

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. 14, No. 1

August 1994

"Journal Ethics"

Michael Davis, Editor, CSEP,
Illinois Institute of Technology

About a year ago, Sohair ElBaz, once CSEP's librarian but by then director of IIT's main library, sent me a clipping from *American Libraries* (January, 1993). In it, Tom Gaughan described one decision in an editor's life.

He had received a submission, "The imperial presidency and the executive board". It accused members of the Executive Board of the American Library Association (ALA) of spending far too much for their travel, lodging, meals, and entertainment at conferences. The accusations rested on figures in the board's own document.

Gaughan knew immediately that he had a problem. *American Libraries* is the ALAS news medium. Printing "The imperial presidency" might upset his superiors. It might also damage the 55,000-member association. Gaughan could easily picture hundreds, even thousands, of ill-paid librarians quitting the ALA in disgust.

Gaughan also knew that he could not just reject "The imperial presidency". The ALA, the world's most important voice in support of libraries, had long been

a prominent defender of intellectual freedom. To reject the submission because it was controversial could undermine the ALAS ability to speak effectively for intellectual freedom. And, of course, rejecting the paper did not mean it would go unpublished. The author had said that he would seek publication elsewhere if *American Libraries* refused to publish it.

Wishing guidance, Gaughan turned to the section of the ALAS policy manual governing his journal. *American Libraries* was, it said, always to represent the "best interests" of the ALA and to keep the journal's pages "scrupulously and faithfully open to all viewpoints of interest and concern to the library profession." That seemed clear enough. Gaughan decided to accept the article-with the understanding that an ALA officer would offer a rebuttal on the facing page-and cleared the decision with ALAS Executive Director. That might have been the end of it. But it was not.

After board members received the manuscript, they held a series of conference calls. Board members spoke with the Executive Director and she spoke with Gaughan and with the article's author. The board requested Inane "corrections". The author agreed to a good number. Nothing troubling about that. But board

members also made enough comments about Gaughan's "editorial judgment" that he began to think he would soon need another job. Then a board member, someone Gaughan respected, threatened to sue him, as well as the article's author and the ALA, for libel if the article were published.

Gaughan asked ALA's attorney for advice. The advice was a revelation. The document on which the article relied, though the board's own, was not necessarily the truth. So, though truth is a defense in any suit for libel, the suit might well go to trial before Gaughan had a chance to make his defense. The ALA's insurer would, of course, pay to defend the ALA-but not Gaughan as such. Gaughan would have to hire his own lawyer if he wanted to be sure his own interests were looked after. If he did, he might win his case and lose his shirt.

Gaughan reviewed his decision to publish. Getting the ALA sued did not seem in its best interests. Getting Sued also didn't seem in his own best interests or in his family's. Wiser, but sadder, Gaughan reversed his decision and rejected the article. He (lid, however, preserve his editorial integrity by explaining-in his journal's "Ed. Notes"-why, this time, *American Libraries* had not been "scrupulously and faithfully open to all viewpoints".

I think Sohair sent me that "Ed. Notes" because she wanted to know whether I thought the ALA had done the right thing. I wrote back that-like her-I thought that it had not: scandal prospers in darkness.

But, having rendered judgment, I had other thoughts: I too am an editor. I could end up in something like Gaughan's situation. Does HT have libel insurance? Would I be covered if I were sued as an individual? Should I stick up for intellectual freedom while legal fees-like termites-devoured my house, my retirement savings, and my son's education?

After hypothetical panic came realistic reflection. Here is a subject about which I would like to know more, the ethics of editing journals. Here is a topic about which little seems to have been written. Indeed, here is a topic for an issue of *Perspectives*!

I had to make far fewer phone calls than usual to get commitments for the three pieces printed here. Editors seemed genuinely interested in the topic and anxious to say something about it. They proved, however, busier than the average *Perspectives* contributor-or, at least, less good at meeting deadlines. I had to make many more than the usual number of calls to get the commitments fulfilled. In the course of these calls, I learned a new term "over-overcommitted" (as in, "I'm afraid I over-overcommitted again"). I learned that from an editor who delivered. Another editor, not represented in this issue, became the first person ever to fail to deliver a piece promised to *Perspectives*. His slow fade, no doubt excusable, suggests a topic

for another *Perspectives*, the ethics of promising to produce.

The first of our contributors, Gary Hengstler is, like Gaughan, the editor of the medium of a large professional society, the American Bar Association. Hengstler, himself a lawyer, begins with what might be the fundamental question in journal ethics: whose ethics is it? Hengstler's answer is, in effect, that it is hard to say. He is, he thinks, primarily a journalist, rather than a lawyer, even though he is both. His ethics should, then, be determined primarily by the journalist's code of ethics rather than by the lawyer's. That seems plain enough. Yet, in practice, he finds himself trying to satisfy both codes; and sometimes despairing of satisfying either. The editor's job seems to generate a range of problems for which neither code was designed.

Neither *American Libraries* nor *ABA Journal* is an academic publication. We might suppose the editor of an academic journal to have life easier. But our other two contributors suggest that we should not suppose that. One, Adil Sharma, writes about editing a scientific journal; the other, Patricia Werhane, about editing an ethics journal. Both devote a good deal of time to the complex interrelation between politics and ethics, the intricate dance by which an editor can (generally) prevent bias, honor power, and publish good work. Both also report moments when the dance stopped and they had to choose. Like Gaughan, both Shaman and Werhane seem to have had moments as editor when they felt very much alone.

This issue concludes with an Editor's Note, initiating a practice

I hope will be short-lived, some reflections on the past and future of *Perspectives*, one editor's response to another editor's failure.

"Legal Journal Ethics"

Gary A. Hengstler, Editor and Publisher, ABA Journal

Before even disclosing who he was, the angry caller demanded, "Are you a lawyer?" Hearing that I was, he proceeded to tear into me for our article on a trial that put the judge and the prosecutor in an unfavorable light. The case was then under appeal.

Reader objections to an article are commonplace in any publishing environment. What was unusual was the basis for the complaint: a supposed violation of the American Bar Association's *Model Rules of Professional Conduct*. I was being accused of unethical conduct for publishing a story critical of lawyers.

The caller was relying on Rule 8.4 (d): "It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice." He was, that is, not relying on a rule designed for journalists but, instead, on one designed for practicing lawyers.

I probably get six or seven calls a year like that. They raise a basic question: Does a writer or editor who also happens to be lawyer have a different, higher standard to adhere to when covering the legal profession? Does our magazine, the official magazine of the ABA, have an ethical

obligation to refrain from publishing stories critical of lawyers because all lawyers have a duty to uphold the integrity of the profession?

We *are*, I admit, obliged to uphold the integrity of the profession. But, I contend, we do that when we illuminate significant wrongdoing. I reject the notion that because a case is under appeal we should refrain from writing about it lest we prejudice the administration of justice. The general press is not so constrained; the ABA rule shouldn't be warped into an interpretation applicable only to legal publications.

The ABA *Rules* were drafted for practicing lawyers, not for legal journalists. To the extent they are relevant to my news judgment, I will consider them (based on what I feel I owe the law). Otherwise, I must follow another standard, the code of ethics of the Society of Professional Journalists (SPJ Code). Unfortunately, the SPJ Code provides less guidance than the ABA's does.

In law school I was intrigued by Canon 9 of the old *Code of Professional Responsibility*: "A lawyer should avoid even the appearance of impropriety." The rule focused on the lawyer's obligation to uphold public confidence in the profession. Nice idea, I thought, but rather vague and subjective. How likely is it that consensus can be achieved that an action appears to be proper (or improper)? The rule invites speculation about motivation, which is generally the reason why people conclude something doesn't look right.

I find no equivalent requirement in the SPJ Code. The closest

provision says, "Journalists should conduct their *personal lives* in a manner that protects them from conflict of interest, real or apparent." 'that addresses only their personal lives and only to the extent of avoiding one area of possible ethical problems, conflicts of interest.

Generally, journalists are urged to avoid only the impropriety itself; they need not consider how the action may appear to the public. This is a significant weakness in the SPJ Code. Some years back when I was still the *Journal's* news editor, we faced a situation that illustrates the point.

Researching an article on personal injury lawsuits charging flawed highway designs, we interviewed an expert who had written a book on the subject. The expert, having been interviewed, had his publisher place an advertisement for the textbook and requested that the ad be adjacent to the article.

Our advertising department saw nothing problematic about the request, no need even to advise the editorial department. When the magazine was published, the editorial department was angry.

Nothing editorially wrong had been done. The expert had been consulted only as a source. From the advertising perspective, nothing wrong had been done because it is not unethical for advertisers to seek such an affinity with the readers.

But the overall appearance was one of editorial prostitution—selling our editorial integrity for advertising.

The SPJ Code states that

"Journalists must be free of obligation to any interest other than the public's right to know the truth." Clearly, our reporter was under no obligation to the textbook author, but that isn't how it appeared to the reader. The impropriety was avoided; the appearance of impropriety was not.

But even the issue of appearance of ethical violations seems to be shifting in the wake of what has loosely been called "political correctness." Partisans are quick to castigate editorial decisions as unethical when those decisions do not reflect the perspective of the adherent.

Let me give an example. Our lead feature article dealt with the large sums governments were paying to informants, particularly in drug cases. For our cover, we decided to photograph a rat perched on a detective's shoulder, whispering into his ear while two more rats waited their turn.

We could not find photos of rats in the right position to "chrome in" by computer. The remedy was to kill three rats, stuff them, and pose them. I authorized it.

When a rival legal publication wrote about the cover's genesis, the result was a flurry of letters from animal rights organizations protesting my "unethical action".

Was it unethical, or merely politically incorrect from the animal rights point of view? Does it matter that the rats were to have been thrown alive into a python's pen for food? Was it not more ethical—or, at least, more humane—lethally to inject them than to let a snake suffocate them?

What determined how I answered was the animal in question. Rats are not an endangered species. Exterminators are paid to go after them. Had it been another kind of animal-say, three basset hounds-I would not have authorized killing them for our cover.

I am satisfied that killing rats for the cover was not, in itself, unethical -politically incorrect maybe, but not unethical. However, I admit that it appeared improper to some. And, because I just suggested that the appearance of impropriety should be a violation of journalism ethics, I must admit doubt about my own suggestion. My trouble with rats shows how hard drawing hard ethical lines can be.

While I'm on the subject of political correctness, perhaps I should mention another difficult question. Does a publication have an ethical obligation to promote cultural, racial, and ethnic diversity in its editorial columns, especially in the selection of graphics?

Hardly a month goes by that I don't get a letter from some constituency pointing out that I didn't have enough-pick one-women, blacks (African-Americans?), Hispanics, gays, or other group as sources for use in photos or sources for articles.

Here the issue is not avoiding an impropriety or even the mere appearance of one, but rather of failing to use the magazine to promote a (perceived) social good.

It is one thing (and quite necessary for survival) for a publication to reflect changes in its readership. It is another for a

vocal segment of the readers to clamor for something like a quota system under the threat of accusations of unethical journalism. Publication changes should be voluntary and consciously planned.

I find the attempt to link political correctness with journalism ethics troublesome. It shifts the traditional notion of what is ethically demanded from avoidance of wrongdoing to a requirement of meeting someone's conception of right-doing. That many journalists I know embrace facets of political correct journalism is even more disturbing. The concept of freedom of the press suggests a wide range of opinions, both popular and unpopular-the "marketplace of ideas" in the words of Justice Holmes.

Similarly, Justice Brandeis once wrote that the remedy for falsehoods and fallacies was "more speech, not enforced silence." I fear that many journalists, fearing to seem out of the mainstream, are easing into an era of enforced silence regarding the politically incorrect. Silence is enforced by branding the socially unpopular word, phrase, or thought as unethical.

Ethical standards are by nature constructed on consensus. But, as we move to merge the ethical with the politically correct, are we not in danger of sacrificing the tolerance a democratic society needs to function effectively?

"Editors, Peer Reviews, and Ethics"

Adil E. Shamoo, Biological Chemistry, University of Marland at Baltimore

While still young, I was editor-in-chief of a new journal. Two papers were submitted by a young author who was in a running conflict with the established view in his field. I chose two members of the editorial board, leaders in the field, to review the papers. Since I was familiar with the topic, I also reviewed the papers.

Both editorial board members recommended rejection because the conclusions did not fit the established view. Though one reviewer was adamant, neither objected to the methodology or the data. Their quarrel was with the author's interpretation. Meanwhile, I had concluded from my own reading that the second paper was primarily a follow-up, adding little to the first. Now, with the reviewers' recommendations before me, I decided to reject the second paper and submit the first to another reviewer, an experienced member of the editorial board not expert in the field. I gave him the comments of the two reviewers without telling him what I thought. He recommended acceptance.

One of the other reviewers, the adamant one, must have heard what I was doing. He called about this time and threatened to resign from the editorial board if I accepted the papers. Did I feel tremendous pressure to give in to his threat? Certainly. For a young scientist attempting to build a journal and a career, what could be more dangerous than rejecting

the advice of those who will soon sit in judgment of one's work? Nevertheless, I went ahead and published the first paper. The caller did not resign. And I heard nothing more of the decision.

I felt then, as I still do, that the purpose of peer review is not to censor the interpretation of data but to evaluate the methodology and the data, to determine whether the author's subject comes within the scope of the journal, and to suggest ways to improve the paper. The peer reviewer should judge the originality and thoroughness of the paper.

Still, the question remains, why didn't I give in to the caller's threats? Perhaps I did not because I myself had been the victim of peer review a few years earlier. I was then teaching at the Medical School of the University of Rochester. I had submitted a grant proposal to a federal agency. The official in charge of selecting reviewers called to say that it appeared that I already had a grant from another federal agency and that this grant was sufficient for a newly appointed assistant professor: would I withdraw my proposal?

Naive and ambitious, I said: No. The two grants were for different purposes. He and I knew many scientists who had more than one grant from more than one federal agency.

Polite, but blunt, he replied that he could select reviewers who would kill any grant proposal.

The discussion went like this a bit longer. Then I demanded that he put his request in writing and send it to me. No, he concluded, that was not necessary. The grant proposal would go through the normal "fair" process of peer

review.

The proposal was denied funding. I submitted three more proposals on the same topic during the next two years. All went to the same official; all were rejected. Finally, I caught on. With my fifth proposal. I sent a covering letter asking that the proposal be assigned to someone else. The proposal was funded.

Now, a seasoned journal editor, I cannot reflect on my first hard decision as an editor without being aware of how much was at stake.

The future of my journal was at stake, of course. The journal was new, fragile. Rejecting the advice of established scientists could have meant their departure from the editorial board, loss of manuscripts submitted by them and their friends, declining subscriptions, and eventually the journal's death. Scientists in my field are a small community. They know who counts. They try to read what the leaders read and publish where the leaders publish. A journal can lose its reputation quickly.

The advancement of my science might also have been at stake. Science seems to advance by the constant assault of new ideas upon the old. Science is forever eating its children. The established leaders of a science, that is, the parents of those children, may be forgiven for finding such an assault objectionable, especially since most such assaults fail. All new ideas must begin unpopular, but most remain so. Still, the paper I accepted might have been important. An editor's duty is not to suffocate a good idea in its cradle.

That duty, though in part owed to science, is also, in part, owed to society at large. New science can have an impact on society, though the impact may be small and slow in being felt. An editor of a science journal serves the public by adopting a reliable procedure for determining what is worth publishing. Peer review, when it works, is certainly such a procedure. But, like any other procedure, it can fail.

The editor's role in peer review is to provide a check on reviewers, to keep an eye out for signs of bias, sloppiness, incompetence, and so on. An editor must be willing to step in-for example, by using a third reviewer-when the ordinary procedures seem to have gone awry. An editor must, of course, be careful not to go too far. Editors are as fallible as reviewers. The editor's role is to judge impartially between reviewers and authors, not himself to replace the reviewers.

How can an editor know that he has done this right? I don't think there is any general answer to that question. I myself take a "pragmatic approach". I ask: do I, taking into account everything I know about this decision, feel comfortable with it? It is this "comfort level" that decides what I will do. After all, whatever else is at stake in an editorial decision, my own peace of mind, my own conscience, is.

Can we improve peer review in journals? Yes, of course. I believe we can make improvements on three different levels.

First, we can change public policy. Public: policy can be quite influential in setting standards across fields. A single regulation of the National Science

Foundation or the National Institutes of Health can have a much greater impact on society than can several hundred journal editors acting individually. Think, for example, of recent regulations concerning plagiarism. Of course, the public policy enacted must be good. Bad public policy is as widely corrosive as good public policy is healthful.

Second, editors themselves can cooperate in setting standards. An individual editor may have trouble resisting the pressure of an important member of the scientific community. But he will have less trouble if he can cite a rule that all editors in his field have agreed to follow. We have a few such rules now (for example, on who should be listed as author). We should develop others.

Third, an individual editor can develop general practices that tend to head off trouble. While I like the current structure of having two reviewers, I think it important for the editor actually to read both reviewers thoroughly even if they agree. An editor should never be a rubber stamp.

I also think every journal should use an evaluation form that virtually forces reviewers to state specific reasons for acceptance or rejection. No one liners. If reviewers state their reasons, an editor can make a judgment on the reviewer's reasons rather than on whether the reviewer checked the "accept box" or the "reject box".

Editors should also routinely use some reviewers not in the paper's field but adjacent to it. Given how small many fields of science are, such a practice helps protect against the groupthink that small fields seem to nourish. Such a

practice may also encourage the editor to think about the paper's importance to science generally rather than getting overly concerned about the minutia of interpretation within a field. Editors should have an explicit policy of not rejecting a paper based solely on its controversial interpretation of data so long as the "standard" interpretation is included as an alternative and the reasons for rejecting that alternative are given.

These practices could eliminate censorship and drastically reduce bias.

We also need to teach science graduate students, and even undergraduates, about the ethics of editing science journals. I might have found my first hard decision easier if, as a student, I had had a chance to think calmly about decisions like mine.

"Editing an Academic Journal"

Patricia H. Werhane, Darden School, University of Virginia

When I began editing a journal for academics, a journal of ethics, I hoped at least to avoid many of the ethical problems of editing. My experience as founder and editor-in-chief of Business Ethics Quarterly (BEQ) belies that hope. Ethical problems arose early and often.

Financing BEQ presented the first ethical issues. Because financing an academic journal is, at best, difficult, we devoted much discussion to the question: Should a journal of business ethics accept

money from business corporations? We were especially concerned that corporate sponsorship might create conflicts of interest, for example, when the journal considered publishing articles questioning corporate behavior.

To date, we have not accepted financing from corporations, not even in the form of advertising, except from other academic journals and academic book publishers. But the question of corporate sponsorship still comes up every year at the meeting of the Board of the Society for Business Ethics, the overseer of the journal.

Because BEQ has so far not accepted corporate sponsorship, paid staff consists of one person, half-time. The managing editor, and the editorial review board, and I must donate our time. For its financial support, the journal must depend on the continued increase in number of subscribers and what our universities can provide.

Financing is one threat to a journal's independence, but institutional connections are another. An academic journal should be independent from any particular school of thought, religious orientation, creed, or national perspective. Maintaining such independence for a journal has proved much easier than maintaining the appearance. Because much of the early work in business ethics was done at Catholic universities in the United States, it is not surprising that BEQ is housed and supported by Loyola University of Chicago, a Jesuit institution. For people familiar with universities, this connection will not seem problematic. All religiously affiliated institutions that are

nationally recognized and accept federal funding are obligated both legally and in their charters to preserve freedom of speech.

To avoid the appearance of religious bias, the Society of Business Ethics developed a mission statement for the journal committing it to diversity, pluralism, and so on. This statement has not proved sufficient. We recently turned down a proposal for a special issue on the Catholic Bishops' Letter on the Economy to avoid appearing too closely identified with Catholic thinking.

The selection of the editorial review board presents more ethical-and political-problems. An editorial review board should include leaders in the field, reflect gender, race, and national diversity and, at an interdisciplinary journal, have representatives from a variety of disciplines. The board should include good reviewers, people who are relatively objective, know the field well, and turn in reviews on time. The board's membership should change often enough to prevent the board becoming a clique. Problems arise (a) when friends nominate themselves (these are often colleagues whom I was saving for the next term of editors), (b) when reviewers demonstrate a consistent bias for or against certain kinds of manuscripts, or (c) when reviewers do not return manuscripts. The academic reputation of a reviewer is often in inverse ratio to the likelihood of such problems occurring.

The term of a member of BEQ's editorial review board is now five years. That has proved too long to allow me to ease out a

questionable or slow reviewer gracefully.

BEQ has a double-blind review system: the author does not know the reviewers and the reviewers do not know the author. Yet sometimes authors leave "autobiographical signs" in their paper that cannot be eliminated. These "signs" can influence a reviewer positively or negatively. How should a reviewer deal with that potential for bias? How should the editor-in-chief deal with it?

Each article is reviewed by two editors, in most instances editors in different disciplines. In principle, this is ideal. In practice, reviewers can sharply disagree concerning the quality of a paper. Such disagreements can raise issues of fairness, since the perspective of one discipline may not be appreciated by another; yet, interdisciplinary reviewing of manuscripts is essential to avoid "old boyism" in acceptance of articles. Because I am a philosopher, my perspective, like that of each of my editors, is also bound to have a disciplinary bias. Where there is disagreement, we solicit a third and sometimes a fourth review. As editor, I read all articles that are approved by two reviewers, all articles for which there is a split vote, and at least scan articles that are rejected by two or more reviewers, occasionally exercising my own judgment. As a result, some editors complain about the appearance of articles they rejected or would have rejected. Are they right to complain? Perhaps.

Because pure objectivity is impossible, we have tried to reduce bias in the journal as a

whole by encouraging response articles from different perspectives and by having special issues with guest editors from other disciplines. We have also encouraged dissident reviewers to write response articles to pieces that they do not like.

As an editor-in-chief well known in my journal's field. I am faced with the temptation to publish my own articles. To date I have refrained, but on two occasions I have published my response to an article, because the response originated in a symposium for which the article was also written. Would the journal be better if I contributed to it more?

More difficult dilemmas arise when a manuscript from a member of the editorial review board is blind reviewed and receives two negatives. I have found no good way to say "no" to a member of the editorial -board. I have, however, learned from experience how not to do it. Last year, we sent a two-sentence form rejection letter to a distinguished member of our editorial board whose paper two other distinguished editors had turned down. The letter was short because the reviewers had had nothing positive to say about the paper. The paper's author was not pleased.

I have learned something else about truth-telling. During the summer, finding people to review manuscripts is virtually impossible. Reviewers travel, work on their own research, are difficult to locate, and seldom review a manuscript promptly. Last year, the managing editor, Al Gini, admitted what everyone knew. He announced that no manuscripts would be reviewed

during the summer. Outraged authors called or wrote. Members of the editorial review board (the same people who are reluctant to review papers during the summer) complained. So, we have gone back to the old practice. This summer we will send out manuscripts for review, although we do not expect much in the way of response until September.

I have so far focused on problems that arise in editing an academic journal. This no doubt makes editing sound like an unpleasant chore. Actually, the excitement of publishing new material, the satisfactions of working with academics from many disciplines, and the chance of encouraging new research in a growing field far outweigh these difficulties.

"Editor's Note"

Michael Davis, Editor, CSEP,
Illinois Institute of Technology

This summer past I took a three-week vacation. It was the longest period without reading or writing anything serious I can recall. When I returned, I found my mind wandering a good deal. During one of those mental excursions, I realized that, when *Perspectives* is fifteen years old next August, I will have been its editor for eight years, more than half its existence and longer than all other editors together. Since I still think of myself as a temporary stand-in for my predecessor, "the real editor", this realization came like a thud on the roof. What ownership comes with such longevity? What responsibilities with ownership?

I have tried to keep *Perspectives*

much as I found it. I have, I think, failed in only one way. Because I find it harder than my predecessor to save room for the CSEP Director's "At the Center", several years have now elapsed since she last reported on Center activities. The Center has prospered; indeed, it promises to reach twenty in 1996 stronger in every way than in 1986. But *Perspectives'* readers hear less and less about it. While I must apologize for this unintended change in format, I doubt I shall reform. My Director seems happy enough to do without the pulpit if only I let her go about her business; and seldom are contributors happy about even small cuts in what they write.

During my editorship, short by most historical measures, publishing has changed more than in most centuries. When I arrived at the Center in 1986, everyone there used a typewriter. *Perspectives* went to press on paper. Typesetters on the North Side transformed our typescripts into galleys using the human eye to read and human fingers to put in what they read. Now computers outnumber typewriters at the Center. *Perspectives* goes to press on a disk. Copy comes back by fax. My typesetters of old have retired. We have begun to rethink our relationship to our printer. Once printers were primarily typesetters. Are they now primarily designers? How much of our publication can be done "in house" and how much, if any, should we send out? Can we save money by skipping the printer altogether (as many other newsletters have already done)? Should we?

Over the next year or two, we will, I think, be experimenting with new ways to publish

Perspectives. We will need help in evaluating the results. We will take silence as (at least mild) approval. So, if you notice something you don't like, feel free to write. Any innovation inspiring even a few angry letters will certainly be scrapped. Like all other publications, the income-earning as well as the free, *Perspectives* exists for its readers. We die a little whenever someone ceases to read us.

"Announcements"

New Books

AIDS: Crisis in Professional Ethics, edited by Elliot D. Cohen and Michael Davis (Temple University Press, 1994), considers special moral problems AIDS (or HIV) poses for physicians, nurses, dentists, pre-school teachers, businesses, university administrators, counselors, attorneys, clergy, journalists, and politicians. Extensive bibliography and index. Available in paper as well as hard cover.

Multinational Corporations and the Impact of Public Advocacy on Corporate Strategy, by S. Prakash Sethi (Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1994), offers 413 pages of analysis of the infant formula controversy and the resulting international boycott of Nestle products. Bibliography and index.

Editing the Refereed Scientific Journal, edited by Robert A. Weeks and Donald L. Kinser (IEEE Press, 1994), has editors of important scientific journals analyzing the practical, ethical,

and philosophical problems of editing refereed science journals. Blurb promises descriptions of 3-way negotiations between editors, referees, and authors. insight into the many ways in which reviewing can fail, and advice for dealing with plagiarism, false data, and conflict of interest.

Regulating Toxic Substances: A Philosophy of Science and the Law. Carl Cranor (Oxford University Press, 1993) considers such questions as: How much protection from toxic substances should we have? How much should we be willing to pay for it? (Should we, for example, be willing to pay \$180,000,000 to prevent one premature statistical death?) Who should pay these costs? Who should decide ?

If I were a rich man could I buy a pancreas? and other issues on the ethics of health care. Arthur Caplan (Indiana University Press, 1992) brims together nineteen of Caplan's previously published papers on such topics as the ethics of animal and human experimentation, the nature of aging and chronic illness, and the relationship between moral choices and financial means.

Call For Papers

Teaching and Training-Business Ethics in the 90's and Beyond: Issues, Strategies, and Tactics, a national conference to explore the legal and religious dimensions of business ethics, will be held at DePaul University, November 10-12, 1994. Contact Robert Allan Cooke, Institute of Business Ethics, DePaul University, One East Jackson Blvd., Chicago, IL 60604, ph. 312-362-8895.

The National Conference on *Ethical Issues in Finance* will be

held at the University of Florida, Gainesville, January 26-28, 1995. The conference will provide opportunities for interaction among practitioners, scholars, and teachers from a broad range of professions related to finance, including (but not limited to) banking, securities, commodities, real estate, insurance, pension funds, and credit bureaus. Papers dealing with media reporting of or advertising for any financial activity are also welcome. Abstracts should be 300-600 words. Deadline is September 1, 1994. Contact: Center for Applied Philosophy, 332 Griffin-Floyd Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32617, ph. 904-392-2084, fx. 904-392-5577.

The fourth annual meeting of the *Association for Practical and Professional Ethics* will be held in Crystal City, Virginia, March 2-4, 1995. Deadline for submissions is October 21, 1994. Submissions may include: formal papers, pedagogical demonstrations, curriculum projects, case studies, posters, nominations of books by members for Breakfast with the Authors. Contact: Brian Schrag, Executive Secretary, APPE, 410 North Park Avenue, Bloomington, IN 47405, ph. 812-855-6450, fx. 812-855-3315, Internet: APPE@INDIANA.EDU.

The new *Journal of Science and Engineering Ethics* welcomes contributions on ethical issues related to any aspect of science or engineering. Among the topics it hopes to cover are institutional responsibility for maintaining ethical standards, professional codes of conduct and practice, scientific freedom and responsibility, educational programs, computer ethics, biomedical ethics, and animal and

human subjects in research. Contact: Stephanie J. Bird, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Room 12187, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, ph. 617-253-8024, E x.617-253-1986.

Ethical Perspectives, a new quarterly review, would like to be a medium through which anyone concerned with practical ethics can "daily read with amazement the quantity and quality of ethical research [with a Christian perspective] coming from diverse approaches" in different countries. Johan Verstaeten, Editor, Centre for Christian Ethics, Catholic: University of Leuven, Naamsestraat 22-B-3000 Leuven, Belgium.

The new *International Journal of Value-Based Management* invites papers clarifying the role of values in organizational behavior and in the process of decision making, especially empirical studies. Contact: S. M. Natale, IJVBM, Hagan School of Business, Iona College, New Rochelle, NY 10801, ph. 914-6332256.

Biomedical Ethics Reviews will publish papers on the topic *Ethics, Technology, and Reproductive*. Choice. Submissions may deal with cloning, the recent Supreme Court decision to allow use of the federal racketeering statute against abortion demonstrators, or anything in between. Papers should be between 10 and 40 double -spaced pages. Send two copies to: James Humber and Robert Almeder, Department of Philosophy, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta CA 30303-3083. Deadline is December 15, 1994.

A *Conference on Accounting Ethics* will be held at Rochester Institute of Technology, April 13-14, 1995. Contact Bruce Oliver, School of Business, RIT, Rochester, NY 14623 (e-mail: blobbu@ritvax.isc.rit.edu).
Deadline: February 15, 1995.

Conferences

Starting, Sustaining, and Stopping Life, the fast concurrent meeting of the American Society of Law, Medicine, and Ethics, the Society for Health and Human Values, the Society for Bioethics Consultation, and the American Association of Bioethics, will be held October 6-9, 1994, at the Pittsburgh Hilton and Towers, Pittsburgh. Contact: Bioethics Concurrent Registrar, c/o American Society of Law, Medicine, and Ethics, 765 Commonwealth Avenue, Suite 1634, Boston, MA 02215, ph. 617-262-4990 or Ex. 617-437-7596

Public Responsibility in Medicine and Research, along with Applied Research Ethics National Association, Tufts University, Association of American Medical Colleges, NIH, and Harvard Medical School, will be sponsoring a series of symposia, on *Clinical Trial Monitoring, Health Care Reform, and Cultural Diversity, Changes and Choices for Institutional Review Boards: The Inclusion of Women and Minorities, and Other Emerging Issues in Research, and Educating for the Responsible Conduct of Research*, October 30-November 1, 1994, at the Park Plaza Hotel and Towers, Boston. Contact: PRIM&R, 132 Boylston Street, Boston, MA 02116, ph. 617-423-4112 or fx. 617-423-1185.

The Canadian Bioethics Society

will hold its sixth annual conference, *Ethical Choices, Economic Realities: The Health Care System in Flux*, November 24-27, 1994, at the Westin Hotel, Ottawa. Contact: Centre for Technoethics, Saint Paul University, 223 Main Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 1C4, ph. 613-236-1393 or fx. 613-782-3001.

The American Society of Law, Medicine, and Ethics will sponsor two conferences, *Ethics Committees and the Elderly: Hospitals and Nursing Homes*, one in Marina de Rey, CA, December 9-10, 1994, and the other in New York, NY, January 27-28, 1995. Contact: Sandra Johnson, ASLM&E, 765 Commonwealth Avenue, 16th Floor, Boston, MA 02215, ph. 617-262-4990 or fx. 617-437-7596.

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: Michael Davis

STAFF: Rebecca Newton

EDITORIAL BOARD: Thomas Calero, Martin Malin, Ullica Segerstrale, 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, IL 60616-3793, Phone: 312-567-3017, Fax: 312-567-3016