern you have for others.

Hume: I understand the difference in opinion between you and your best friend. The ideas you have are connected to internal feelings in both of you (Morris and Brown). However, I believe that this incident should be reported to the authorities.

## **Best friend. Does this mean that my best friend wants me to go to jail?**

Me: That is not what I mean. My point is that we should follow the right channel to address this issue for fairness and justice to all. Furthermore, we should not be so pessimistic that you will be prosecuted and jailed if we call the authorities. Let us give justice a chance for the best results.

Kant: If you indeed mean well for your best friend, then let him make the decision here based on his reasons. His reasons alone will set him free.

Rousseau: Your best friend and Kant seem to be driven by pity and self-preservation. If we allow these factors to motivate everyone, we shall have a society where human beings live like animals. People should not be motivated by their self-pity and preservation. There shall be no one left to care and show love to the poor and disabled. The woman you knocked down, for instance, was poor judging from her dressing and the work she was doing. We should not discriminate against her because of her social status. We should stand against a society where some people dominate over others for their happiness.

Rocheffoucauld: I cannot concur more. The inequality we have in the society today is a result of the concern people have for themselves. Very few people in our society today would sacrifice their happiness for their neighbors' sake. In addition, the poor have been left for themselves. Those in a position to help are not willing to do so. To correct this negative norm, we have to start with the incidences we are closest to. Let us not allow the poor and minority to be discriminated against as we watch. They should access justice just like everybody else.

Kant: I now understand the point you are trying to make. As much as some

of us base morality on human reason, evil should have no chance in the society. Our reasons must be sober and justified. Therefore, I do agree my colleagues that this incident should be reported to the authorities.

Me: I appreciate the fact that most of you have finally agreed with me. I urge my best friend to report to the police immediately so that justice will be served to all.

## Works Cited

Findlaw. " Voluntary Manslaughter Penalties and Sentencing." 2014. Web. 6 Dec. 2014 <http://criminal.findlaw.com/criminal-charges/voluntary-manslaughter-penalties-and-sentencing.html>

Laist. " Motion To Shrink L. A.'s 20, 000 Annual Hit-And-Run Cases Goes Before Public Safety Committee." Jul. 2014. Web. 6 Dec. 2014.

Morris, William and Brown, Charlotte R. " Brown Hume", Stanford

Encyclopedia of Philosophy. < <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/hume/> >

Roche foucauld, La. Maxims. Killington Way, South Bend: St Augustine Pr Inc, 2009. Print.

Thomas, Jeremy. Santa Maria's hit-and-run dilemma. Santa Maria Sun, 2014.

Web. 6 December 2014, < <http://www.santamariasun.com/cover/1794/santa-marias-hitandrundilemma/>>

< <http://www.phillymag.com/news/2014/05/20/moral-dilemma-theres-app/>>

Plato. Hume's Moral Philosophy. Plato Stanford. 29 October, 2004. Web. 6 December, 2014.

< <http://www.phillymag.com/news/2014/05/20/moral-dilemma-theres-app/>>