I - a) According to the Morgenstern article, LeMessurier faced many challenges including the discovery of a design mistake in the Citicorp Center, the realization that quartering wind loads were not taken into consideration when the construction was taking place. In addition, LeMessurier needed to balance between his career’s reputation and the duty to public safety which pushed him to handle this urgent situation in a secretive way not letting the public discover it, so panic doesn’t build up in the society.

b) In the Kremer article, many concerns are raised about LeMessurier’s actions including the fact that he faced the situation in a secretive way such as the repair process where he got his team to work only at night avoiding the public’s acknowledgement. Moreover, placing his reputation as a priority over transparency to the public was also covered in this article. Therefore, celebrating LeMessurier’s adjustments for the flaw should be reconsidered because it was his fault in the first place and so needing to hold him accountable.

c) In their portrayal Morgenstern shows how LeMessurier had a heroic behaviour throughout his actions towards the catastrophe and how he had the courage to admit his mistakes and the need to save the lives of the people living in the Citicorp Center. However, Kremer shows the opposite. In fact, she concentrates her article on criticizing LeMessurier’s actions such as his secrecy towards the public and his lack of responsibility as an engineer. In my opinion, I find Morgenstern’s perspective more compelling because indeed he managed to surpass the catastrophe in a successful way despite his previous mistake.

II- a) As an engineer, my priority is the safety of the public. Therefore, assuring the safety of the building would be the decision that I would take. In addition to that, it was his mistake in the first place that he didn’t take into consideration the quartering wind actions towards the building.

b) My decision reflects professional responsibility by placing public safety above my personal risks, staying honest towards society no matter what the situation is.

III- a) LeMessurier should have taken into consideration the quartering winds although they weren’t part of the code. That’s the case because they played a part in the safety of the public which is considered priority for an engineer. Therefore, engineers should go beyond the code requirements when it comes to something related to the safety of society because of its importance in the engineering principles.

b) LeMessurier inadequately supervised the substitution of bolted joints for welded ones which underlines his lack of responsibility as a lead engineer because he missed a crucial detail that led to a catastrophic flaw in the structure built.

c) LeMessurier contemplated remaining silent to the public. This action isn’t justifiable in a scenario where public lives are at risk. In fact, the society have the right to acknowledge the situation that they are at and should be aware of the possible consequences. His actions do not conform to the obligations towards society where engineers should prioritize safety and be transparent.

d) LeMessurier’s actions were partially consistent with the reasonable care model. In fact, he was able to address the problem with his night shift repair process, but the openness part of the reasonable care was missing for him. For instance, he kept this procedure secretive to the public; he lacked communication.

IV- If the same scenario happened to you today, would behave in a different way or would you do the same thing?