

PERSPECTIVES

On the Professions

A periodical of the Center
for the Study of Ethics in
the Professions (CSEP),
Illinois Institute of Technology

HUB Mezzanine, Room 204, 3241 S. Federal Street, Chicago, IL 60616-3793
Tel: 312.567.3017, Fax: 312.567.3016, email: csep@iit.edu

Vol. 6, No. 1

June 1986

"Training and Practice Revisited"

Fay Sawyer, Editor, CSEP,
Illinois Institute of Technology

Several issues ago, PERSPECTIVES' focus was on the relationship between professional education and practice. At that time a nurse, a woman engineer and an architect reflected on their experiences of being "professionalized."

In this issue we present the introspective narratives and judgments of a well-known Chicago doctor, of an out-of-state attorney and of a professional philosopher.

My reasons for devoting two issues to this topic are first of all that there is an intrinsic dramatic and human interest in it. Secondly, the moral life demands reflective self-examination and that activity, carried out by these men and women in their professional "personae", offers us clues to some areas of particular ethical vulnerability within each profession. Finally each author sketches a particular sort of professional idealism that was an integral part of his or her training but which confrontation with practice (with "the real world" as one writes) has tarnished or at least diminished.

I invite your speculation as to

whether professional education and training should, therefore, become more "realistic" or whether on the contrary the professional emphasis on public service and moral idealism should be augmented and include some instruction in how to make these an integral part of practice.

"Notes on Professionalization" Quentin D. Young, M.D.

The anxious passage from childhood choice ("I want to be doctor") through the ordeals of academe and residency has commanded more than its share of literature. This has been augmented in recent years by the orgy of television voyeurism seeking, unsuccessfully alas, to sate the seemingly insatiable public hunger for "material" about physicians.

I can recount some personal experiences, which significantly influenced my professional consciousness, yet have not, I'm quite sure, found record in any book or TV production.

"Now a lot of people come here with slips from their precinct captain or their ward committeeman or even their congressman." Speaking is the

Medical Director of the fabulous Cook County Hospital; his audience, the one hundred competitively selected interns of the 1947 class. "These slips say the bearer is a worthy citizen and you should admit them to the hospital. Now you and I know they don't need those slips. But they think they do. So there's no use you tearing up those slips or criticizing the precinct captain. Just tell the patient you will take good care of them:"

Thus were we oriented to the crucial role County Hospital played as a service expression for the political machine: with 3400 beds, over 100,000 admissions (20,000 deliveries), the hospital was an enormous center, entry to which, its users believed absolutely, required a note from the local pot (to whom, of course, a political debt was then owed to be paid on voting days).

The Medical Director, a political bureaucrat himself, was giving the new team an instruction, reinforced throughout residency: the Organization's interest was to assure that its minions assumed the Hospital's services were a benefit or reward for political fidelity.

Regularly, patients who required no hospital care (often unwanted elderly relatives) were admitted after a visit or phone call to the Warden's Office. "Admit, per

Warden" was an override familiar to the Emergency Room doctors. No one ever challenged this regular abuse of terribly overstrained resources. Physicians in training who would fight for their sick patients as a tigress for her cubs were totally compliant, learning early on "to render unto Caesar" even if Caesar subverted the hospital's mission.

From the beginning, I was a critic of organized medicine, the conservative American Medical Association. My attending physicians at County admonished me to join up, rather than criticize from the outside.

So I joined. I dutifully attended my local Branch of the Chicago Medical Society (CMS) the first month out of my residency. I remember the speaker talked about Crohn's Disease; there were eight people present. And in the social hour following I was warmly greeted by an elderly doctor, who informed me he was the Branch President and invited me to be the slated candidate for Secretary at the upcoming election.

"Why should I do that?" I queried. "Well, after serving as Secretary we will elect you President and you will then also serve on the CMS Council, where the action is!" "That's interesting. But why, may I ask, me? You never met me before and already you have me running for office." "We have," he said, "a lot of colored in this Branch and we want to keep the officers white."

That unembellished racism I was not expecting and it posed an obvious moral dilemma. I chose to accept his shameful offer and, of course, when I ran for President it was with a black colleague for

Secretary. The color bar in the CMS Council was ended the next year, never to be re-established. It should be noted that the American Medical Association insisted it was a federation of state societies and, until 1957, "did not condone" but gave full recognition to the state associations in the south which formally barred non-white physicians from membership. In Illinois, the informal limitations on black doctors' election to leadership, a gentleman's agreement, worked quite well.

In the mid-1950's there were other efforts addressing institutional racism in medicine. A group with a cumbersome but precise title arose locally: The Committee to End Discrimination in Chicago Medical Institutions (CEDCMI). We were concerned that exclusion of black physicians from medical staffs, other than Provident Hospital, was a way to exclude blacks as patients. We knew that of the 300 black physicians (150 of whom were certified by Speciality Boards), only 24 had appointments on "predominantly white hospital" staffs.

We shared the common knowledge that blacks were not welcome at most private hospitals. The hospital spokesmen and the Chicago Hospital Council angrily denied systematic exclusion. "Indeed," they said, "we don't even keep any records of a patient's race;" as if this was further exculpation.

The CEDCMI was stymied. Without data, we could not overcome the hospitals' repeated public utterance denying difference of access by race. Then we got a bright idea! By state law, birth and death are reported by race. Could we get the City Department of Health to give

us the birth and death statistics by hospital? The commissioner of Health (and simultaneously the President of the Board of Health) was colorful Dr. Herman Bundesen, a medical maverick. Until Dr. Spock, Bundesen's baby book was the nation's most popular. He had proven his courage in more than one battle with organized medicine (which had expelled him from the Society) and with the political machine, which generally left him alone.

Nevertheless, he knew the great effect his data might have on the medical establishment. He paused for a few seconds, though to us it seemed interminable, and curtly said yes. We would have the racial breakdown of births and deaths.

A very few minutes later (it was the pre-computer era of machine sorted cards), we had our numbers. It told an unequivocal story of exclusion, total or nearly so in most of Chicago's hospitals—even those located in black neighborhoods.

Upon publicizing the finding, we never had to prove racial segregation again. At that point the hospitals thrashed about to explain the pattern, most often blaming their medical staffs, who pass on physician credentials, conveniently concealing the reality: the medical staff understood—and often concurred in—the hospital's wishes to keep out blacks and, again, acquiesced.

Remarkably, in 1955 and 1957 the Chicago City Council, based on the strong evidence of exclusion and, of course, pressed by rising impatience of Chicago's "minority" citizens, passed ordinances which outlaw

discrimination both in hospital admissions and medical staff appointments.

The outcome, harbinger of national civil rights laws, illustrated to me what can be done with tenacity in proving your case, coupled with versatility of tactics. It worked, to be sure, when a top official was won over to the importance of our petition and, finally, we were able to inform the public.

"The Underachieving Overachiever: Dissonances in the Practice of Law"

The author is a partner in a large east-coast law firm.

The practice of law in large law firms is undergoing substantial change. There are a number of causes, but the most important is economic. Practice has become increasingly complex and corporate counsel, in view of the high fees charged by law firms, are increasingly turning to outside lawyers only for the most complex, difficult and specialized matters. Such matters are those with respect to which the risk of error and therefore of exposure to malpractice suits is greatest.

These factors taken together mean that the pool of young lawyers who can do the work required of them in a large law firm is smaller than in the past. At the same time the pool of such lawyers available to large law firms in big cities is being further reduced by those who are unwilling to accept the demands placed on associates by such a practice and who opt for positions in smaller, less

pressured practices, as well as by those who abandon the law for higher paid positions, for example in investment banking or real estate development. This reduction in the pool of young lawyers qualified for large firm practice has been accompanied by a nationwide increase in the demand for them caused by the continued growth in large firm practices in major cities.

In sum, the demand for highly qualified young lawyers has risen, and the supply available to large law firms has diminished. The result is, of course, inevitable. Salaries paid to beginning lawyers (and therefore to all associates, since every raise in starting salaries must be reflected in the salaries of more senior associates) have risen exponentially. A major New York firm has just announced that its starting salary will be \$65,000 in the fall, and those who have been judicial clerks will be paid a signing bonus which can be as much as \$25,000.

These changes in large firm law practice which have their source in its changing economic structure are in their turn causing important other changes. This paper addresses one: the apparently increasing dissonances for some of the best law students between the fulfillment of law school and the realities of an associate's practice in a large corporate law firm (particularly in New York City) as that practice evolves.

Generalizations are necessary to the paper-about law school and law students and about law firms and associates-which are not demonstrable. Those set forth seem essentially correct, however, and two caveats may be sufficient: 1) no generalization in this paper

is wholly true about anyone or any law school or any law firm; and 2) all generalizations are false (including this one).

There are two student populations: those who see law as a relatively low risk career alternative to business as a means of access to high salaries (the "diverted business person") and those who consciously or unconsciously see the practice of law as a more accessible, much better paid and less isolated alternative to the life of a scholar (the "diverted scholar"). The second of these two is the central concern of this paper, and a portrait (idealized) of such a law student is helpful.

The diverted scholar has been a consistently outstanding student and has demonstrated the intellectual capacity to be a teacher and scholar. She is interested in theoretical questions and research and values original thought. She has spent much of her student life considering moral questions both in the classroom and out of it, has a continuing concern for social justice and puts a premium on the possibility of making a contribution to society in her professional life. She is not certain that she has the ability to lead the lonely life of the scholar and in particular that she has the "sitzfleisch" which the life of the dedicated scholar demands. She is unwilling, in any event, to run the considerable risk that after devoting seven or eight graduate years to specialized study she will find no rewarding teaching position, and she wants to earn more money than most scholars command.

Law school offers much to such a student, and she and those like her come in substantial numbers.

Indeed, they have in the past appeared to be in the majority, at least at some major law schools (if one can take a career interest in the public good as decisively identifying them): annual polls of entering students taken at Yale Law School fairly consistently indicated that the majority of the entering class intended to pursue careers of public service.

Such a student spends three years at law school essentially free from economic pressure (except that of the mounting debt she will one day have to repay). She is almost wholly in control of how her time is spent. At least after the first year, much of it can be devoted to activities other than school work, and she is on the whole autonomous. She spends the three law school years searching with the brightest and most able among the faculty and her fellow students for an expanded understanding of law, legal theory and social justice; and as her competence grows, she is increasingly treated by the faculty as a valued colleague in that search.

If she, like the majority of her classmates, decides to join a large corporate law firm after graduation, she will immediately confront one dissonance: a substantial number of the faculty of law school-whose approval is of particular importance to her-have little admiration if not indeed disdain for such a choice. Moreover the changes in her life will be radical. A recent series of interviews by the National Law Journal with mid-level associates of large New York law firms suggests what these changes will be.

First and foremost she will be paid handsomely for what she does. This warrant of the value of

her contribution is, to say the obvious, extremely welcome after her many years as a student (and in light of the debts she has incurred), but for the thoughtful there is even in this a question. As one associate expressed it to the National Law Journal interviewer, "Money, money. The damn thing about money is that we get paid too much. You begin to live a lifestyle your salary can sustain, and like other vices, you become addicted to that lifestyle."

Secondly, for the law student who joins a large corporate law firm there are significant changes, compared with the life of a law student, in autonomy, lifestyle and status. She is no longer free to determine when and how she will work. Demands on her time are constant and frequently extreme. As one of the interviewed associates said: ". . . it's best (for the partners) to have a full crop of eager prospective partners killing themselves to beat each other out to join the higher ranks [by billing the largest possible number of hours]:' And her status as a valued colleague whose opinions count is to be won again and, even when seemingly won as a senior associate, is frequently, in her eyes, put in question by the way partners deal with her. Again the views of the interviewed associates: "I think associates can be, to a much greater extent, brought into the firm decision-making." "So many partners and senior associates look at you as just junior to them In some cases you're stepped on . . ." "I think the major problem is that. . . [the firm's] pyramidal structure reduces anyone's feelings for the firm:" "The high moments are the times when a suggestion [of mine] gets taken seriously."

Her work, moreover, will for the

first time have consequences other than grades in a transcript. After years as a student this is also very welcome-indeed, a frequently articulated reason why she and others chose law practice over scholarship. Again, however, there are dissonances. In law school the ultimate question was, "Is this just?" In practice it is, "Will this advance the interests of my client?" The question of the ultimate comparative value of the two arises for some. Most seem persuaded, as one interviewee said, that "[t]he process itself. . . has a societal function and to the extent that I help preserve the efficacy and integrity of that process, I am doing something worthwhile." But there are caveats. As the rhetorical question of a young litigator framed one of them: "Do I think genuine societal benefits will flow from victory in my cases? Precious few . . ." A more important caveat is evident in the interviews of most of the associates the National Journal talked to: "When I was in law school, I thought about legal aid or defending the rights of the poor:" "Would I be doing greater good working for Legal Aid or in some policy area? Probably yes . . ." "I would be happier in a position where I could feel that I'm doing something worthwhile:"

The most fundamental change she experiences, however, is in the certainty of her status. From recognized able scholar in the law school community she becomes again an aspirant, this time for a position in the inner circle of partners. In New York, at least, the odds are against her and growing longer as changes in the economic structure of practice evolve. This is an uncertainty she must live with, generally for eight years, if she is to remain in the running, and one which will only

grow in intensity as she gets nearer the time of decision and has committed more and more of her life to the outcome. Not only is there uncertainty about the outcome, but about the standards which determine it. "It's foolish. . . to assume you'll become a partner no matter how good you are. There are other factors. It's some kind of secret thing like the Elysian rites but we, on this end of it, don't have a clear sense of it"

Much of what is reflected in these young associates' responses is simply the contrast between training for any profession and the doing of it; much which is unique to the practice of law in a large law firm is not new. Some themes are new, however, in degree at least, and most of what is new has its source in the changing economics of a large firm practice.

Many of the life changes described above which the joining of a large firm brings with it are positive and exciting for the beginning lawyer; but it is obvious that others create very substantial pressures and exact a considerable price. For the overachievers who are the subject of this paper—a uniquely driven and compulsive group who are "afraid to fail"—the pressures and the price are yet another challenge to achievement, and partnership is achievement of a very significant kind economically, professionally and in terms of the power and prestige which accompany it.

But the changes in the economics of large law firms have exacerbated the pressures and increased the price enough that some associates have become more questioning about the bargain they have struck. As one

summed it up: "I have to say the benefits outweigh the costs or I wouldn't be here. But I'm not happy and the costs are very high:"

A summation of those costs as reflected in the responses of the interviewed associates is instructive. To appreciate fully its significance an obvious fact needs to be kept in mind: these young persons are subject to high stress. Research suggests that individuals who handle stress most successfully are those about whom three things are true: 1) they are challenged by what they are doing; 2) they are in control of the outcomes; and 3) they are strongly committed to their work and its outcomes.

The evidence in the responses of the interviewed associates that they are highly challenged is clear, although dissonance results from the frequent shift from high level responsible work to work "which can be, not demeaning, but work you can do with one eye [sic] tied behind your back"

On the other hand, that they have a strong sense that they are not in control of their lives frequently comes through. One, leaving his firm although he felt that he had been treated well and "may have been viewed as a potential partner;" gave as the central reason for his decision to leave "the lack of control over my life." This feeling came to a head when he found himself working with people he did not enjoy but who were senior. "Working with these people made me realize I was subject to their whims and dictates to a degree I could not tolerate. It drove home the point of how out of control my life was."

The final issue for these highly stressed young persons—and

perhaps the most telling—is that of commitment to their work and its outcomes. They are totally committed to excellence in the work they do, and equally so to serving clients well. This much is true both of the associates who are diverted business persons and those who are diverted scholars. Commitment beyond dedication to these values is a function of other factors. For the diverted business person commitment is directly commensurate with the amount of money being made. If it is high, her commitment will be high. For the diverted scholar an increased commitment may not always follow continued increases in salary; uneven challenges, lack of autonomy or control and the limited commitment of some associates in large law firms may make its costs seem very high. The ultimate costs may be that some of these overachievers will wonder whether they are, for the first time in their lives, underachieving.

"The Real World Of Philosophy"

Michael Davis, Ph.D., Illinois
Institute of Technology

In most professions there's a relatively sharp line between those who teach the learned art and those who practice it. Those who teach the profession stand for something "higher" or at least apart from those subjects to the demands of practice. Teachers, unlike practitioners are supposed to be dedicated to the pursuit and dissemination of knowledge. The change that comes when one "enters the real world" of practice comes as no surprise in these

professions (though it may still come as something of a shock).

So, it may seem, entering the profession I practice should be different. To be a philosopher is to be a teacher of philosophy, and to be a teacher is to be someone not subject to the demands of practice. That, however, was not my experience. Taking up my profession was not like getting up from a seat in the classroom, walking up to the front, and taking over. It was, well, more like "entering the real world." So, perhaps we need to revise our general conception of what distinguishes those who teach a profession from those who practice it. Furthermore, perhaps we ought to prepare our students for "the real world of philosophy" as teachers of other professions try, whether successfully or not, to prepare their students for a different world of practice.

Among my first lessons in the real world of philosophy was that the classroom is not the center of academic life for faculty. Faculty do not often talk about what they do in class because they have no classes together. What they have together is their department. That is the center of their common life. One's relation to the department is not simply a relation with a series of individual faculty. Such relations exist, of course, but in addition to them there is the relation with the department as a whole. In a department of, say, two or three members, the distinction between individual faculty and department is small. But, in a department of even eight or ten, it can be enormous. One can, for example be getting along well with most members of the department and still not be getting along well with "the department".

That is possible because departments are organizations, organizations the central feature of which is "academic rank," something to which students need not give much thought. For a graduate student, all professors are more or less equal. The distinction between, say, "assistant" and "full" professor does not mean much. The distinction between "untentured" and "tenured" means even less (since it does not, like "assistant" or "full," even appear in the catalogue). Some of the best philosophers maybe young "assistants," while others are older "associates" or "funs." One "assistant" may treat you like dirt, while another makes you feel like a longtime friend. Full professors are much the same.

Only with my first job did I realize how important rank is, however democratic the department tries to be. A tenured philosopher has "made it," whatever his or her contribution to philosophy or eminence as a teacher. An untenured philosopher is, on the other hand, still "on probation," subject to being turned out for almost any reason the department thinks appropriate. Rank decides who gets to sit in judgment of whom, whose sense of profession takes precedence.

There is a story illustrating this. I do not know whether it is true. But if it is not, I know some others which, while too complicated for retelling here, would illustrate the same point. So, for my purposes, the truth of this story does not matter.

Here is the story: There was once a young philosopher teaching at a famous eastern university. He was clever, hard working, a good teacher, and helpful critic. He

was, in short, everything a graduate student is taught he should be. But he was not perfect. He often made a nuisance of himself at departmental colloquia. As soon as the speaker had finished, he would raise his hand and, being called upon would start asking questions. His questions might take up a good part of the question period. But, he would press on until the speaker had satisfied him on the point or, as happened more often, he had revealed a serious flaw in the speaker's work. Everyone agreed his performance on these occasions was often brilliant and valuable. Certainly, it showed just that single-minded pursuit of the truth for which philosophy students are regularly rewarded in graduate school as if that were the chief value of a philosopher. No one ever told our young philosopher that he should give his colleagues more opportunity to talk. No one ever suggested instituting a moderator to structure discussion more. But, when our young philosopher's probationary period came to an end, he was denied tenure because he did not "fit in."

Unlike most such stories, this one has a relatively happy ending. Our young philosopher soon afterward received an offer from another famous eastern university. When the department heard, it repented and offered him tenure. He left anyway and eventually became about as famous as philosophers become these days. But he left a quieter man.

I could tell similar stories about reading papers at colloquia (beware of reading unpolished work even though the tenured people do it all the time), how much to publish (publishing too much can make you look

"superficial" to those who cannot appreciate your work and may also hurt the feelings of the department's non-publishers), choice of journals to publish in (better to publish in journals your colleagues know than in journals those in your field are most likely to read), how to lobby colleagues (very discreetly, much as a Victorian might discuss sex), "campaigning" for office (don't, since it suggests you think your colleagues can't tell who deserves the job), whom to confide your insecurities in (no one in the department above you in rank, especially not someone on the tenure committee), how to receive criticism (it's better to agree with it all than to appear argumentative), and so on. Once tenured, our young philosopher could, of course, have done just what he did with relative impunity. Academics generally, and perhaps philosophers in particular, have a high tolerance of eccentricity among tenured colleagues. But, until tenured, a philosopher's career depends upon understanding how much "politics" can take precedence over research and teaching, something of which graduate school gives the student no warning.

I do not, of course, mean to suggest that all philosophy departments are as far from the ideal as the one in my story. Nor is it necessarily my view that that department did something wrong. All I mean to suggest here is how great the discontinuity between the ideals of graduate school and the real world of philosophy can be. It would, I think, be helpful if we openly discussed such matters with graduate students before sending them out. Indeed, it would be helpful if we openly

discussed such questions among ourselves. Perhaps our ideals are wrong. Perhaps being able to "fit in" is more important than brilliant and valuable questioning. Perhaps more philosophers should evaluate graduate students the way medical schools seem to evaluate their students, taking into account character as well as learning.

If such possibilities strike my fellow philosophers are strange, how much stranger is it that philosophers, who have so much to say about philosophy as an intellectual pursuit, have had so little to say about philosophy as a way of life.

Workshop on Professional Societies and Ethics

Mark S. Frankel, Workshop
Co-Director

On May 24-25, the Center and the Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility of the American Association for the Advancement of Science co-sponsored a workshop on the experience of and expectations for the scientific and technical professional societies in promoting ethical conduct by their members. More than 40 participants, representing professional society staff and ethics committee members, legal counsel to the societies, government agencies, university faculty, corporate management and professional journals, joined in discussion of some of the

promises and pitfalls of the professional society's role in matters of ethics. Each morning of the workshop included a plenary session, while the afternoons were devoted to small discussion groups. The two plenary sessions will be described first, followed by a summary of the four discussion groups, all of which were held concurrently during both days.

The Plenary Sessions

The first day of the workshop convened with a plenary session on "Professional Society Ethics Activities: Current Policies, Programs and Procedures," with four speakers approaching the topic from somewhat different perspectives. Rosemary Chalk, co-director of the workshop and Program Head of the AAAS Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, presented an overview of the professional ethics activities undertaken by scientific and technical societies. She included in her talk some of the results of a 1979-80 survey of such activities involving more than 200 societies affiliated with the AAAS in order to make some comparisons with current professional society programs. (The survey results were part of a larger published volume entitled, *Professional Ethics Activities in the Scientific and Engineering Societies*. The 1980 book is available from AAAS at 1333 H. St., NW, Washington, DC 20005.)

Attorney Barbara Mishkin, former Deputy Director of the

Presidential Commission for the Study of Ethical Problems in Medicine and Biomedical and Behavioral Research, focused her remarks on the law/ethics interface, especially with regard to health care providers and biomedical researcher. Mishkin argued forcefully that an important component of any effective ethics program was the willingness of professional to report inept or unethical colleagues to authorities, and she recommended the adoption of uniform state law that offered immunity to those professionals who did so.

The third morning presentation was by David Mills, Administrative Officer for Ethics of the American Psychological Association, who reviewed the ethics activities of the social and behavioral science professions.

A set of issues especially pertinent to the social and behavioral sciences relate to confidentiality and privacy. Mills reviewed the importance of confidentiality to the professional-client relationship, and discussed privileged communication statutes intended to enforce confidentiality. Yet, he also noted exceptions to both the principle of confidentiality and the legal privilege, focusing especially on the professionals "duty to warn" as it has evolved through common law. A professional, warned Mills, would ne ill advised to ignore this duty to warn third parties if the threat posed to the latter by a client endangered their well-

being.

The final presentation that morning was by William Middleton, Chairman of the Member Conduct Committee of the Institute for Electrical and Electronics Engineers. Middleton's charge was to review the ethics activities of the engineering and physical science professional societies. He concluded his talk by urging professional societies with common experiences to create a mechanism or process for exchanging information and ideas related to their professional ethics activities.

The plenary session of the second day began with Mark Frankel's examination of the normative role of professional societies in promoting ethical practices. He concluded with the observation that if one accepts that a professional association can be held morally accountable, then it has a duty to put in place mechanisms that will enable it to meet its responsibility.

Following Frankel's presentation, Charles Levy, Chairman of the Ethics Advisory Panel of the National Association of Social Workers, explored the opportunities and obstacles confronting professional societies relative to their ethics activities. While recognizing the diversity among professions, Levy also noted the commonality associated with professional efforts to codify, implement and enforce their ethics. Whatever self-serving function may be promoted by a

profession's ethical stance, it is quite evident that this ethics is a matter of considerable public interest and will be appropriately scrutinized by bodies external to the profession. Indeed, Levy observed that more or less authoritatively, patients and clients know more and are demanding more of professions, and they are increasingly appealing to public agencies and the legal system to satisfy their demands

The next speaker was Arthur Lerner, an attorney who was former Assistant Director of the Federal Trade Commission's (FTC) Bureau of Competition. Lerner discussed the implications of the antitrust laws for professional associations, reviewing recent Supreme Court decisions affecting the profession's effort to articulate and enforce ethical principles. He also described the FTC's role in overseeing professional activity during his tenure in the Bureau of Competition. He stressed the importance for professional associations to be informed of the legal constraints under which they must operate when administering their ethics activities.

The final speaker that morning was Judith Swazey, Director of The Acadia Institute. She discussed the societies' gatekeeping role, emphasizing the ethical responsibilities of professional journals. She urged professional societies to pay more attention to competency standards and continuing education, to the

education and socialization of graduate students and to explore innovative and effective sanction and support activities. Ways need to be found, argued Swazey, to sensitize graduate students to the ethical dilemmas likely to be associated with their work as professionals, and she urged to professional societies to take a more active role in that effort.

The Discussion Groups

Among the issues raised during the *professional ethics and law interface* group meetings, two were especially prominent. In one instance, group members discussed the importance of the professional societies clarifying the duties of professionals, particularly engineers, to report on matter of safety and to whom such reports must be made. The second issue that generated considerable discussion was the responsibility of the professional society in its investigations of alleged wrongdoing.

The group session on *developing a code of ethics* focused on four themes or questions: (1) For what purposes should codes be developed?; (2) Who can and should develop a code of ethics for a profession?; (3) Should codes be enforced and, if so, how and by whom?; and (4) What should be built into a code to insure that it can be modified as conditions change?

At the group sessions on *sanctions/support activities*, most of the participant expressed dismay about the limited range of

professional duties in an ethical manner or for investigating claims of member wrongdoing.

How the societies could educate their members and students about professional ethics matters was the thrust of the group session on *educational materials and programs*. Professional societies were called on to work more closely with university faculty in developing and disseminating appropriate materials for graduate education.

Conclusion

The results of a formal evaluation completed by the workshop participants and a more detailed summary of the workshop will be available at a later date. For more details, contact the office of:

The Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility
AAAS

1333 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

"Announcements"

CONFERENCES: The Council on Employee Responsibilities and Rights will hold its annual national conference on October 16-17, 1986 at the Sheraton Hotel in Virginia Beach, VA. For more information, contact: Chimezie A.B. Asigweh, Yg., CERR President and Program Chairman, Department of Management, Norfolk State University Norfolk,

VA 23504. Phone: (804) 623-8264 or 8920. The Long Island Philosophical Society will sponsor a conference on Professional Ethics in the Healing Arts, scheduled for October 25, 1986. For more information, contact Dr. Luis E. Navia, Chairman, Department of Social Science, New York Institute of Technology, Old Westbury, NY 11568. The Society for the Study of Ethics & Animals will conduct its annual meeting on December 28, 1986 in Boston, MA. For more information, Contact: Harlan B. Miller, Department of Philosophy, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 24061.

WORKSHOPS: The Center has been awarded a grant by the FelPro/ Mecklenburger Foundation of Skokie towards the organization of a Workshop on Vocational Ethics to be cosponsored with the Illinois Vocational Association. The two-week Workshop, tentatively scheduled for summer 1987, is intended to introduce vocational education instructors in Illinois to the field of applied and professional ethics and to assist them in developing teaching materials for use in their courses.

CALLS FOR PAPERS: The Missouri Gerontology Institute in cooperation with Lincoln University invites the submission of abstracts for presentations concerning humanities and aging for a conference entitled: "For the Aging: Equity and Quality of Life," to be held October 16-18, 1986. Publication of selected presentations is anticipated. Deadline for submission of abstracts is July 1, 1986. For more information, contact: Dr. Patricia Morrow, Aging Program Specialist, Lincoln University,

Jefferson City, MO 65101.

The next volume of *Philosophy in Context*, vol. 16 (1986), will be devoted to the subject of moral truth. What does it mean to say that an ethical judgment, or for that matter, an ethical theory is true? Or how might anyone know whether it is? Deadline for papers is August 1, 1986. Include two typed copies, double-spaced, 15 pages maximum, with notes at the end. Send papers to: Richard M. Fox, Editor, *Philosophy in Context*, Department of Philosophy, Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH 44115.

The Society for the Study of Ethics and Animals welcomes papers on the topic of assessing the value of moral agents for their meeting on March 26, 1987 in San Francisco. Those interested in submitting papers or in serving as commentators should contact, at their earliest convenience: Prof. Steve Sapontzis, Department of Philosophy, California State University, Hayward, CA 94542.

Center Plans Training Session for Motorola: The Center has contracted with the Communications Sector of Motorola to conduct a pilot one day training session on "Ethics in Decision-Making." If the session is successful, it is anticipated that a series of such training programs will be organized for the company. The faculty for the session will be Mark Frankel, Jack Snapper, and Vivian Weil.

The Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois Institute of Technology was established in 1976 for the purpose of promoting education and scholarship relating to ethical and policy issues of the

professions.

EDITOR: Fay Sawyer
ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Warren Schmaus
STAFF: Sharon Matthews
EDITORIAL BOARD: Thomas Calero, Mark Frankel, Martin Malin, Vivian Weil

Opinions expressed in *Perspectives on the Professions* are those of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions or the Illinois Institute of Technology: Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill. 60626.