Sudarshan Srirangapatanam

**Week 2 Reflection**

**1.A Which group were you in? What was your immediate reaction when you discovered that there were different materials in various groups?**

I was in Blue group, I was initially shocked since it did not come to my attention until we had a discussion about it. But at the same time I was sure that there was an underlying purpose for it.

**1.B Where in your life are you potentially in the (blue) high resource group? Discuss how this may influence your perspective in that area. What is one action you could (reasonably) take to address the disparity? [If you are having trouble with this one, consider the fact that you are a UC Berkeley student, and how that may be different from a community college or city college student.]**

In reality all of us can find many situations where we are all in the blue group and one example I would like to take is the fact that we ALL have better health system compared to, let’s say, some African villages. Thinking about our health system this way will definitely change the way we look at our on health system here in the U.S. We will better appreciate the research we as a society put into health and also better appreciate opportunities we have for seeking health care. For example, if a person in some remote village elsewhere in the world gets malaria his chances of survival is very slim since he/she wouldn’t have the same accessibility to health care as we have here. One action I would take to address the disparity would be to make medicine and health care global. I.E organize camps at a larger scale and more frequently.

**2.A Identify the stakeholders who have an interest in this statement (ex. consumers are one of the stakeholders, who are the others?).**

Consumers since they eat the food, manufacturers since hiding certain ingredients they use or masking them might have certain gain for their company, FDA since they regulate these rules, and CDC since they certain ingredients might have a causality to a particular disease.

**2.B Apply the 'rights' and 'utilitarian' theories as they pertain to the various stakeholders.**

For this case we have can consider many options: 1) consumes are given masked information, 2) consumers are given no information about safety, 3) all information regarding safety is fully disclosed.

As a utilitarian approach, options 1 and 3 are plausible since they both benefit a particular sector while 2 is on one end of the spectrum. Option 1 in this case would give consumers enough knowledge to make healthy choices as well as protect companies from losing their place, and option 3 would ultimately help consumers make more informed choice about food that they buy, but this would eventually wipe out all companies causing more harm.

In terms of rights approach we clearly see that option 3 wins for consumers and CDC and FDA would settle for option 1 since they would ideally have more information to unmask any masked information, while manufacturers would be most happy with option 2 since they are most protected under it.

By masked information I mean information that is somehow hidden, for example, zero calorie foods are not exactly zero calorie but they are allowed to be listed as such since they have very low calories per serving, also another example is using of names that are uncommon for public and thus giving information that is virtually useless, concerning consumers.