

Name: Gia Dao.

Student ID: 1001747062.

Question 1:

The death of Rocco Sapienza had reflected a profound difference in citizen's perspectives of the laws during the pandemic. Generally, Donald Lewinski deserved his charge for homicide; however, further analysis is important in this case. From Rocco's perspective, he had the right to feel angry as he witnessed someone who did not obey the law; not wearing a mask during the pandemic could jeopardize other people's health as the virus was easily spread through droplets. On the other hand, Lewinski perhaps could have viewed wearing a mask as a personal choice, whether he wanted to do it or not, his own decision to make and no one could enforce it on him. It was indeed Lewinski's fault for not wearing a mask; however, I would not agree with Rocco's reaction. First, there was no need to invoke violence, and he could have reported Lewinski's case to the authorities. Second, during the lockdown, he had no reason to come to the bar, when there were rules that prohibited social gathering. From this incident, I see that America still had a long journey to overcome the obstacle of social division. Perhaps conflicts were inevitable, especially when it came to civil rights and freedom; however, I felt that the "democracy" America had strived for, was losing its meaning. The term "we the people" mentioned in the Constitution had reminded me what truly "democracy" is. At least on my basic level of knowledge, democracy is simply an idea of creating a society in which all citizens had equal rights and opportunities to participate in different aspects to contribute to that society. Living harmoniously to reach a general goal is much more crucial compare to personal needs. This pandemic had revealed a hidden side of America. Our society is now facing a stark division in races and rights, and also, it was the society that could easily be manipulated by multi-medias. In conclusion, the difference in values would need time to unite; and instead of arguing, people should focus more on how to protect themselves and care more for others.

Question 2:

Matt Gaetz's statement had reflected his aggression towards the act of the President removing the mask during the press conference. I think that Matt Gaetz is a strong advocator for wearing face protection while in the public; however, after witnessing the act of the president, he would surely felt disappointed. As the author shared his feeling in the diary, he viewed removing the mask publicly would be "ludicrous and inappropriate", then perhaps Matt Gaetz had the same feeling with the authors. The diary provided this evidence to criticize the President for his risky act after he was infected with the virus and did not follow the CDC guidelines to prevent the spread of Corona, and Matt Gaetz's statement could be considered as his hopelessness towards the irresponsibility. After the president had been infected with the virus, he could have done better to spread the message of warning people to be more careful; however, his announcement of returning to the office, in this case, had worried officers and his staff. Matt Gaetz was reasonable to get angry as the president's action may cause further conflicts among people, and ruined the efforts of the health services, doctors who are encouraging people to be more cautious of their well-being.