Reflection Task

Abstract

Over the course of the project, I have been contemplating the importance of law-abidingness when compared to an urgent or even dire situation. It has gotten me to ponder over the meaning of morality and the very nature of us human beings. It started with a thought at the time incomplete, like a seedling yet to blossom into a magnificent tree of wisdom. Is the law a pillar instrumental in maintaining the human order? What is morality? Why does one act the way one does when given a pressing situation? Is all fair in love and war?

Today, though that seedling has not yet fully grown into the mother tree, mother Gaia has continued to bless its growth. Its fruits are ripe for the picking, and I shall share the insights I have gained over this project.

Introduction

One has pondered, in a situation of pure desperation and urgency. Should the law be upheld. Though legalists may argue that the law, an instrument to maintain order in the human society, is critical and should be upheld with utmost rigour at all times. The philosophers of both old and new have argued against such a preposterous notion. The law, legalists argue, is a tool essential to maintaining order in human society, without it, there will be no society. By the very nature of human beings, we are but selfish creatures acting in ways that benefit only ourselves, thus, the law is necessary in making sure all humans follow a set of societal regulations that dictate what shall and shan't be allowed, to maximise benefits for the society. One might think that idea originates from the economic left, yet many a peer of Karl Marx argues against such a notion, particularly Leon Trotsky, believing in Anarchism. In which there are no rules to follow nor laws to be upheld. In our situations here, particularly case 3, the dilemma of the bomb, our character (the player), chooses between crossing the street and saving the lives of others, or obeying the law and watching the building explode. This case highlights a nature of human beings not seen in other animals – Empathy. It is our natural empathy that drives us to risk even our lives to help others. If the law was truly to maintain social order, then in this case it is doing the opposite. By defusing the bomb, we uphold social order while saving others lives. It shows that in times of desperation, the law is not needed.

For an out of project look at this question. We must briefly discuss war. In times of desperation such as facing an invasion, should the citizens under fire continue to follow the law? The law forbids murder, yet on the battlefield, murder becomes a tool for survival for victims. Should the civilians choose to obey the law they'd be dead, whereas if they break it, they'd live. From another angle, there are no police officers to uphold social order in times of war. If there is no one to uphold the law, does the law still matter? If a tree falls in

a forest and no one is there to listen, does it still make a sound? Such profound unanswered question. Yet I shall answer them from the wisdom gathered, no. The law only matters when there are those who uphold them, or see them happens or whatnot. That is how it should be.

project

The project, besides make me question my own existence due to the level of errors I had to go through. Case 3 and 4 are the more interesting cases I have come up with. Case 3 lets the player wrestle with the survival of others or obeying the law, even though the answer should be obvious. And case 4 comes up with a completely unrealistic case and shows the player the opinion of the author(me).

The outcomes shows the delicate balance between morality and doing what you believe to be right. In some cases, being moral trumps that of being right, in other cases, not so much. But what I believe my project excels in is showing the nuance in a situation. It makes the player ponder about the seriousness in an absurd scenario.

I'm pretty sure my thoughts on the matter are pretty obvious. Though I would reiterate it again, it's obvious that I agree that in cases where it is of critical importance to "break" the law. Not in an egregious manner, but one which hovers over the edge of legality.

Implementing the scoring system, awakened me. As I realized that in real life we have no scoring system (surprising I know), yet we still keep a "mental score" of some kind to justify our actions. Then I realized at the end of the day, the whole point of morals is to justify logically idiotic actions as being above the more rational actions. Then it dawned upon me the facade we all live in. What is the point of logic, but to use as a tool to justify unjustifiable actions. We do things not because it is the most objective but because it is more accepting in the eyes of others. To truly defy this unchanging constant of society is to argue against society itself.