

Civil rights activist Sylvia Gasca offered this perspective:

Employers can make reasonable demands for performance; that's not job discrimination. But when they fire a person for reasons that have nothing to do with work performance, that's discrimination, whether it's racial or gender- or disability-based. And in the case of genetic information, it can be even more extreme, because the person may not even have a disease—just a gene. It's genetic discrimination.

**The Decision**

Taylor thought about the various points of view that these people had expressed. In particular, she remembered the words of Reiger's wife, who was furious about the whole situation:

Giving him the test without his consent is inexcusable, but saying he can't fly is preposterous. He's not a child. He's a responsible adult, who knows all about Huntington's disease. If he experiences even a hint of a symptom, he'll ground himself immediately. There's no disease here now: just the gene that will cause the disease some day in the future.

Taylor also knew that Reiger himself had been devastated by the grueling experience of watching his father die. The knowledge that he, too, stood a very good chance of living through that ordeal had to be earth-shattering for him and his family. Taylor had never before faced a decision that involved such a difficult variety of factors.

02/2014-8897

This case was developed by the Business Ethics Institute for the participants of the Business Ethics class discussion.

Additional cases in the Business Ethics cases in order.

Copyright © 2014

Cases may not be reproduced in any form or by any means.