

Ethical decisions in the most dangerous game and barn burning

[Literature](#), [Books](#)



Ethical decisions can be determined many of ways there is no correct or incorrect ethical choice. The major impact of ethical decision figures out what is correct or off-base thing to do. If you comprehend what your ethics are and where you remain in life it will be simpler to live step by step and make the correct ethical choice. When talking about ethical decisions, in these two short stories *The Most Dangerous Game* by Richard Connell and *Barn Burning* by William Faulkner; the two characters Rainsford and Sarty will end up making choices that we will determine whether ethical or unethical.

First off, in *The Most Dangerous Game*, I believe Rainsford is not correct in saying ' Who cares how a jaguar feels?'. I know that the Game is a game for chasing wild animals and killing, but I don't think other individuals should hunt other individuals if the challenge for killing animals is way simpler. Toward the finish of the story Rainsford is happy with the death of Zaroff because he can never again worry for his survival and is compensated with an agreeable bed and land to call his own. Even though he may be relaxed and stress free he will always have to live with the conscious of killing those individuals who were embarked to slaughter him. Instead of just killing himself General Zaroff instead of those other individuals that were told by General Zaroff to kill him. The ethical decision that Rainsford should have done was to go to the higher authorities and let them handle it. That would have been a lot easier and a lot of less people being killed.

At the point when Rainsford first discovered them for progress he would not help him in any capacity so General Zaroff took him in and acquainted him

with everybody. Rainsford held resentment in the back of his brain until the time came. While being chased by these two men. Taking out Ivan was a simple errand and help since he wasn't as experienced in the amusement chasing people as Zaroff seemed to be. After taking out Ivan. Rainsford could then concentrate on the greater danger who is known for chasing man and who likewise had a pack of chasing hounds. Indeed, self-protection is valid. I concur with what Rainsford did. As a wild creature which he is delineated as cornered and had nothing left to do other than bouncing or biting the dust. He took the most dangerous choice and went for the act of pure trust seeking after the best as he did. Rainsford made up for himself by hopping off the bluff and shockingly enduring it. He then later returned for vengeance guaranteeing his position of authority.

Secondly, in the story Barn Burning, Sarty Snopes and his family sees that the barn they were living in for four days had been in flames. His dad Abner Snopes is the bad person who started the fire. So, when they noticed the barn was in flames he tries and get everyone together and he tries to make sure Sarty especially because he is worried Sarty would tell and ruin what he was doing. Well right before Sarty was held and not capable of telling he got away to warn the owner of the barn that his barn was in flames. I believe he had made the right ethical decision by warning Major de Spain. Although the consequences were wrong with his dad dying he h made the right ethical choice. If Sarty had not warned the owner of the barn about the barn and stuff I believe he would have shared the guilt and eventually then throw his dad under the bus and say his dad was the one who cause the burning

barns. The only thing I believe Sarty could have done differently so his father would still be alive is that he could have put out the fire himself instead of telling Major de Spain.

Additionally, regardless of how much love he had for his father there is no reason why Sarty should feel guilty because ethically that was the right decision. Throughout the story Sarty keeps his mouth shut about what his father was doing because of the love and stuff for his dad. Abner had kept telling Sarty throughout the story that he was becoming a man and that right there had another piece that made Sarty be a man and tell Major about what Abner was doing to the barn. Although Abner is ethically wrong for burning the barn there is a little responsibility that the Major should take. Abner is not just doing this for fun and games he is doing it with a purpose to get his message across that a man shouldn't be rich because of the sweat of a poor man. So now when Abner burned the major's barn, the major now must explain the death of a veteran with no proof that he burned his barn. The major could have sat down and spoke to the family about what happened instead of taking fatal shots. But he just listens to the warning of Sarty and fired his gun and killed Sarty's dad.

In conclusion, in both short stories *The Most Dangerous Game* by Richard Connell and *Barn Burning* by William Faulkner I believe the characters Rainsford and Sarty were both ethically right with what they did. But Rainsford could have done it a whole lot different. Because I believe it not right to just murder and get away with it, but these people were coming after him so by all means I believe it was kind of a self-defense type thing. Sarty

on other hands was totally right with what he did. He had to overcome the love and bond he had with his dad to be able to tell the major about what his dad was doing and that takes a lot of courage to do. So, all in all I believe they both were ethically right in their decisions of what they did.