

Leo Mei

Individual Paper #1

Engr 101

04/21/2019

Pragmatism, defined by Bargar as “[it] is not so simple a matter as it is for the Idealist and Realist...the Pragmatist believes that reality is a process” (Bargar, 43), is the philosophical standpoint that best fits my ethical worldview. The reason why I chose it is because “nothing is always good, nor is there anything that is always bad” (Bargar, 44). As well as every coin has two sides, we should not conclude that one thing is moral or evil without exploring and understanding the truth under the veil. Although one thing might seem obviously bad, people could have only looked at it from one point of view. As a result, the boundary between absolute goodness and absolute badness is ambiguous. In addition, Bargar stated “results or consequences are the ultimate measure of goodness” according to Pragmatism. He basically indicated that a bad thing could become moral at the end if it produces good results. Since it also implies Pragmatist would sacrifice something valuable for good outcomes, I agree on this idea but with a consideration on these valuable things. Indeed, Pragmatism allows us to focus on solving practical problems and producing the most direct benefits with our precious energy. It saves out time, energy and social resources. However, such advantages of Pragmatism could be bad practices such as sacrificing quality and essence. Therefore, my own version of Pragmatism must include balancing results and sacrifices. Pragmatism is also one of the 7 ethical frameworks that were introduced in class. I certainly agree that it is “good for making decisions in crisis situations” since we must sacrifice reasonably to reduce loss from crises in some circumstances (Lecture 1&2).

In September 11 2001, the World Trade Center was hit by a hijacked plane and eventually collapsed. However, it was able to withstand for more than 2 hours after the impact but was destroyed by the intense heat of the jet fuel fire. In detail, the intense heat engendered the steel to lose strength and deform which caused several floors to fall. The angle clips, which were responsible for holding floors, could not support the total weights of falling floors and

crashed down. Eventually, all floors failed due to the same reason and caused the building to collapse. In technical aspect, intense heat generated by jet fuel fire was most at fault implied by the documentary and the article. However, in my opinion, the Administration was most at fault because it failed to respond to the hijacking in time. Ethical dilemma of tradeoffs between safety and economy was raised by the accident. According to Eagar and etc, the WTC was “one of the most redundant and one of the most resilient skyscrapers” at that time because of its lightweight and “perimeter tube” design (Eagar et al, 2). In spite of ever new design to reduce costs and construction time, the WTC was proven safe enough to resist the impact as Corley stated “the buildings...performed well... there was no trade off of safety for economy in construction” (Kennedy et al, Why the Towers Fell). My interpretation of Pragmatism includes an idea of balancing results and sacrifices. Inspired by this accident, I consider that public safety must be the first priority and there should not be any tradeoffs. In addition, we should also improve the current emergency rescuing system to minimize casualties. This accident had taught engineers not to compromise safety to any other factors. While designing a project, engineers must have done their best to simulate possible failures and to improve the design to prevent such failures. However, there could be external elements such as jet fuel fire in this accident which might lead to catastrophic outcomes. In my opinions, putting public safety as the highest priority when design a project would be the main lesson. For example, hardening stairways or adding fire protection to emergency exits would have saved more people from the WTC accidents. These methods are relatively simple to carry out without intensive simulations.

Work Cited

- Eagar, T. W., & Musso, C. (2001). Why did the world trade center collapse? Science, engineering, and speculation. *Jom*, 53(12), 8-11.
- Hough, K. Lecture 1 and 2. *Engineering 101*. University of California, Santa Barbara
- Kennedy, G., & Klein, L. (2002, February 10). Why the Towers Fell. Retrieved from <https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0381710/>