

Name - Md Farhan Islam

Std-ID: - 180041120

Dept : CSE

Course ^{Number} ~~Name~~ : HUM 4441

Ans. to Q.no. 1(a)

There are divisive opinions on what is morally right in the given scenario. The explanation according to ethical theories are given below:

Utilitarianism: Utilitarianism follows the utility principle - we need to do the action which results in greatest happiness for the greatest number of people. If the power supply line is left as it is then people will be able to see the match, and the number of people is a lot ~~and~~ with high amount of associated happiness. But the consequence will be that a small amount of people might lose their lives and properties. It is pretty obvious that the amount of happiness by watching the cricket match is far greater than the loss of life and properties for a small number of people. So, according to utilitarianism, the supply line should be kept as it is so that thousands of people can enjoy the match.

Kantian Theory: Kantian theory tells us that the action will be morally right only if it is in agreement with a moral rule. The moral rule is that taking lives of innocent people and letting their properties getting damaged is immoral. The man himself would be able to identify the morality of the act without thinking of other consequences. So, the ^{supply lines} ~~first person~~ must be repaired according to Kantian theory ^{supply lines} because failing to do so ~~might~~ ^{will} result in ~~a~~ negative consequences making the act immoral.

Virtue Ethics: Virtue ethics believes that the ~~correct~~ virtue nature of the acting person should be able to make a judgement on his/her own. In this case, ~~as~~ I think, a virtuous man wouldn't let innocent people die for the sake of happiness of many people. So, according to this theory, the supply lines must be repaired and there will be power loss during the cricket match. However, this opinion is subjective, because the idea of virtuous person ~~a~~ and virtues vary person to person. So, in a sense, virtue ethics doesn't give a DEFINITE answer.

Ans. to Q.no. 1(b)

These theories donot result in same consequence. Kantian theory and Virtue ethics tells us that the supply lines should be repaired and Utilitarianism tells us that the power supply lines should be left as it is. So, consequences are different.

The intuitive opinion tells me that the ~~the~~ supply line should be ^{NOT BE} fixed. Because many people will be unhappy if they won't be able to watch the match. Personally, I would be unhappy and I believe most people who would decide intuitively will think the same way. So, the intuitive opinion is that the line should NOT BE fixed and left as it is,

Ans. to Q.no. 1(c)

The criticism of each outcome is given below:

(i) Utilitarianism: Utilitarianism does ensure maximum happiness but also results in the loss of life of people. And the unlucky people who will die or lose their property will suffer a lot. So, in a sense, it is injustice as everyone isn't treated equally. What if a close relative or family member of mine dies? This often results in exploitation of minorities and underpowered ones, Distributive justice isn't served and the loss of lives can result in extreme unhappiness for some people which isn't considered in this theory.

(ii) Kant's theory: Kant's theory is too rigid. Even in this case, if the event resulted in loss of ~~the~~^{property} only, people would say that the ~~stop~~ person should have let them watch the match as it involved thousands of people. Maybe if the consequence was lower (say the damage of property for ONE person), Kant won't let it do it because bending the ethical rule is immoral.

(iii) Virtue ethics: Virtues are not unconditionally good. The opinion on virtues are subjective and it doesn't tell us HOW to act. So, for this case virtue ethics will tell, a virtuous man, shall save the lives of people, but doesn't directly tell what to do. A virtuous man should also perform his duties. Is one art more virtuous than the others?

Ans. to Q. no. 1(d)

Rule Utilitarianism gives a certain moral rule that can not be broken even in case of ~~at~~ greater happiness. For our scenario, say, the moral rule is ~~to~~ to not put people at risk that might result loss of lives. It is immoral to do so. Hence, rule utilitarianism ~~can't~~ will tell be to fix the lives because not doing so will result in loss of lives.

But act ~~utilitarianism~~ utilitarianism doesn't have such constraints. It will tell to not fix as it results in greater happiness. Hence the result is opposite and this is the contrast.

Ans. to Q. no. 2(a)

| <u>Burden of Proof</u> on harm | <u>Precautionary Principle</u> |
|---|---|
| (i) Unless the risk is proved, there is no need to take measures. | (i) If there is a possibility of risk and or harm precautionary steps need to be taken. |
| (ii) In the scenario, the risk can be not be proved, for sure with for sure. There is no evidence that the supply lines will result in loss of lives and damage of property. It MIGHT result but it is uncertain. | (ii) There is a possibility of risk for the people to lose lives or property. So, precautionary steps need to be taken to avoid this. |
| (iii) Will result in leaving the supply lines as it is | (iii) Will repair supply lines as it is risky for some people. |
| (iv) Burden of proof concludes that the people aren't at risk because the harm can not be proved. | (iv) Concludes that people ARE at risk because of the chances of harm. |
| (v) Might result in loss of lives and property. | (v) Might result in unnecessary steps and unhappiness of thousands of people. |

⑥

Ans. to Qno. 2(b)

There are 4 ~~the~~ conditions for blameworthiness to apply:

(i) Wrong doing - The act/action of causing the fire wasn't done ^{directly} by me. So, I'm not involved in wrong-doing.

(ii) Causal contribution - I had no causal contribution as none of my actions ~~not~~ contributed in causing the fire. But I failed to act, so I can be blameworthy due to this condition.

(iii) Foreseeability - I had foreseen the outcome ~~and~~ [^] catching fire and loss of lives of people. I'm blameworthy due to this condition.

(iv) Freedom of action - I had the freedom to repair or not repair the lines. So, I will also be held blameworthy ~~in~~ in this condition. I didn't act under compulsion.

~~Only two~~ ^{three} of the four conditions were met, So, I am ~~not~~ blameworthy as all ~~3~~ ³ conditions were ~~not~~ met.

Thus, I can be held accountable due to causal contribution, foreseeability and ~~blameworthiness~~ freedom of action.

Ans. to Q no. 2(a)

There is a conflict between the employee and employer. The employee did an act which he viewed as morally ~~do~~ ~~virtue~~ right.

My respond will depend on the principles of whistleblowing -

The policy for the company could have resulted in harm to the public. But before taking the decision I should have informed my superior and exhaust all internal procedures. I didn't do all these steps, hence, I have no right to whistle blow due to ~~the~~ scolding of my boss. Hence I would tell the CEO that it was my fault and ~~and~~ would have ~~can~~ be careful about this from next time.

Ans. to Q. no. 2(d)

Professional integrity tells me that the duty is to be done as part of my profession conduct but I mustn't do something immoral that results in harming others. So, the professional integrity won't let ~~me~~ me harm others in the procedure and thus I must fix the supply lines.

The policy of my company won't result in making thousands of people unhappy. Institutional loyalty tells me to blindly follow institutional codes and be loyal to it even if the policies are immoral. So, in the given scenario, I will do nothing ~~and~~ not fix lines if I follow institutional loyalty.

Ans. to Q. no. 2(e)

The systematic approach is done by ethical cycle.

Moral Problem: If we ~~don't~~ fix the system thousands won't watch the match and result in unhappiness. Not fixing the system ~~could make thousands~~ result in loss of life and property if ~~few~~ few people.

2. Analysing the problem;

The stakeholders are
few ^{stakeholder} people \rightarrow ^{intense} ~~loss~~ protect their
lives and property
thousands of people \rightarrow watching a cricket
match

Fact: CEO will be pleased if I don't fix else displeased.

3. The Identifying actions to solve problem

- Fix the supply lines and result in loss
- Not fix and result in loss of lives.

4. Ethical evaluation according to theories done in 1(a)

5. Reflection; The Most of the theories would result
in fixing the supply line and my own intuition says the
same. So, reflection is to be ~~do~~ decide what to do as
result and I think it is to fix the lines.

Ans to Q no. 3(a)

I need to assess the risks ~~before~~ and And if they are okay based on four ~~of~~ considerations. ~~16~~
Risks are ethical if:

- (i) Degree of informed consents with the risk.
- (ii) Risky activities are benefited and outweigh disadvantages.
- (iii) Alternatives at lower risk are available. Risk shouldn't be taken if so, and lower risk is to be taken
- (iv) Risk ~~and~~ advantages are justly distributed.

I did not ~~fix~~ the supply line. Hence most of the ~~informed~~ people aren't informed, degree of informed consent is hence low. But the risky activity is highly benefited as many ~~co~~ will watch the match. Alternatives at lower risk are also available, and, the risk and advantages are ~~not~~ NOT justly distributed. So, ~~the~~ ~~only~~ the second condition is met to take the risk ethically. Hence, the risk shouldn't be taken, and this is my justification.

Ans. to Q. no. 3(b)

The expected degree of fault is

$$E(\text{degree of fault}) = 3 \times 0.1 + 2 \times 0.4 + 1 \times 0.5 \\ = 1.6$$

$$\text{and, } E(\text{amount of damage}) = 0.2 \times 500,000 + 0.4 \times 150,000 \\ + 0.4 \times 50,000 \\ = 180,000 \text{ BDT}$$

∴ Expected amount of damage in taka is

$$E(\text{damage expected cost}) = 1.6 \times 180,000 \\ = 288,000 \text{ BDT (Ans.)}$$

Ans. to Q. no. 3(c)

The severity of risk is found by risk assessment.

The risk assessment results in fire, ~~and~~ it can be very severe. The exposure is small amount of people, the consequence is also severe. So, the ~~first~~^{order} is high, low and high and risk can be called high risk.

(12)