## Business ethics on dbcp issue assignment

Art & Culture



Such actions listed UT the potential threats ODBC may bring to users, like negative effects via skin contact, orally taken and inhaled in vapors. A set of warning wordings were built and printed on products to guide users using it in a safe way, like in area with enough ventilation. Along the years of launching, Shell also commissioned the University of California on toxicological properties studies, which drilled down to adverse effect of vapor after inhaled by live beings.

A safety ceiling of ODBC fumes in parts per million set a good tankard for safe working environment for manufacturing labor. At this stage, under presence of preventive measure to users and workers, DOD and Shell were doing enough provided that no hazardous health threats to human were discovered at the time being. The 2 years spent on assessment of potential threats of ODBC causing to live being was also an implication of Social Contract Theory, which is to make profit along the standard of objective morality.

Yet, upon release of the combined study by Dotterels-Hint discovering the adverse effects of ODBC caused to testes of live-being, DOD and Shell turned to respond to stakeholders' interest more than considering the safety of ODBC manufacturing workers, "They went to the federal to register the research result as commercial secret". This was sad but understandable act as this protected the firm's interest from preventing potential competitors' entry for a fraction of costs and very little risk. Having acknowledged the safety standard for ODBC was no longer