

Adam Passanisi

Questions #5,6

5.) When looking at this situation from a deontological point of view, the obvious solution to this problem is for Toysmart to not sell their customers information, solution #1. According to the rights based approach, the right to privacy is a basic human right that is universal to all humans. This means that when companies hold a customer's private information (such is the case with Toysmart), they cannot trade it to a third party unless they have said that customers give consent to do so. By selling their information to others, Toysmart would be breaking a basic human right. Selling this information would also bring up another problem for Toysmart. When they first created their business, they told their customers that absolutely none of their private information would be sold to a third party. But if they sold their information now, they would be lying to their customers. The act of keeping promises and telling the truth, according to W.D. Ross, is an indisputable moral duty. This means Toysmart would be breaking another moral right by selling this information.

6.) In the situation of Toysmart and its customer's information, the correct solution using the teleological perspective would be to sell the information to another company and then have that company ask each customer for consent to use their information. This would be solution #3. When looking at situations from a teleological perspective is it to use something called 'moral calculus.' The key to teleological perspective is to do the most good for the most people or the least bad for the least amount of people. So that is why selling the info and then asking

for their consent makes the most sense from a teleological perspective. All of the creditors are happy since the debts that they were owed by Toysmart have been paid. Even though their information had been sold to another company, the customers at least get the option whether or not the company can use their information.