

## Week 5

Martin Fracker Section 905

February 16, 2017

### Week 5

The woodcutter was telling the truth. His final story is the one that sounded least embellished and explained certain unbelievable elements of the stories that everyone else told. For example, the bandit told about an honorable battle between him and the husband. But, as the woodcutter told it, it actually seemed quite lame and pitiful. You could also see what the Bandit meant about the woman's fiery personality in the woodcutter's story. It seemed to me that everything in the woodcutter's story was true for this reason.

Determining accountability is tough even after hearing the woodcutter's story. Sure, the Bandit was the one who plunged the sword into the husband, but he was also driven to it by the woman who provoked him, saying he had no backbone. Neither the husband nor the woodcutter were innocent neither. The husband could have been more understanding of the woman's state of mind after being raped, and the woodcutter wanting to stay out of it did wrong by doing nothing to intervene. This determination of accountability is what the Doing article focuses on by taking an epistemographic approach to studying accountability in engineering failures.