

Name

Period #

Date

Knowledge at Work Analysis

Section 1: The real life situation I will be discussing is the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. After the surrender of the Axis powers at the end of World War Two, the United States had to figure out how to force Japan into capitulation. In the end they decided to drop two atomic bombs on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, this ultimately forced Japan to surrender and ended the war. One of the main reasons for the United States' decision was the massive amount of casualties they would suffer if they performed a land invasion.

Section 2: Should soldiers lives be more of a priority in a war than civilian ones?

Section 3: Some knowers perspectives that could help answer my knowledge questions are that of a soldier, government officials, citizens of the countries at war, and military leaders. Government officials will look at the war as something that needs to be won to benefit their country as well as have a degree of morality. A military official would be different because winning the war would most likely be their top priority, therefore they would most likely value their soldiers' lives more as they would be crucial to the war effort. Soldiers and citizens however, would look more at the moral aspect of the question, both groups would most likely value civilian lives more as soldiers are expected to sacrifice their lives by society. Therefore not caring as much about the outcome of the war.

Section 4: Citizens- Soldiers are supposed to sacrifice their lives for their country.

Soldiers - Civilians are the most important to protect because it would be immoral to do otherwise

Government Officials - In order to achieve success for my country, sometimes foreign civilians must be harmed in some way.

Military Officials - If you are involved in a war your main goal should be to win said war

Section 5: Another real life situation would be would be the bombing of Dresden by Allied forces in the second World War. The city of Dresden was full of hundreds of thousands of civilians and had an extremely small military presence. However Allied forces carried out bombing raids on the city in order to demoralize the civilian population of Germany. This was done in the hopes that Germany would surrender, saving the lives of countless soldiers.

Collazo's Notes to this student...

Section 1: Your RLS is clearly explained and it is an appropriate, historical RLS.

Section 2: Although your question is an interesting moral dilemma, there are no clear knowledge concepts embedded in the wording. Additionally, your question needs to be so general (i.e. NOT referring to "soldiers" or "civilians") that it can apply to another RLS that is NOT connected to the original RLS. This means that it can be applied to an entirely different RLS that falls within a completely different AoK. Your RLS in Sections 1 & 5 both deal with military/WW2 situations; this is usually evidence of a knowledge question that is too narrow in its scope. Remember, a good knowledge question (1) uses knowledge concepts, (2) is open-ended, and (3) is written in general terms.

Section 3: You do a good job discussing some of the most important perspectives. But there is no explicit consideration of the ETHICS or morality of these choices. You allude to them, but don't seem fully aware of their broader implications beyond the RLS.

Section 4: For this section, you listed the claims that represent the perspectives you mentioned in Section 3, which is exactly what you're supposed to do.

Section 5: Your RLS is specific enough. But, the fact that this is still about a historical, military/civilian situation (another RLS connected to ethics, as opposed to another, unconnected AoK) suggests that your KQ was too specific to the RLS.