1. No, I don’t believe that Amvac operates in an ethical strategy. The very core of their business is to resell chemicals that are no longer producing enough revenue for larger companies. This would mean that either the chemicals are too dangerous for a company to keep selling and risk lawsuits or harming their company name, or on the lighter side it would mean that the chemical is just superseded by a better one. I believe that most chemicals are dropped by a company because they’re too dangerous to keep selling. So the fact that Amvac picks up these outdated and dangerous chemicals knowing that they harm people is unethical. They even fight for the chemicals when they are being banned which signifies that they don’t care much about ethics.
2. I don’t believe that they follow their ethics code to the point and as far as I can see they don’t really provide any consequences for not following them. Their environment awareness code of ethics shows no concern for the environment because it doesn’t provide specifics on what employees should be doing to dispose of harmful chemicals, instead it just sounds like they wrote it up to cover a general concern of environment wellbeing just to show that they have something covering environment protection.
3. I don’t think the United States should have the ability to decide whether a company can export such chemicals to other countries because other countries have the right to choose whether they care to prohibit the use of dangerous chemicals or not. Some countries don’t have too many resources to be so picky. They can’t afford to be so environmentally aware as the more established countries around the world. Although, as society grows we might consider the fact that what other countries are doing will affect many others around the world so we’ll need to think about whether it would be ethical for us as a country to disallow companies to export such dangerous chemicals.
4. Now days we have better pesticides that aren’t so dangerous so I would say their benefit doesn’t justify how dangerous they are. That being said, I think in the years that they came out they were beneficial because insects can do some really bad damage to crops. When I lived in Bolivia I would see large fields of soybeans go to lose more than half of their life or seed just because of deceases and insects eating at them. This would happen just because a farmer would spray the field a few days too late. Image what would happen if we didn’t have pesticides at all, what would happen to them? Still, I don’t think these specific pesticides justify how dangerous they are.
5. I would buy its stock because I don’t believe all their products are as dangerous as the worst ones they’ve had. I think they blind and convince themselves to think some of the dangerous chemicals they sell justify how dangerous they really are but some of that responsibility falls on the operators. My reason for thinking this way is because like it or not we need pesticides until we come up with plant seeds that can fight against such insects and diseases. Farmers can’t afford to raise crops affordably and still make money so they need pesticides. If you want pesticide free vegetables then grow a garden.