

Dissent about nuclear safety

[Science](#), [Social Science](#)



04 March Dissent about nuclear safety: Mill's approach to morality seems to achieve two purposes, one of which is that an action should be considered right if it evenly maximizes utility. Second component of this theory declares that even good intentions are irrelevant when outcomes are bad or worrisome. Sound ethical theories are considered the best because they fulfil all criteria used in evaluating ethical theories (Martin and Schinzinger 72). In accordance with this theory, Alison Turner should express her reservations about the Justification for Continued Operation (JCO). The JCO clearly does not attach any importance to the consequences or outcomes of the act of allowing the loss of one heat exchanger. The performance of the heat exchangers is substandard, but the loss of one can lead to heat exchange problems in future. Alison is well aware of this fact and also of another reality that continued operation of both heat exchangers can cost her company millions of dollars. But, going along with the JCO means that Alison does something which does not maximize utility in an even manner and which is also worthy of punishment because problems are anticipated despite good intentions to save the company. When the time to vote arrives, Alison should not vote in favour of the JCO for the same reasons expressed already in this discussion. It would not be wrong for her to cast a dissenting vote even if future calculations show that using a single heat exchanger does not cause any heat exchange problems for two reasons. First, outcomes of an act matter the most and second, intellectual pleasure which would result from safe outcomes supersedes physical pleasure which members of PNSRC would experience from cost savings.

Work cited:

<https://assignbuster.com/dissent-about-nuclear-safety/>

Martin, Mike W., and Schinzinger, Roland. Introduction to Engineering Ethics. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill Higher Education, 2010. Print.