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**Made in the USA – Dumped in Brazil, Africa, Iraq…. Q:4**

The Question: If No law is broken, is there anything wrong with dumping? If so when is it wrong and why? Do any moral considerations support dumping products overseas when this violates US Law?

Based on the last portion of this question, if “Dumping” overseas violates U.S. Law, then this question has already answered itself, because it is illegal and therefore wrong. For the purposes of this assignment, we can pretend that “Dumping” is legal, and analyze whether this practice is ethical.

When we consider that “Dumping” is the act of selling a product to another country cheaper than selling on domestic markets then the questions that must be asked to justify this act are questions such as the following:

* How much does the product in question usually sell for in the country in question?
* What is the reason for the price difference?
	+ Is it the local economy?
	+ Is it because of unfair undercutting practices to force out competition?
	+ Is it because the product in question has been over produced, or discovered to have some negative affect causing the manufactures to try to liquidate stock

The answer to these questions will determine whether the act of “Dumping” is ethical.

If local economy prices in another country for similar products are cheaper than domestic prices, as a business you would be faced with the choice of whether or not sell in that country, or price competitively for that country, which could result in cheaper pricing than domestic. In this circumstance, the illusion of dumping could be justified.

However, “Dumping” would not be ethical if the purpose was to undermine the local economy by severely undercutting local business owners to the extent that it forces the local business owners out of business, or as in the case of this particular case study, providing products that have been proven to be unsafe to the consumer.

The case study makes the point that some Third world governments demand access to these subpar products, otherwise we are violating their national sovereignty, but even considering this, if a product is known to be unsafe, then it should not be sold. Because you would then be morally responsible for any harm that may come to those that use the product, regardless if the selling of the product was legal.

**The A7D Affair…. Q:4**

The Question: Do you think Vandivier was wrong to work up the qualification report? Explain the moral principle or principles that underline your judgment.

Yes, Vandivier was wrong to work up the qualification report. He was conflicted about the doing the report because he knew that if he wrote the report a unsafe product would be pitched and sold to a company as a solid piece of equipment that would not fail, when he clearly knew that it would.

Even with management demanding that the report be written, and knowing that it would probably cost him his job, it would have been better to stand up for his principles and what he knew was right, instead of writing the report.

In the end Vandivier did, what I believe was the correct thing to do, which was to report the fraud to the authorities. It half way redeemed his mistake of writing the report in the first place, which allowed faulty product to be tested in situations in which lives depended on it, and it probably saved him from even more serious consequences when everything eventually became public after some tragic accident and investigation involving those faulty brakes.

Sadly, it only half way redeemed his mistake, because the writing of that report still cost him his career as an engineer, and he ended up as a newspaper reporter. The blowing the whistle did not cost him his career. The report cost him his career. Even if he had lost his job because he refused to write the report, he would have still had a clean conscious and been able to say that he had never falsified any data, and he would probably have been able to find another engineering position.

In this particular case the moral principle that I feel was crossed, is that it is wrong to falsify or withhold information that could directly lead to unnecessary and dangerous risks being taken because of decisions that were made based on the information that was provided.