

Maryam kurbanova

February 11, 2024

Dudley, Stephen, Brooks and Parker were cast away at sea for weeks. They had no food except for some turnips and a turtle. On the nineteenth day, Dudley suggested a lottery to see who would die in order for them to eat and survive. However, the idea was turned down by Brooks. The next day, Dudley killed Parker and for the next four days they fed on Parker's corpse. On the twenty fourth day, the three survivors were rescued by a German ship. The verdict of the jury was that Dudley and Stephens were to be sentenced to death.

I agree with the verdict of the jury. The reason is that it is not justifiable to murder an innocent person. Doing what you have to do in order to survive even if it results in someone's death/harm is the wrong mentality. The three should not have killed the boy. They could have kept trying to catch sea creatures and if it ended up being a lost cause, they could die honorably without having to kill an innocent. Their situation was indeed grave and the pain they went through was severe. Nevertheless, necessity does not justify killing someone innocent.

Even if Parker consented, it would not be appropriate to murder him. The reason is that it would still be murder. The lottery process would not be appropriate either since all the sailors would hope someone else gets killed. Any process that involves murder is not appropriate. If Parker had died, however, due to natural causes, I would think that it is justifiable to eat his dead body due to necessity.

The consequential position that murdering the orphan was the best thing to do in the scenario is wrong. The position takes into account the interest of the families of the three sailors, if they had any, but doesn't take into account the happiness of Parker. The poor kid was an orphan and ended up being murdered. Should they have kept killing each other if no ship had come? Their actions were wrong and murdering an innocent person isn't justifiable.