Act Utilitarianism

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Action/Choice | Party\_#1: Morton  Thiokol | Party\_#2: NASA |
| Morton Thiokol  recommending the launch of  Challenger to proceed,  noting “Lund (of Thiokol)  reversed his previous  decision and recommended  that the launch proceed.” | Act Utilitarianism is satisfied as a successful launch would preserve the business of the company as well as promote the company’s business/. The benefits outweigh the costs like probability of disaster. | Act Utilitarianism is satisfied as a successful launch will bring in support for NASA programs and NASA had the recommendation of the company that made the component.  It can also be argued it is not satisfied since Morton Thiokol were previously hesitant and disaster would bring negative publicity for NASA |
| NASA did not want to  postpone the launch, noting  “NASA didn’t want to  antagonize [Vice-President]  Bush, a strong NASA  supporter, by postponing the  launch due to inclement  weather after he had  arrived. | Act Utilitarianism is satisfied as going against NASA would mean that the company could lose business. In addition, NASA was insistent that the launch go ahead after it had been postponed many times previously. | Act Utilitarianism is satisfied as a successful launch in front of vice president would mean continued support for future NASA missions as well as support from the public on the insistence of VP. |

Rule Utilitarianism

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Action/Choice | Party\_#1: Morton  Thiokol | Party\_#2: NASA |
| Morton Thiokol  recommending the launch of  Challenger to proceed,  noting “Lund (of Thiokol)  reversed his previous  decision and recommended  that the launch proceed.” | If Morton Thiokol does not have any rules on how to react on this kind of situation, then it is satisfied. Otherwise, it is not if they are rules that suggest a launch should not go ahead if it hasn’t been tested in prevalent conditions. | Rule Utilitarianism is satisfied as rule state that the launch can go ahead if it is recommended by the engineers who developed the component. |
| NASA did not want to  postpone the launch, noting  “NASA didn’t want to  antagonize [Vice-President]  Bush, a strong NASA  supporter, by postponing the  launch due to inclement  weather after he had  arrived. | Depends on the Morton Thiokol’s rules. If they state that the launch should not go ahead below certain temperature or if has not been tested at prevalent temperature, then rule utilitarianism is not satisfied. However, it there are no rules, then it is satisfied. | It depends on the rules that NASA have. If NASA has rules that launch should not go ahead below a certain temperature, then rule utilitarianism is not satisfied. However, if there are no rules, then it is satisfied. |

Duty Ethics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Action/Choice | Party\_#1: Managers Gepp,  Dee and Lentz | Party\_#2: Workers at  Aberdeen Proving  Ground |
| Managers Gepp, Dee and Lentz --- managing and operating the facility, but having “hazards… left in open containers; chemicals that can become lethal when mixed together stored in the same rooms; barrels of toxic chemicals that were leaking; … an external tank used to store sulfuric acid that had leaked 200 gallons of acid into a local river. | Managers violated their duty of being vigilant and managing the facility properly. They violated their duty of ensuring proper storage and disposal of chemicals. | Managers violated the duty of being responsible managers by not providing a safe working environment for the workers at Aberdeen Proving Ground. |
| Workers at the AberdeenProving Ground facility --- working at the facility, but having to face the situation of being “exposed to hazardous and toxic chemicals.” | Managers violated the duty of providing a safe working environment for the workers at Aberdeen Proving Ground | Workers violated the duty of being self vigilant and reporting any defects on the facility. |

Right Ethics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Action/Choice | Party\_#1: Managers Gepp,  Dee and Lentz | Party\_#2: Workers at  Aberdeen Proving  Ground |
| Managers Gepp, Dee and  Lentz --- managing and  operating the facility, but  having “hazards… left in  open containers; chemicals  that can become lethal when mixed together stored in the same rooms; barrels of toxic chemicals that were leaking;… an external tank used to store sulfuric acid that had leaked 200 gallons of acid into a local river. | Managers can argue that did not violate any right as these were common practices at that point of time. But ignorance is weak argument for violation of rights.  Managers violated the rights of clean environment of communities living around the proving ground. | Managers violated the right of employees to have a safe working environment. |
| Workers at the Aberdeen  Proving Ground facility ---  working at the facility, but  having to face the situation  of being “exposed to  hazardous and toxic  chemicals.” | Managers’ violated the rights of workers to have safe working environment. However, it can also be argued that managers’ right to be aware of their plant was violated by workers as managers were not the one who were handling the chemicals. | Workers’ right to have safe environment was violated. |