

Chapter 1 : Good Samaritan law - Wikipedia

*Good Samaritans Law and Legal Definition A good samaritan in legal terms refers to someone who renders aid in an emergency to an injured person on a voluntary basis. Usually, if a volunteer comes to the aid of an injured or ill person who is a stranger, the person giving the aid owes the stranger a duty of being reasonably careful.*

Background Piliavin et al. The murder attracted interest from psychologists because not one person out of the 40 people, who witnessed the attack lasting over half an hour, tried to help or contacted the police. Many laboratory studies were carried out by social psychologists to test bystander apathy. That is the phenomenon of when observers of an emergency situation do not intervene. Importantly social psychologists looked for the cause of bystander behaviour not in the type of people who do or do not help but in the situational factors which influence helping behaviour Two important concepts investigated by social psychologists were diffusion of responsibility and pluralistic ignorance. Diffusion of responsibility is the idea that people are less likely to offer to help someone if there are others present, because they perceive responsibility as being shared between all present, and therefore see themselves as being less personally responsible. Pluralistic ignorance is the tendency for people in a group to mislead each other about an emergency situation. For example, a person might perceive an emergency as a non-emergency because others are remaining calm and not taking action. Latane and Darley These experiments usually consisted of one participant and a number of confederates. One of the findings of such laboratory experiments was that people did demonstrate diffusion of responsibility. That is they were less likely to help as the number of bystanders increased. However Piliavin et al. They therefore planned to investigate helping behaviour using a field experiment where they could observe behaviour as it is in the real everyday world. The aim of the study was to investigate factors affecting helping behaviour. The factors they were interested included i The type of victim drunk or ill ii The race of the victim black or white iii The speed of helping iv The frequency of helping v The race of the helper. Importantly the field experiment also investigated the impact of the presence of a model someone who offers help first , as well as the relationship between the size of the group and frequency of helping. The participants were approximately men and women travelling on a particular stretch of the New York underground system between 11 a. The average number of people in the train carriage was 43, and the average number of people in the critical area where the incident was staged was 8. Two particular trains were selected for the study. The trains were chosen because they did not make any stops between 59th Street and th Street. This means that for about 7. Therefore a single trial was a non-stop, 7. On each trial, a team of four students, two males and two females , boarded the train using different doors. The female confederates sat outside the critical area and recorded data as unobtrusively as possible during the journey, while the male model and victim remained standing. The victim always stood next to a pole in the centre of the critical area See Figure 1. Until receiving help, he remained motionless on the floor, looking at the ceiling. If he received no help by the time the train slowed to a stop, the model helped him to his feet. Layout of adjacent and critical areas of subway car The four victims one from each team were males, aged between 26 and 35, three white, one black, all identically dressed in Eisenhower jackets , old slacks and no tie. In all other aspects, victims behaved identically in the two conditions, and each victim participated in drunk and cane trials. The models white males aged 24 to 29 were all casually, but not identically, dressed. There were four different model conditions used across both drunk and cane victim conditions: Critical area - early: Critical area - late: Adjacent area - early: Adjacent area - late: When the model intervened, he helped the victim to a sitting position and stayed with him for the remainder of the trial. A number of observations were recorded. A second observer also noted how long it took for help to arrive The observers also recorded comments made by nearby passengers and also tried to elicit comments from a passenger sitting next to them. The cane victim received spontaneous help on 62 out of the 65 trials, and the drunk victim received spontaneous help on 19 out of 38 trials. The race of the victims made no significant difference to helping behaviour, but there was a slight tendency for same-race helping in the drunken condition. Diffusion of responsibility was not evident. The diffusion of responsibility hypothesis predicts that helping behaviour would decrease as the number of bystanders increases. In fact the field

experiment found that the quickest help came from the largest groups. However, in the earlier laboratory experiments there was only one participant and the other bystanders were confederates. Nobody left the carriage during the incident mainly because the train was moving, on 21 of the trials a total of 34 people left the critical area, particularly when the victim appeared to be drunk. More comments were obtained on drunk than cane trials and most of these were obtained when no one helped until after 70 seconds; this could be due to the discomfort passengers felt in sitting inactive in the presence of the victim, perhaps hoping that others would confirm that inaction was appropriate. The following comments came from women passengers:

Explanation Piliavin et al. Cost & Reward Model They argue that firstly, observation of an emergency situation creates an emotional arousal in bystanders. This arousal may be perceived as fear, disgust or sympathy, depending on aspects of the situation. This state of arousal can be reduced by a number of factors including: Therefore according to this model we are motivated to help people not by altruism acting in the interest of others but as a way of reducing unpleasant feelings of arousal. According to Piliavin et al. Cost & Reward Model. The drunk is helped less often because the perceived cost is greater - helping a drunk is likely to cause disgust, embarrassment or harm. The cost of not helping is less because nobody will blame another for not helping a drunk because he is perceived as partly responsible for his own victimisation. Diffusion of responsibility is not found in the cane-carrying situation because the cost of not helping is high and the cost of helping is low. As time without help increases, so does the arousal level of the bystanders. A late model is not copied because people have already chosen an alternative way of reducing arousal; they leave the area or engage in conversation with others in order to justify their lack of help. A problem with the field experiment is that the participants cannot give their consent, because they do not know that they are participants in an experiment. Similarly the participants are being deceived because they are unaware that it is not a genuine emergency. Participants were also not debriefed as this would have been almost impossible. Following from this it is possible that participants had feelings of guilt, distress, and anxiety. A further problem with field experiments is that they are more difficult to control than laboratory experiments. For example we could question whether travellers on the trains saw more than one trial. Field experiments are also more difficult to replicate and more time consuming and expensive. Strengths A main strength of the study has to be its high level of ecological validity. The study was done in a true to life environment and consisted of an incident, which could and does happen. However, some of the participants were very close to the victim and were in a situation where they could not escape. This is often unlike many other situations where we come across emergency situations and this may be one of the reasons why diffusion of responsibility did not occur. The sample size was also very large and we would assume a fairly representative sample of New Yorkers. The researchers should therefore be able to generalise their findings with much more certainty than if they had carried out a study on say 40 students. Evaluation of Explanation A criticism of the Arousal: Cost & Reward Model is that it takes a very negative view of people. It denies that people act altruistically and assumes that behaviour is always measured in some form of cost or benefit. Cost Benefit model assumes that we therefore never behave altruistically Furthermore Piliavin et al. Finally it is interesting to note that 40 years on from the murder of Kitty Genovese there is still considerable debate in New York about the accuracy of the original reporting of the events in the New York Times. Perhaps there were not as many witnesses and some people may have called the police. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13,

Chapter 2 : Good Samaritans Law and Legal Definition | USLegal, Inc.

*Good samaritan definition, a person who gratuitously gives help or sympathy to those in distress. Luke See more.*

Four teams of students, each one made up of a victim, model, and two observers, staged standard collapses in which type of victim drunk or ill, race of victim black or white and presence or absence of a model were varied. Data recorded by observers included number and race of observers, latency of the helping response and race of helper, number of helpers, movement out of the "critical area," and spontaneous comments. Major findings of the study were that a) an apparently ill person is more likely to receive aid than is one who appears to be drunk, b) race of victim has little effect on race of helper except when the victim is drunk, c) the longer the emergency continues without help being offered, the more likely it is that someone will leave the area of the emergency, and d) the expected decrease in speed of responding as group size increases the "diffusion of responsibility effect" found by Darley and Latané does not occur in this situation. Implications of this difference between laboratory and field results are discussed, and a brief model for the prediction of behaviour in emergency situations is presented. Some of the findings of this research have been provocative and nonobvious. Furthermore, recent findings indicate that under certain circumstances there is -not "safety in numbers," but rather "diffusion of responsibility. Subsequent research by Latane and Rodin on response to the victim of a fall confirmed this finding and suggested further that assistance from a group of bystanders was less likely to come if the group members were strangers than if they were prior acquaintances. The field experiments of Bryan and Test, on the other hand, provide interesting findings that fit common sense expectations; namely, one is more likely to be a good Samaritan if one has just observed another individual performing a helpful act. Much of the work on victimization to date has been performed in the laboratory. It is commonly argued that the ideal research strategy over the long haul is to move back and forth between the laboratory, with its advantage of greater control, and the field, with its advantage of greater reality. The present study was designed to provide more information from the latter setting. The primary focus of the study was on the effect of type of victim drunk or ill and race of victim black or white on speed of responding, frequency of responding, and the race of the helper. On the basis of the large body of research on similarity and liking as well as that on race and social distance, it was assumed that an individual would be more inclined to help someone of his race than a person of another race. The expectation regarding type of victim was that help would be accorded more frequently and rapidly to the apparently ill victim. This expectation was derived from two considerations. This realization may, in fact, not only constrain helping but also lead observers to turn away from the victim-that is, to leave the scene of the emergency. Aside from examining the effects of race and type of victim, the present research sought to investigate the impact of modelling in emergency situations. It was expected that the phenomenon would be observed as well in the present study. A final concern of the study was to examine the relationship between size of group and frequency and latency of the helping response, with a victim who was both seen and heard. In these studies, however, the emergency was only heard, not seen. Visual cues also provide clear information as to whether anyone has yet helped the victim or if he has been able to help himself. Thus, in the laboratory studies, observers lacking visual cues could rationalize not helping by assuming assistance was no longer needed when the victim ceased calling for help. Staging emergencies in full view of observers eliminates the possibility of such rationalization. To conduct a field investigation of the above questions under the desired conditions required a setting, which would allow the repeated staging of emergencies in the midst of reasonably large groups, which remained fairly similar in composition from incident to incident. It was also desirable that each group retain the same composition over the course of the incident and that a reasonable amount of time be available after the emergency occurred for -good Samaritans to act. The mean number of people per car during these hours was 43; the mean number of people in the "critical area," in which the staged incident took place, was 8. A single trial was a non-stop ride between 59th and 66th Streets, going in either direction. All trials were run only on the old New York subway cars, which serviced the 8th Avenue line since they had two-person seats in group arrangement rather than extended seats. The designated experimental or critical area was that end section of

any car whose doors led to the next car. There are 13 seats and some standing room in this area on all trains see Figure 1. Procedure On each trial a team of four Columbia General Studies students, two males and two females, boarded the train using different doors. Four different teams, whose members always worked together, were used to collect data for trials. Each team varied the location of the experimental car from trial to trial. The female confederates took seats outside the critical area and recorded data as unobtrusively as possible for the duration of the ride, while the male model and victim remained standing. The victim always stood next to a pole in the centre of the critical area see Figure 1. As the train passed the first station approximately 70 seconds after departing the victim staggered forward and collapsed. Until receiving help, the victim remained supine on the floor looking at the ceiling. If the victim received no assistance by the time the train slowed to a stop, the model helped him to his feet. At the stop, the team disembarked and waited separately until other riders had left the station. They then proceeded to another platform to board a train, going in the opposite direction for the next trial. From 6 to 8 trials were run on a given day. All trials on a given day were in the same "victim condition. The four victims one from each team were males between the ages of 26 and 32. Three were white and one was black. All were identically dressed in Eisenhower jackets, old slacks, and no tie. On 38 trials the victims smelled of liquor and carried a liquor bottle wrapped tightly in a brown bag drunk condition, while on the remaining 27 trials they appeared sober and carried a black cane cane condition. In all other aspects, victims dressed and behaved identically in the two conditions. Each victim participated in drunk and cane trials. The reason for this is easier to explain than to correct. Teams 1 and 2 both white victims started the first day in the cane condition. Teams 3 black and 4 white began in the drunk condition. Teams were told to alternate the conditions across days. They arranged their running days to fit their schedules. Then the Columbia student strike occurred, the teams disbanded, and the study of necessity was over. At this point, Teams 1 and 3 had run on only 3 days each, while 2 and 4 had run on 4 days each. Four white males between the ages of 24 and 29 assumed the roles of model in each team. All models wore informal clothes, although they were not identically attired. There were four different model conditions used across both victim conditions drunk or cane. Model stood in critical area and waited until passing fourth station to assist victim approximately 70 seconds after collapse. Model stood in critical area and waited until passing sixth station to assist victim approximately 130 seconds after collapse. Model stood in middle of car in area adjacent to critical area and waited until passing fourth station. Model stood in adjacent area and waited until passing sixth station. When the model provided assistance, he raised the victim to a sitting position and stayed with him for the remainder of the trial. An equal number of trials in the no-model condition and in each of the four model conditions were pre-programmed by a random number table and assigned to each team. The three model trials completed for the cane victim were all early, with 2 from the critical area and 1 from the adjacent area. On each trial one observer noted the race, sex, and location of every rider seated or standing in the critical area. She also recorded the race, sex, and location of every helper. A second observer coded the race, sex, and location of all persons in the adjacent area. Both observers recorded comments spontaneously made by nearby passengers and attempted to elicit comments from a rider sitting next to them. The victim with the cane received spontaneous help, that is, before the model acted, on 62 of the 65 trials. Even the drunk received spontaneous help on 19 of 38 trials. The difference is not explicable on the basis of gross differences in the numbers of potential helpers in the cars. Mean number of passengers in the car on cane trials was 45; on drunk trials, Total range was 30-60. On the basis of past research, relatively long latencies of spontaneous helping were expected; thus, it was assumed that models would have time to help, and their effects could be assessed. However, in all but three of the cane trials planned to be model trials, the victim received help before the model was scheduled to offer assistance. This was less likely to happen with the drunk victim. In many cases, the early model was able to intervene, and in a few, even the delayed model could act see Table 1 for frequencies. A direct comparison between the latency of response in the drunk and cane conditions might be misleading, since on model trials one does not know how long it might have taken for a helper to arrive without the stimulus of the model. Omitting the model trials, however, would reduce the number of drunk trials drastically. In order to get around these problems the trials have been dichotomised into a group in which someone helped before 70 seconds the time at which the early model was programmed to help and a group in

which no one had helped by this time. The second group includes some trials in which people helped the model and a very few in which no one helped at all. If a comparison of latencies is made between cane and drunk nonmodel trials only, the median latency for cane trials is 5 seconds and the median for drunk trials is seconds assigning seconds as the latency for nonrespondents. It is quite clear from the first section of Table 2 that there was more immediate, spontaneous helping of the victim with the cane than of the drunk. The effect seems to be essentially the same for the black victim and for the white victims. Among the white victim teams, the data from Team 2 differ to some extent from those for Teams 1 and 4. Team 2 accounts all of the cane-after 70 seconds trials for, as are 4 of the 5 drunk before 70 trials. Median latency for cane trials is longer for Team 2 than for the other teams; for drunk trials, shorter. This is the same team that violated the "alternate days" instruction. It would appear that this team is being rather less careful-that the victim may be getting out of his role. The data from this team have been included in the analysis although they tend to reduce the relationships that were found. What of the total number of people who helped? The data from the model trials are not included in this analysis because the model was programmed to behave rather differently from the way in which most real helpers behaved. That is, his role was to raise the victim to a sitting position and then appear to need assistance. Most real helpers managed to drag the victim to a seat or to a standing position on their own. Thus the programmed model received somewhat more help than did real first helpers. There are no significant differences between black and white victims, or between cane and drunk victims, in the number of helpers subsequent to the first who came to his aid. Seemingly, then, the presence of the first helper has important implications that override whatever cognitive and emotional differences were initially engendered among observers by the characteristics of the victim. Another possibility is that the key factor in the decisions of second and third helpers to offer assistance was the first helper.

**Chapter 3 : Good samaritan | Define Good samaritan at [blog.quintoapp.com](http://blog.quintoapp.com)**

*Good Samaritan laws offer legal protection to people who give reasonable assistance to those who are, or who they believe to be, injured, ill, in peril, or otherwise incapacitated.*

Iron Age[ edit ] The narratives in Genesis about the rivalries among the twelve sons of Jacob are viewed by some as describing tensions between north and south. They were temporarily united in the United Monarchy , but after the death of Solomon, the kingdom split in two, the Kingdom of Israel with its last capital city Samaria and the Kingdom of Judah with its capital Jerusalem. The Deuteronomistic history , written in Judah, portrayed Israel as a sinful kingdom, divinely punished for its idolatry and iniquity by being destroyed by the Assyrians in BCE. The tensions continued in the postexilic period. The Books of Kings are more inclusive than Ezraâ€™Nehemiah since the ideal is of one Israel with twelve tribes, whereas the Books of Chronicles concentrate on the Kingdom of Judah and ignore the Kingdom of Israel Samaria. They had their own sacred precinct on Mount Gerizim and claimed that it was the original sanctuary. Moreover, they claimed that their version of the Pentateuch was the original and that the Jews had a falsified text produced by Ezra during the Babylonian exile. During the New Testament period, the tensions were exploited by Roman authorities as they likewise had done between rival tribal factions elsewhere, and Josephus reports numerous violent confrontations between Jews and Samaritans throughout the first half of the first century. From a photo c. According to historian Lawrence Schiffman , throughout the Persian Period, Judeans and Samaritans fought periodically with one another. The Samaritans were a blend of all kinds of peopleâ€™made up of Israelites who were not exiled when the Northern Kingdom was destroyed in BCEâ€™of various different nationalities whom the Assyrians had resettled in the area. The inhabitants worshiped the Pagan gods , but when the then-sparsely populated areas became infested with dangerous wild beasts, they appealed to the king of Assyria for Israelite priests to instruct them on how to worship the "God of that country. According to Chronicles During the First Temple, it was possible for foreigners to help the Jewish people in an informal way until tension grew between the Samaritans and Judeans. This meant that foreigners could physically move into Judean land and abide by its laws and religion. According to Ezra, this rejection precipitated a further interference not only with the rebuilding of the Temple but also with the reconstruction of Jerusalem. There had always been a division between the north and the south and this instance perfectly illustrates that. We do know that Samaritan and Jewish alienation increased and that the Samaritans eventually built their own temple on Mount Gerizim, near Shechem. The rebuilding of the Jewish Temple in Jerusalem took several decades. The project was first led by Sheshbazzar ca. The work was completed in BCE. The term "Kuthim" applied by Jews to the Samaritans had clear pejorative connotations, implying that they were interlopers brought in from Kutha in Mesopotamia and rejecting their claim of descent from the ancient Tribes of Israel. According to many scholars, archaeological excavations at Mount Gerizim indicate that a Samaritan temple was built there in the first half of the 5th century BCE. His policy was to Hellenize his entire kingdom and standardize religious observance. According to 1 Maccabees 1: The universal peril led the Samaritans, eager for safety, to repudiate all connection and kinship with the Jews. The request was granted. This was put forth as the final breach between the two groups, being alleged at a much later date in the Christian Bible John 4: We therefore beseech thee, our benefactor and saviour, to give order to Apolonius, the governor of this part of the country, and to Nicanor, the procurator of thy affairs, to give us no disturbances, nor to lay to our charge what the Jews are accused for, since we are aliens from their nation and from their customs, but let our temple which at present hath no name at all, be named the Temple of Jupiter Hellenius. Samaria was a largely autonomous state nominally dependent on the Seleucid Empire until around BCE, when the Jewish Hasmonean ruler John Hyrcanus destroyed the Samaritan temple and devastated Samaria. Only a few stone remnants of it exist today. Samaritans appear briefly in the Christian gospels, most notably in the account of the Samaritan woman at the well and the parable of the Good Samaritan. In the latter, it is only the Samaritan who helped the man stripped of clothing, beaten, and left on the road half dead, his Abrahamic covenantal circumcision implicitly evident. The priest and Levite walked past. But the Samaritan helped the naked man regardless of his nakedness itself

religiously offensive to the priest and Levite [60] , his self-evident poverty, or to which Hebrew sect he belonged which was unclear to any, due to his nakedness. A building dated to the second century BCE, the Delos Synagogue , is commonly identified as a Samaritan synagogue, which would make it the oldest known Jewish or Samaritan synagogue. Samaritan Revolts This period is considered as something of a golden age for the Samaritan community, the population thought to number up to a million. The Emperor went to Neapolis Shechem , gathered the elders and asked them to convert; when they refused, Zeno had many Samaritans killed, and re-built the synagogue as a church. Zeno then took for himself Mount Gerizim , where the Samaritans worshiped God, and built several edifices, among whom a tomb for his recently deceased son, on which he put a cross, so that the Samaritans, worshiping God, would prostrate in front of the tomb. Later, in , the Samaritans revolted. The rebels attacked Sichem, burned five churches built on Samaritan holy places and cut the finger of bishop Terebinthus, who was officiating the ceremony of Pentecost. Here several Christians were killed and the church of St. Justa celebrated the victory with games in the circus. According to John Malalas , the dux Palaestinae Asclepiades, whose troops were reinforced by the Caesarea-based Arcadiani of Rheges, defeated Justa, killed him and sent his head to Zeno. Zeno rebuilt the church of St. Procopius in Neapolis Sichem and the Samaritans were banned from Mount Gerizim, on whose top a signalling tower was built to alert in case of civil unrest. With the help of the Ghassanids , Emperor Justinian I crushed the revolt; tens of thousands of Samaritans died or were enslaved. The Samaritan faith, which had previously enjoyed the status of *religio licita* , was virtually outlawed thereafter by the Christian Byzantine Empire ; from a population once at least in the hundreds of thousands, the Samaritan community dwindled to tens of thousands.

**Chapter 4 : Good Samaritanism - Puns - Pun Pictures**

*Good Samaritan n. A compassionate person who unselfishly helps others, especially strangers. [After the Samaritan passerby in the New Testament parable who was the only person.*

They are related to but not identical with the inhabitants of ancient Samaria. Samaritanism resembles Judaism, but there are several differences. Samaritans think that the temple of YHWH should not be on Mount Zion in Jerusalem, but on Mount Gerizim near modern Nablus ancient Shichem; they believe that their line of priests is the legitimate one, as opposed to the line of priests in Jerusalem; they accept only the Law of Moses Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy as authoritative, and have a slightly different text of these books. The Prophets and Writings are not recognized as divinely inspired. To understand these tensions, we need to go back to the first quarter of the first millennium BCE, before the two religions had developed their characteristic ideas and customs. By then, the cult of YHWH was probably widespread in the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, and the temple of Jerusalem was not the only place of worship. In the large cosmopolitan city of Samaria, the capital of Israel, many believers venerated YHWH without feeling any need to go to the peasant town that was Jerusalem. Towards the end of the seventh century, king Josiah tried to reform the cult in Jerusalem, an act that is associated with the composition of the core of the Biblical book of Deuteronomy, which contains the regulations of the reform program. From now on, the stories and laws of the five first books of the Bible the Torah or Pentateuch were at the heart of Jewish monotheism. The fall of Jerusalem in and the deportation of the elite of Judah to Babylonia did not change this. Far away from Jerusalem, the Torah became even more important. In , Babylon was conquered by Cyrus the Great, the Babylonian Empire became part of the larger Achaemenid empire, and the Jews were allowed to return home. Yet, because there was no king from the house of David anymore, the priests of Jerusalem rose to prominence, and they said that the temple of Jerusalem was the only true sanctuary of YHWH. To promote their claim, the text of the scriptures was revised, taking into account ideas that had originated in Babylonia. There are two variants of the Torah: The texts are essentially the same although there are differences, and this can only mean that both variants go back to the same original. In other words, the holy book of the Samaritans was composed after ca. This means that three theories about the origin of Samaritanism can be discarded: The Samaritans themselves believe that in the age of the Judges, the sanctuary with the Ark of the Covenant was at Mount Gerizim, and that the wicked priest Eli removed it to Shiloh. From there, king Solomon brought the sacred objects to Jerusalem. The Samaritans think that the schism between their own community and the Judaism of Jerusalem dates back to this period. In the Jewish Bible, it is suggested that the Samaritan community originated in the northern kingdom of Israel. When the ten northern tribes separated from Judah, they started to accept foreign beliefs. In other words, Samaritanism originated when the Israelites left the Covenant. Another Biblical explanation is that the Samaritans descended from the people that settled in Samaria after Israel had been conquered by the Assyrians and the original inhabitants of Samaria had been deported. These theories have in common that they maintain that originally, there was only one, pure and uncontaminated religion, and that later, there was a schism between Samaritanism and Judaism. Probably, this is the wrong perspective. Originally, the cult of YHWH was widespread, and over the centuries, two religions developed. At some stage, the Samaritans accepted the Torah that had been written in Jerusalem, and made some changes to it. We can probably be a bit more precise about the moment when the Torah was introduced in the north. In the s, there was discord among the priests of Jerusalem, and several members of this order left the city. They settled in Samaria, and in , they were able to get permission from the Macedonian conqueror Alexander the Great to build a temple near Shichem on Mount Gerizim, a few kilometers east of Samaria. Archaeology has more or less confirmed this story, which is told by Flavius Josephus, because it has shown that Shichem was rebuilt at about this moment. In itself, the foundation of a temple was not problematic. There were Jewish shrines in Egypt and several scholars assume that there was a sanctuary in Babylonia too. From now on, the two groups were to grow apart, and the differences were to increase. The city of Samaria, more cosmopolitan than Jerusalem, was inhabited by several groups of pagans, and their cult practices may have influenced those of

their YHWH-worshipping fellow-citizens. The two groups grew apart when they responded differently to the omnipresent Greek culture. In the south, Judas the Maccabean organized a revolt and purified the temple of Jerusalem. In the north, the people of Samaria, which was more open to Greek culture, were not willing to resist Antiochus, and their monotheist fellow-citizens were not in a position to show the same zeal for their faith as that shown by Judas and his followers. What had been a religious division, now became a political conflict as well. One of them was John Hyrcanus , who greatly expanded the Jewish state and captured Samaria in or The temple on Mount Gerizim was immediately destroyed. Again, this is archaeologically more or less confirmed, because the occupation of nearby Shichem came to an end in the last quarter of the second century. There is some linguistic evidence that the Samaritan Torah was rewritten at about this time. It may have been a response to the destruction of the Samaritan temple. Now, there were two hostile groups of monotheists: Most Jews lived in Judah, but there were also Jews living outside the country in the Diaspora ; and there was a non-Jewish minority in Judah. The same applied to Samaritans. Although many lived near Samaria, there were non-Samaritans living in Samaria too, and there were diasporic Samaritans e. When the Romans annexed the country, which they called Judaea , they started to use the religious division for their own purposes. For example, there were two military units, recruited in the city of Samaria and probably manned with Samaritans, which were used to occupy Jewish towns like Jerusalem. At the same time, the members of the Samaritan community dreamed of restoring their sanctuary. In 36 CE, a man, usually called the Samaritan prophet , and many armed followers occupied Mount Gerizim. During the Jewish War of , the Fifth legion Macedonica stormed Mount Gerizim, probably putting an end to another attempt to rebuild the temple. The Samaritan community might have disappeared, but a teacher named Baba Rabba reorganized the believers and their ideas. The Samaritans flourished in Late Antiquity, with synagogues on several places. It did not abolish the high-priesthood as the Jews did. However, in the sixth century, there was a Samaritan revolt against the emperor Justinian. He suppressed the insurrection with a ferocity that was already commented upon by his contemporary Procopius. In the second half of the twentieth century, however, the Samaritan community unexpectedly more than doubled its size. In , the community consisted of people, of which were living in Holon, and near Mount Gerizim. This page was created in ; last modified on 29 June

**Chapter 5 : GOOD SAMARITANISM:**

*of contexts including those involving good Samaritanism (Bryan & Test, ). It was expected that the phenomenon would be observed as well in the present study. A final.*

Modern-day Samaritans live in Samaritan neighborhoods or quarters in Nablus and Holon, with about people in each settlement, a significant population increase from a low of about in the s. There is an ongoing debate as to whether the Samaritans are Jews or Arabs or Jordanians or Israelis those in Holon are considered citizens of Israel , but Samaritans prefer to see themselves as a distinct people. In Nablus, Samaritans are culturally similar to the Arab population, whereas those in Holon more closely resemble their Israeli neighbors; both populations are now politically aligned with Israel. Depending on who they are communicating with and whether the subject matter is secular or religious, Samaritans use the English, Hebrew, Arabic, Samaritan, and Samaritan Aramaic languages, although Hebrew is now the primary domestic language. According to Jewish tradition and the Bible , the modernday Samaritans are descendants of foreign peoples who were brought into ancient Israel after the Assyrians conquered and drove the Judeans out in b. The Samaritans, however, trace their ancestry to remnants of the Judean population who remained in Samaria following the conquest. Recent scholarship tends to support the Samaritan view. With the return of the Judean exiles from Babylonia in the fifth century b. At about this time, the Samaritans began calling themselves "Shomeronim" Hebrew for "to conserve" in reference to their adherence to traditional religious beliefs and practices. Barred by the Jews from participating in the rebuilding of the Jewish Temple, the Samaritans, in the fourth century b. The temple was destroyed in b. Since the building of the first temple, Mount Gerizim has been the destination for Samaritan pilgrimages, and continued access to the site is a major concern to contemporary Samaritans. At about the time of Jesus, the Samaritans numbered several hundred thousand and were spread in settlements across the Fertile Crescent. Both before and since that time, Samaritan numbers and settlements steadily decreased at the hands of the Jews, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, and Arabs. Relatively few in number, the Samaritans have been easily absorbed into the Israeli and Jordanian economic systems, with many employed as civil servants in the Israeli government. Samaritans in Holon serve in the Israeli military. Again, because of their small population and because of their ambiguous identity, Samaritans occupy an uneasy position within the Israeli nation and enjoy no formal political or religious representation nor designation as a distinct ethnic minority. Endogamous marriage is the rule; only Jews are allowed to marry in, and those who do virtually all women are expected to follow Samaritan religious beliefs and practices. Family relationships are now more egalitarian than in the past, when men dominated the family. Arranged marriages have given way to freedom of choice in selecting a spouse. Families are generally nuclear and small and provide the major arena for socialization into the Samaritan religion. The Samaritan religion resembles the Karaite Jewish tradition in that Samaritans and Karaites are both outside the mainstream of Israeli Judaism , which mostly follows the Rabbinite tradition. Samaritans believe in one God , that Moses is the only Prophet, that only the first books of the Bible the Torah are authoritative, that Mount Gerizim is sacred, and that there will be a future time of messianic revival. They celebrate most major Jewish Holy Days and festivals, although their practices, such as the ritual slaughter of a lamb at Passover Pesach and kneeling in prayer, do not conform to those of modern Judaism. In short, Samaritan religion resembles contemporary Judaism in many ways, but also includes various beliefs and practices characteristic of early Judaism. There is a priestly class among the Samaritans, which consists of only a few priests and one high priest. Cite this article Pick a style below, and copy the text for your bibliography.

*Liberal theorists of justice hardly ever study duties of Good Samaritanism. This is not to say that they regard a failure to be a Good Samaritan as morally acceptable: indeed, most of them think that it is morally wrong. But they tend not to think that it is morally wrong on the grounds that it.*

Australia[ edit ] Most Australian states and territories have some form of good Samaritan protection. In general, these offer protection if care is made in good faith, and the "good Samaritan" is not impaired by drugs or alcohol. Variations exist between states, from not applying if the "good Samaritan" is the cause of the problem New South Wales , to applying under all circumstances if the attempt is made in good faith Victoria. Protection from liability 2. China[ edit ] There have been incidents in China, such as the Peng Yu incident in , [13] [14] where good Samaritans who helped people injured in accidents were accused of having injured the victim themselves. The death of Wang Yue was caused when the toddler was run over by two vehicles. The entire incident was caught on a video, which shows eighteen people seeing the child but refusing to help. It was reported that various lawmakers of the province are drafting a good Samaritan law, which would "penalize people who fail to help in a situation of this type and indemnify them from lawsuits if their efforts are in vain. The Finnish Rescue Act thus includes a principle of proportionality which requires professionals to extend immediate aid further than laypersons. However, any help one provides cannot and will not be prosecuted even if it made the situation worse or did not fulfill specific first aid criteria. People are thus encouraged to help in any way possible, even if the attempt is not successful. This act provides for exemption from liability for a person, or voluntary organization, for anything done while providing "assistance, advice or care" to a person who is injured, in serious risk or danger of becoming injured or suffering from an illness or apparently so. There are exclusions for cases of "bad faith" or "gross negligence" on behalf of the carer, and incidents relating to the negligent use of motor vehicles. This Act only addresses situations where there is no duty of care owed by the good Samaritan or the volunteer. Israel[ edit ] In Israel, the law requires anyone to assist a person in danger or at the very least call for help. People who help in good faith are not liable for damages. Helpers are eligible for compensation for damages caused to them during their assistance. Romania[ edit ] In Romania, the health reform passed in states that persons without medical training offering basic first aid voluntarily at the indications of a medical dispatch office or from own knowledge of first aid maneuvers, acting in good-will to preserve the life or health of another person cannot be held responsible under penal or civil law. Prior to passage of the Emerson Act differences in language and applicability between states often discouraged national and regional companies from donating, resulting in otherwise usable food being sent to landfills. The Aviation Medical Assistance Act also provided coverage for "Good Samaritans" while in flight Section 5b [25] United Kingdom[ edit ] In the common law of England and Wales there is no criminal liability for failing to act in the event of another person being in danger; however, there are exceptions to this rule. In instances where there has been an assumption of responsibility by the bystander, a dangerous situation was created by them, or there is a contractual or statutory duty to act, criminal liability would be imposed on the bystander for their failure to take action. Common features[ edit ] Duty to Assist[ edit ] In some jurisdictions, unless a caretaker relationship such as a parent-child or doctor-patient relationship exists prior to the illness or injury, or the "good Samaritan" is responsible for the existence of the illness or injury, no person is required to give aid of any sort to a victim. Good Samaritan statutes in the states of Minnesota and Vermont do require a person at the scene of an emergency to provide reasonable assistance to a person in need. At least five other states, including California and Nevada, have seriously considered adding duty-to-assist subdivisions to their good Samaritan statutes. The furnishing of medical assistance in an emergency is a matter of vital concern affecting the public health, safety and welfare. Prehospital emergency medical care, the provision of prompt and effective communication among ambulances and hospitals[,] and safe and effective care and transportation of the sick and injured are essential public health services. The legal principle of imminent peril may also apply. To illustrate, a motor vehicle collision occurs, but there is no fire, no immediate life threat from injuries and no danger of a second collision. If someone, with good intentions, causes injury by pulling

the victim from the wreckage, a court may rule that good Samaritan laws do not apply because the victim was not in imminent peril and hold the actions of the rescuer to be unnecessary and reckless. Medical professionals are typically not protected by good Samaritan laws when performing first aid in connection with their employment. Stork" page, and had not asked or expected to be paid. This can be as simple as a lack of adequate protection against potential diseases, such as vinyl , latex , or nitrile gloves to protect against blood-borne pathogens. A responder is never legally compelled to take risks to aid another person. The responder is not legally liable for any harm to the person assisted, as long as the responder acted rationally, in good faith and in accordance with their level of training. Implied consent Consent may be implied if an unattended patient is unconscious, delusional, intoxicated or deemed mentally unfit to make decisions regarding his or her safety, or if the responder has a reasonable belief that this was so; courts tend to be very forgiving in adjudicating this, under the legal fiction that "peril invites rescue" as in the rescue doctrine. To illustrate, would the average, reasonable person in any of the states described above consent to receiving assistance in these circumstances is able to make a decision? Consent may also be implied if the legal parent or guardian is not immediately reachable and the patient is not considered an adult. Parental consent[ edit ] If the victim is a minor, consent must come from a parent or guardian. However, if the legal parent or guardian is absent, unconscious, delusional or intoxicated, consent is implied. A responder is not required to withhold life-saving treatment e. Special circumstances may exist if child abuse is suspected the courts will usually give immunity to those first responders who report what they reasonably consider to be evidence of child abuse or neglect, similar to that given to those who have an actual duty to report such abuse, such as teachers or counsellors. In other jurisdictions any rescuer is protected from liability so long as the responder acted rationally. Under the common law, good Samaritan laws provide a defence against torts arising from the attempted rescue. Such laws do not constitute a duty to rescue, such as exists in some civil law countries, [41] and in the common law under certain circumstances. However, the duty to rescue where it exists may itself imply a shield from liability; for example, under the German law of unterlassene Hilfeleistung an offense not to provide first aid when necessary , a citizen is obliged to provide first aid when necessary and is immune from prosecution if assistance given in good faith turns out to be harmful. Quebec operates a civil law system, based in part on the Napoleonic Code , and the principle of duty to rescue does apply. The penalty for this offence in criminal courts is imprisonment and a fine under article 6 of the Criminal Code while in civil courts judges will order payment of pecuniary compensation to the victims. There are, however, specific exceptions to this right. When the "life, health or safety of another person is at risk," then specific groups, including "police officers, firefighters, or employees of a hospital, clinic or other type of medical worker including EMS " are specifically excluded from the right to refuse unsafe work.

## Chapter 7 : Samaritans - Livius

*Investigated the effect of several variables on helping behavior, using subway express trains as a field laboratory. 4 teams of undergraduates, each made up of a victim, model, and 2 Os, staged.*

Early, Late or No model Model initially sitting in the critical area or adjacent area. The number of people on the train. The Dependent variables are: The time taken to help. The race of the helper. The percentage of trials in which passengers subjects left the critical area. The number of comments made. The results found were: The cane victim, regardless of his race, was helped more often and sooner than the drunk victim 62 out of 65 trials for the cane victim compared to 19 out of 38 trials for the drunk victim. There was a tendency for same race help in the drunk condition. Significantly more men helped than women. The more people on the train the greater chance of somebody helping. This goes against the diffusion of responsibility theory. Also note that the response level for a seven-person group is higher than would be predicted by the response rates of smaller groups. This would suggest an effect of affiliation. The initial position of the model had no effect on helping behaviour. As time went by more comments were made and more people left the critical area. The early model was more likely to encourage others to help also, than the later model. Once one person helped the fact that the victim was drunk did not affect whether others helped. Piliavin explains the results by proposing a model of emotional arousal empathy, being close to the emergency and the length of time the emergency continues and its reduction by helping, going to get help, leaving the scene and believing the victim does not deserve help , as well as a cognitive appraisal of the situation in terms of the costs and rewards of helping or not helping. As a useful exercise you would do well to consider whether or not the results are explained by the theory. Several ethical guidelines are broken. You should consider whether the experiment could have been more ethical, without changing the validity of the experiment. A major limitation of this study, considering it was the Kitty Genovese murder that initiated this kind of research, is that it looks at the inactivity of bystanders rather than why it is that some men attack innocent women. Howitt points out that these original studies perpetuate the myth that all rapes are carried out by deviant men against questionable women.

## Chapter 8 : Piliavin - Subway samaritans - Psych Tutor

*Good Samaritanism Died in a Car Crash by David J Givot, Esq. Prologue On December 18, , in a stunning decision (S), it seems the California Supreme Court effectively killed the spirit of the state's "Good Samaritan Law" (HSCA§) along with countless individuals who will now be left to suffer and die by would-be rescuers afraid of being sued.*

## Chapter 9 : Good Samaritan - Wiktionary

*The Samaritans are adherents of Samaritanism, The best known reference to the Samaritans is the Parable of the Good Samaritan, found in the Gospel of Luke. The.*