

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. 16, No. 1

Fall 1996

"Professional Ethics: Taking Stock, 1976-2016"

Michael Davis, Editor, CSEP,
Illinois Institute of Technology

The Roman god Janus, entombed in the name of January, the month that, beginning the new year, also marks the end of the old, was always depicted with two faces, one looking forward, the other back. Someone to watch a doorway, Janus was the god of change—and, I suppose, as "janitor", also the god of maintenance, the war against change. His temple was closed only in those rare moments of universal peace when history and prophesy, like tired dogs, sleep in a corner.

The Anniversary and the Topic
Janus must also have been the god of anniversaries, those moments when, celebrating an old beginning, we consciously begin anew, measuring the settled past against the wilds of a future we can only guess—which is why I mention him here. This issue of Perspectives marks the twentieth anniversary of IIT's Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions.

Twenty years is a long time for an ethics center. Only one, the Hastings Center, has survived longer; and only two others, the Center for Business Ethics at Bentley College and the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy

at the University of Maryland, have survived as long.

But twenty years is a good time to look both anniversary when looking backward and forward have a sort of equality. Soon, by the twenty-fifth anniversary or the thirtieth, the time between the old beginning and the new is so great that humans cannot look as far ahead as back; anniversaries then become occasions at which the past is the honored guest and the future stands near the door forgotten.

When I arrived at the Center ten years ago, just in time for its tenth anniversary, the editor of Perspectives asked me to describe what the Center might be in ten years. Of the three predictions I made, only one, that the Center would still exist in 1996, turned out just as I said.

Having shown no gift for prophesy, and having myself become editor of Perspectives, I decided to let others do the predicting this time. I also decided to focus not on the Center but on (some of) the professions it tries to serve. I asked three relatively young practitioners each to take stock of his own profession: How have the profession's ethical concerns changed over the last twenty years? What has not changed? What may be different twenty years from now? What the same? The three --- lawyer,

engineer, and doctor--- differ a good deal in how they answer.

Lawyers, Markets, and Technology

Barry Maram, a graduate of IIT's Chicago-Kent, reports important changes in what lawyers do and how they do it. Over the last two decades, the line between the practice of law and certain other occupations has blurred. Law-school training has become an alternative to an MBA in administrative fields where law, rather than money, sets the fundamental boundaries.

The practice of law has also changed. Computers have, by giving lawyers the power to do better research, raised substantially the standard of legal research. They have also dissolved the line between preparing legal documents or letters and typing them up. Computers are making it easier for law firms to track costs and to supervise lawyers more closely. Computers may also have had something to do with the enormous growth in the size of law firms. Law firms are beginning to look like factories; lawyers, like skilled workers.

Expecting these trends to continue, Maram nonetheless predicts that the fundamentals of lawyering will remain. Lawyers will still owe their clients competent, independent judgment

concerning what the law is, how to accomplish their ends within its bounds, and how to change those bounds.

New Opportunities for Engineers?

John Katrakis, a graduate of IIT's Armour College, begins with a problem Maram did not identify as a problem. Technology, Katrakis notes both grants power and taxes for it. Not all power is worth the tax. Those who make technology, especially engineers, should try to make it so that its tax, not just in dollars but in environmental harm, work satisfaction, family life, and other "side effects" are worth the price. Katrakis might, for example, have wondered whether, on the whole, anyone has benefited from the computerization of law. Lawyers work harder; clients must pay for more research in order to stay even with "the other side" in law's ultimately futile "arms race"; and firms must let go many employees in a struggle to survive in an increasingly competitive market.

Katrakis argues that engineers are now in a better position than twenty years ago to shape technology as they wish. The same competition that seems to be driving lawyers into larger and larger organizations seems to be breaking up or at least shrinking the large employers of engineers. More engineers are, according to Katrakis, able to work in small firms or alone.

Increasingly, too, competition makes it harder for companies hiring engineers to provide lifetime employment; engineers will change employers more often than they used to. Even within a company, competition means that the old lock-step advance up the career ladder is no

longer possible. Engineers are therefore freer, both within a company and when choosing where to work, to choose what they do.

With this freedom comes more responsibility for what they do. How should engineers exercise that freedom? Katrakis offers nine principles. Might other professions benefit from trying to follow the same principles?

Corporate Medicine

Michael Frampton, a psychiatrist, describes a major change in the practice of medicine in the United States, one paralleling the change in the practice of law Maram describes. Until the last decade, physicians worked alone or in small groups, associating themselves with one or more hospitals as the convenience of their patients required. Now a good part of medicine is under the control of large profit-making corporations, "managed care" companies; soon most of medicine will be.

The result, according to Frampton, is a system of health care with most of the disadvantages of a national health service and few of the advantages. In theory, the managed-care company is merely an insurer, paying Frampton for service provided under its policy. In practice, however, it is a "metadoctor", intrusive, domineering, and bureaucratic. The company will not pay for services it has not authorized in advance, will not authorize a service without examining Frampton's interview notes, and will make its determination according to elaborate protocols which, being secret, Frampton cannot challenge.

For Frampton, the great ethical problem, the one likely to dominate medicine during the next twenty years, is how to provide competent medical care under such conditions. The solutions Frampton canvasses—unionization, government regulation, and socialization of medicine—suggest how desperate he thinks the problem is.

A Trend?

Before deciding the subject of this issue, I consulted my advisory board. When two members of the board began arguing about how to look at what has happened in professional ethics over the last twenty years, I invited one, David Beam, the director of IIT's Master of Public Administration Program, to put his position in writing, and the other, Robert Ladenson, a philosopher much involved in the Center, to respond.

Beam's thesis is that the relative economic stagnation of the last two decades has created conditions in which ethics has become ever more marginal. "The market", "competition", and "survival" have become the key terms in most discussions of how to act. Beam hopes the next twenty years will be better, in part, it seems, because they could not be worse.

Ladenson's response accepts much of Beam's description of the last twenty years, but suggests a more hopeful interpretation. Efficiency and profit are, he notes, morally relevant considerations. The problem is not that efficiency and profit are taken into account but that sometimes they are taken into account to the exclusion of everything else. That problem, the problem of ignoring relevant considerations, has nothing in particular to do with business. The

physician who considers curing the patient all that matters, excluding from consideration even the patient's own wishes or the welfare of other patients, would behave as immorally as would a physician who considered only the profit of her managed-care company.

Ladenson concludes by reminding us of what we have to celebrate. What an ethics center can do, what ours has done for twenty years, is try to ensure that "we", both academics and members of the various professions, do not ignore relevant considerations when making morally significant decisions.

Vivian Weil, the Center's director, concludes this issue with a report of recent events at the Center: this has not been a year to close the Temple of Janus.

-MD

"Lawyering Into the Twenty-First Century"

Barry Maram, Sonnenschein,
Nath & Rosenthal

As the twenty-first century approaches, the practice of law is changing rapidly. Though law has survived many millennia, what is new—and what is old—in its practice may surprise you. I shall describe some of those changes here, pointing out some important ethical issues I think they raise.

New Look of Lawyers

Expect lawyers to continue to serve as your Presidents, Vice-Presidents, U.S. Senators, and

local representatives. But also expect to find more lawyers among your bankers, real estate financiers, university administrators, high school principals, authors, theologians, police, ethicists, and even doctors. Many more individuals will use a legal education to supplement their expertise, even though they do not actually practice law.

This infiltration of the legally trained into traditionally non-legal environments is a response to increased litigation, government regulation, and rule-governed complexity of corporations. Increasingly, an analytical and practical understanding of the law will make those doing non-legal work more attractive job candidates. Should the rebel Dick in Shakespeare's Henry VI reappear in the twenty-first century, he would have to search many unlikely places to "kill all the lawyers".

Loss of Control

What about those lawyers we've known as lawyers—the large-firm, small-firm, and in-house-corporate attorneys? What will become of them in the twenty-first century? Expect these lawyers to experience a significant loss of control over their own work. Partners in many firms have historically been allowed to choose assignments, take new clients, and bill within their own discretion. Though the law has long been a bastion of individualism in the business world, it probably will not continue to be. Increasingly, the market is forcing clients to demand that lawyers account for how they bill and to limit what they bill. Such client demands are forcing firms to try to cut costs and maximize return on each lawyer's time. Increasingly,

lawyers must justify taking an interesting but insufficiently profitable case.

Technology

It has been said that by the year 2000 there will be just two types of business: those embracing technology—and those looking for a good bankruptcy attorney. Lawyers are not exceptions. Technology is no longer an extravagance for the practicing attorney. Soon it will be essential to a competitive legal practice.

Lawyers and their firms are already responding to rapid changes in technology. Law libraries, especially in large firms, are quickly becoming almost "paperless" in their research capabilities. Computers have already drastically changed the way most firms process and revise documents in complex and multiple transactions. Computers are already the standard medium of research, correspondence, and the preparation of legal forms.

The ability to "globally connect" has made an enormous impact on legal services. While the twenty-first century may never see "the law firm without walls", expect practice by state quickly to give way to national and international patterns of practice.

Re-engineering the Law Department

The twenty-first century promises to make changes for the in-house corporate legal counsel as well. In a changing and ever more competitive environment, corporations are "re-engineering" legal departments as well as other operations. A recent American Corporate Counsel Association conference was devoted to re-engineering the law department. Among the topics were: (1) cost-

effective and efficient use of outside legal counsel, including discounted fees for volume work and other novel payment mechanisms, (2) the use of technology to communicate with outside counsel and the corporate client and to manage litigation, and (3) development of comprehensive strategies for the corporation's operations. In-house counsel were urged to do more with less before their employer did it for them.

Marketing

Lawyers and their firms will continue to react to an increasingly competitive market. Law firms will not only compete against each other, they will also compete against consulting firms, accounting firms, and others performing services overlapping those they provide. Knowing how to market a product or service legally has often helped law firms keep the business clients they have and to win new clients. In order to distinguish themselves from similar services, law firms will continue to produce sophisticated seminar presentations, newsletters, and other professional marketing devices. Increasingly, law firms will have marketing departments.

Legal specialization will continue to increase, especially in areas of growth such as environmental law, health care, international business, computers, and financial products. No doubt, new areas will emerge. Law firms—and lawyers—with a deep expertise in both law and a specific industry or technology will have a distinct advantage over the "general practitioner".

Impact on Ethics

What will all these changes mean for legal ethics?

Lawyers acting both as consultants and attorneys will find traditional roles blurred. Clients, at times, rely on lawyers for business advice as well as legal advice. This can produce difficulty in maintaining the ability of the lawyer to provide independent legal advice that may run counter to the profitability of the clients' business. Lawyers will have to find new ways to preserve the independence of their legal judgment.

Technology, which tends to direct legal services towards regimented solutions, threatens the legal axiom of considering each case on its own facts. Even with its sophisticated legal forms and comprehensive searches, technology cannot always identify solutions for specific or unique fact situations. Lawyers would be ill advised to rely on such form over the substance of their problem solving and analytical skills.

As firms increase in size (major firms often have hundreds of lawyers) and as technology makes practice global, conflicts of interest once rare may become common. An international firm may, for example, find itself representing a client in Nebraska whose interests are adverse to those of a client (in a different office) in Queensland or Singapore. Law firms will have to find new ways to avoid such conflicts of interest or the profession may have to allow more conflicts to be managed rather than requiring that they be avoided.

Re-engineering law departments can displace employees without any guarantee of increased profitability. What responsibilities do lawyers have to insist that

harm to displaced employees be considered in assessing any proposal to re-engineer a law department?

New areas of specialization will no doubt give lawyers the job of defending unique but unpopular positions.

So much for what may change. What will remain the same? The lawyer, when practicing law, will still have the obligation of providing each client with competent legal service, whoever the client may be. The lawyer will still have to find a way to be both ethical and a good advocate of the client's cause. Was that ever possible? I think so. As law professor Monroe Friedman pointed out, in discussing Lincoln's biography by David Herbert, Abraham Lincoln earned the title "Honest Abe" while practicing law. Abe's honesty was consistent with avid pursuit of clients and fees, indifference to whether a client's cause was just, and a good deal of tactical shrewdness, zeal, and creativity in his client's behalf. The twenty-first century should have room for many such honest Abes.

American society will continue to have a love-hate relationship with lawyers. It will demand its legal rights on an ever-increasing spectrum of socio-economic issues. At the same time, it will often frown upon the champion of a (currently) unpopular cause. Combined with new conditions, this old relationship should make the work of the twenty-first century lawyer interesting.

"Engineering, Ethics and the New Millennium"

John Katrakis, J. T. Katrakis & Associates

The history of technology can be read as a chronicle of devices and schemes to regain the Garden of Eden. Some people, those now enjoying both the fruits of technology and the power to shape it, may even believe they have achieved that paradise already. Yet our time, the most bountiful ever, may also be the time of hunger, violence, desperation, and disappointment for more people than ever before. What has gone wrong? What can engineers do to help set it right?

The last 150 years have given us increasingly powerful technologies: mass production and automation; coal, oil, and nuclear energy; agricultural and human genetic engineering; instant world-wide communication; antibiotic medicines and convenient contraception; personal automobiles and the trucking industry. While these have done great good, they have also caused great harm. The harm is no longer evident just in the speculative foreboding of a few scientists, engineers, philosophers, and social commentators. The harm has become the daily experience of technology's users and those who bear technology's side-effects. Consider the automobile:

The first-time buyer will enjoy new convenience, comfort, and privacy. An auto may even provide a youngster in the family with the confidence- and responsibility- building pastime of maintaining the auto. That auto will, however, also contribute to:

traffic congestion; increased chance of injury and death by accident; health-debilitating and planet-warming pollution from engine exhaust; toxic oil and gasoline leaks; micro-particles from the wearing of radial tires; the loss of valuable land to roads, parking lots, and driveways; community development that makes all of us dependent on the auto, limiting public transit and walking options; and the sacrifices necessary to project military power into the Middle East to maintain control over vital sources of petroleum. There is also the temptation to increase highway speed in order to travel faster and increase profits. Even though lowering the speed limit in the 1970s reduced driving-related deaths and injuries, Congress recently voted to increase the speed limit. How many deaths and injuries will occur because of the higher speed limit? Are they worth it?

What can we as engineers do about the harmful effects of technology? How does engineering ethics help us address these issues? Twenty years ago, the literature on engineering ethics was focused on employer-employee and consultant-client relationships: conflict-of-interest, safety and health, whistleblowing, how to minimize exposure to liability, and so on. Since then there has been a growing awareness among engineers of the pervasive role, both positive and negative, that technology now has, a growing awareness of how much individual engineering decisions affect the material status, health, and character of many people.

The profession of engineering may also be changing. Early in the nineteenth century, when the

United States began building railroads, colleges began offering an engineering education. The engineers they graduated were equipped with a good understanding of how to develop and manage the new and increasingly complex technologies that became sources of economic power in the industrial age. These engineers were essential to channeling the inventive genius of people like Edison, Westinghouse, Ford, and Bell into the commercially successful products that have become the hallmarks of our time. Their education emphasized solving problems identified by their employer.

In recent years, however, more engineers are working in smaller businesses, as consultants, and even as individual contractors. Engineers today are making more direct contacts with clients and customers. We see engineers becoming more entrepreneurial, more aware of the trends that affect the relevance of their services and products, and better able to identify new opportunities and to avoid newly discovered bad side-effects. Engineers employed in larger companies are likely to switch positions and companies more frequently than in previous generations. They have to be nimbler, to think strategically and act adventurously, not only to keep abreast of the increasingly frequent changes in their industry but to help shape those changes.

So how can engineers today work to make the next century better? Here are some guidelines:

- 1. Choose to develop products and services that are good for people as well as profitable for your business.** Not only should a

good product or service not harm anyone, it should be designed to foster useful and healthy activity. A good product or service should create jobs with sufficient income, help people be more responsible and caring, provide opportunities for learning and developing new interests, and enhance (or at least maintain) the quality of the environment.

2. Try to work on technologies that are sustainable, equitable, and local. Technologies should replenish and refresh, not deplete and pollute. They should promote equitable sharing and access, not concentrate wealth and power. They should make people less dependent on resources from distant countries. Engineers should try to avoid working on products which, though shown to be less than desirable for American consumers, are exported to foreign markets less able to control quality.

3. Don't restrict yourself to solving problems defined by others: train yourself to define new problems worth solving. Cultivate an understanding of how your particular specialty in engineering relates to key social issues. Understand how your product or service affects people, their organization, and their physical environment. Not only work to define a problem that should be solved, also work to present your solution in a manner your boss or client can appreciate. If you can organize the people, skills, and resources to tackle the problem, you may have created new work for yourself and others. Cultivate the perspective of a socially responsible professional, not a hired gun. Be a team player who, when necessary, can also be a maverick working for a higher good.

4. Try to devote some of your time to those who, while needing your professional skills, can least afford them. Identify worthwhile clients, such as inner-city community organizations or social-service agencies, that need your engineering. Sometimes such public service is not possible until late in one's career (when one's reputation is made, children are grown, and savings are enough for retirement). Generally, however, engineering pays well enough to allow an engineer to engage in some public service much earlier. In any case, try not to wait until retirement.

5. Work for people who are not only technically good but good people. Organizations are made up of people—they are not a higher level of being: choose an organization by the people who are in it, not by its reputation. Especially important is finding a good mentor. A good mentor is someone who will look out for you rather than compete with you, who will help you see how to do better engineering. Look for a good mentor.

6. Learn to attach the right level of value to your product or service. Cultivate the habit of learning from each of your clients their mission and their understanding of your role in it. Take the time to inform your clients how best to use your knowledge, skill, and judgment to fulfill their responsibilities—technical, legal, and moral. Avoid overstating or understating the significance of what you do or how you do it. Examine the advertising your company uses to sell your service or product. Is it truthful, or does it prey on the buyer's unrealistic yearning? Does it say too little? Advertising should reveal just how good a

service or product is, no more and no less.

7. Learn when and how to say "no" to a client or job assignment. Learn to place a high value on your own time and the time of the people you work with. Periodically check to see that you have your priorities right. Avoid working for clients of dubious integrity or on a product or service of dubious value. Don't let your professional work consume all your waking hours. Don't fall for the rationalization "if we do not take this job someone else will". When you say "no", explain your reasons to your client or employer—and perhaps even to your competitors

8. Cultivate an attitude of service. Whether you are in manufacturing, selling tons of metal each day, or producing paper studies, you are providing a service to people. If you try to work for the good of your customer, company, employees, and—ultimately—society, you will learn the humility necessary to discern what is right and to express it without appearing self-righteous or arrogant.

9. Avoid false gods, especially the single-minded pursuit of money or power. Do a good job, all things considered, not just what is expedient, most profitable, or what you can get away with. Search for challenges that help you find what you believe in, what really matters to you. Ask yourself what projects are worth risking your job, your wealth, your health and safety, the well-being of your loved ones. Search for God in your work: don't make your work into a god.

"Corporate Health Care: A Brave New World of Medical Ethics?"

Michael Frampton, M.D.

Medicine today faces many important ethical questions. Some arise from the power of technologies that, pushing the margins of life, have forced us to think about the nature of life itself. Other questions arise because of a technology's cost or scarcity. Practitioners and institutions seem forced into de facto rationing, such as waiting lists for liver transplants. (If there are fewer livers than candidates for transplant, who should get a liver? Should alcoholics be treated like other candidates?)

While these (and other) high-profile questions are challenging enough ethically and socially, their actual impact on the daily practice of most physicians is small. What will, I think, shape health care in the United States over the next twenty years is the almost unnoticed takeover of medicine by "health maintenance organizations" (HMOs), "preferred provider organizations" (PPOs), and other multi-billion dollar "managed-care companies".

Corporate Medicine

Managed care became important to medical practice five or so years ago, but I did not appreciate what it does until, after working mostly in non-profit community mental-health centers for seven years after my psychiatric residency, I started my own solo practice. By then (1994), the traditional authority, privacy, and healing of the physician-patient dyad had already become a

physician-patient-corporate triad. The managed-care company had become the invisible third party at every physician-patient conversation.

Clinical information the physician receives in confidence flows by telephone or writing into the computerized data-base of the managed-care company where anyone with knowledge of the computer and the password can access it. There a "caseworker" employed by the company, usually a masters-level social worker, sifts through the information sent in and decides the type, duration, and length of treatment.

I am always aware of this invisible eavesdropper. I must be careful what I ask a patient, since I must report what I learn back to the company, knowing that one wrong question may make the difference between "approved" and "disapproved".

Because the public has not paid much attention to managed care, my patients are generally not even aware of the corporate presence—until I inform them that I must get the company's approval for our treatment plan. My patients are rather acquiescent, unless, of course, the company decides not to pay for treatment. If the company decides not to pay, the patient can file an appeal with the company's physician, an employee, who in turn consults the unpublished corporate "criteria" which decide "yea" or "nay". Appeals are usually unsuccessful.

The Effects

How does managed care change how I practice? Here's one example: I might prescribe a specific antidepressant, say,

Prozac. The corporate "gatekeeper" can replace what I prescribe with an alternative but not exactly equivalent antidepressant, such as Zoloft, because it costs less. Sometimes this replacement takes place without my approval—or even my knowledge or that of my patient!

Here's another example: Generally, the company will deny inpatient detoxification even to a heavily addicted user of crack cocaine. The company prefers less expensive outpatient treatment—unless there is a clear-cut, medically threatening physical sign of withdrawal (such as elevated blood pressure)—even though the probability that such an addict will stop cocaine use during those first, critically important few days without twenty-four hour supervision is practically zero.

Letters of denial always end with the disclaimer that "responsibility for the decision to seek a particular course of treatment is ultimately between the patient and his or her physician." In theory, the company does not deny treatment as such, only reimbursement for the cost of treatment. In practice, of course, the two are often the same. The cost of any treatment for which the company will not pay must fall on the physician, the hospital, the patient, or the taxpayer—or the patient must do without. Denying treatment in this way is easy: one does not take responsibility for the consequences or even have to face the patient.

Diagnosis

What went wrong? Before the advent of managed care, the basic economic-political unit in

medicine was the individual practitioner with his or her small population of patients. Though physicians had organizations, most notably the American Medical Association (AMA), these were relatively weak and highly decentralized. They could not control medicine. With managed care has come the massive, centrally organized corporations headed by a handful of CEOs wielding great power over a large population of patients and physicians (and with considerable political power too).

Before managed care, medical decisions were more or less left to the individual practitioner. This way of making medical decisions gave the patient certain protections now lost. Unlike the CEOs running large managed-care companies, physicians were trained to put the physical and emotional well-being of patients first, even before their well-being or that of their families. While an ideal not always achieved, this commitment has deep roots not only in medical practice but in the ten-to-twelve years of medical apprenticeship, years of financial, physical, and emotional deprivation in the service of others. The ethically depraved physician—the physician who doggedly pursues personal gain at the expense of his patients—is, in my experience, the exception. Other physicians will condemn him publicly when he is discovered and avoid professional relations with him.

The CEO of a managed-care company has different ethical commitments. These belong to the distinctive intellectual and emotional life of the MBA, the grueling climb up the corporate ladder, the shareholders' questions

about return on investment, and so on. For a CEO to place profit above the well-being of paying customers (patients) is, while bad for business if widely publicized, not contrary to his primary commitment to shareholders or, if legal, likely to damage him professionally.

Cure?

What next? So far physicians have been complacent about managed-care, but complacency seems to me unlikely to continue much longer. Physicians are too intelligent, educated, and skilled, too committed to values diametrically opposed to those of the managed care companies, to do nothing about what is happening to health care. Physicians also still have the power, collectively, to oppose the corporate megaliths: the signature of a physician still accounts for most of the billions of dollars spent on health care in the U.S. each year. So, I think physicians might well organize unions as earlier in this century blue-collar workers did. Physicians will, however, have to do it without the help, and perhaps despite the hindrance, of the AMA.

Since the power of a union ultimately rests on the willingness of its members to strike, corporate medicine may one day force on physicians this hard ethical choice: Do I sit by as corporations exact profits at the expense of my patients, or do I strike for better conditions, but at the price of temporarily denying my patients needed medical care?

A physician strike could be justified only if the long-term gain for patients outweighed the short-term harm. But justifying a strike by such a trade-off is itself

troubling. Medical ethics has always placed value on each and every patient, present and future, and not just on the overall good of future patients. So, many physicians will be looking for alternatives to unionization.

One such alternative is public outcry against the unmitigated profiteering of corporate medicine. The public could pressure elected officials to pass laws curbing corporate power over medical decisions. In fact, this has already begun to happen. This fall Congress returned to the physician the power to allow a post-partum woman and her infant to remain in the hospital an extra day without being denied reimbursement for it. The managed-care company is required by law to pay for care that the treating physician deems appropriate.

While I am not an advocate of a national health program to replace corporate medicine, I do think a governmental solution to delivering health care would probably be better than the current corporate solution. The basic ethical commitment of the typical public servant, whether elected or appointed, is public service. Government medicine, though inevitably less efficient than corporate medicine, would at least have as its chief object the patient's well-being. Corporate medicine is, in contrast, though more efficient, ruthlessly self-serving. Savings accrue chiefly to its shareholders (and CEOs).

Best of all, I believe, would be a return to solo or small group practice. Unfortunately, that alternative does not seem to be open. Big medicine seems here to stay. So, for the next decade or

two, medical care will increasingly be dispensed by corporations according to algorithmic protocols derived from a careful analysis of what is necessary to yield the correct profit margin. Medical graduates may even give up the Oath of Hippocrates in favor of one inspired by Lee Iacoca. A brave new world of corporate medicine, indeed!

"The Elevation of the Economic and Erosion of Everything Else"

David R. Beam, Public Administration, Illinois Institute of Technology

During the twenty years since CSEP's creation, attention to ethical concerns has grown in many professional associations, business firms, and governments. Codes of ethics have been enacted, updated, or tightened. Political office-seekers and appointees have come under ever-stricter scrutiny. There has also been increased consideration of the moral foundations of American society. Consider, for example, the recent best-selling *Book of Virtues* (now a television series)—or two scholarly tomes, *Trust* and *Integrity*. The author of the latter is at work on another, *Civility*.

All this, though healthy, is, it seems to me, a mere eddy. The dominant current of the last twenty years has been in another direction: elevating purely economic values and

downgrading nearly everything else.

End of the "Opportunity Era"

1973 was a watershed in America's ethical history. The country was then fixated on "Watergate", the scandal that would eventually force a U.S. President to resign the office to which he was twice elected. Observers of politics regularly say, "Power corrupts," but Watergate still seemed unusual. Not only did the corruption reach the highest office, it also touched many respected members both of business and of the legal profession. A broad rededication to certain standards of conduct seemed essential and in fact resulted.

In the longer view, however, 1973 was much more important because of another development, one less apparent at the time. 1973 was the "last good year". Up till then, most Americans had benefitted from the post-1945 economic boom, a rising tide that really did lift all, or nearly all, ships. Workers could justifiably expect that—with greater experience, steady exertion, and continuing education—their real income would increase each year. After 1973, the increase in income stopped: slower growth in productivity, tougher management, more foreign competition, have all contributed to a significant decline in worker's real income.

This surprising, even bewildering, reversal of expectations—by now both thoroughly documented and widely publicized—is linked to other economic disruptions. Major industrial plants, sometimes whole industries, have closed down or moved. Major

corporations have "downsized". Computers have replaced many clerks and skilled tradesmen. Jobs that once promised lifetime employment and secure retirement have become temporary "contract positions", with few or no health, vacation, or retirement benefits. More people work longer hours or two jobs, while others have gone from unemployed to unemployable. The market for new college graduates is weaker even as business demands more education of those it does hire. In short, we have less security and less economic opportunity than we had two decades ago.

Duck and Cover

The repercussions of this change have been enormous. The problems are economic but their ramifications are social and psychological. The good society is one that draws on the talents of—and provides some measure of status and security to each of its members. But post-1973 America is a country where more and more people are under-used or redundant—and feel it.

Like other Cold War children, I was taught to duck under my school desk if the siren sounds. That is how many have responded to the economics of the last twenty years. They have hunkered down, pulled in, hoped for relief; they have struggled to "keep up appearances" and worried over possible remedies.

Both public and private life seem to have experienced a decided shift from the humane potentialities that sit atop Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs toward the baser ones at the bottom. What sphere of life has not been affected? Even motherhood—once (with apple

pie) among our most revered values—has gone out of fashion because two incomes are now needed where one used to be enough. People who cannot afford to have someone pump gas into their car and clean their windshield can hardly afford to stay home to raise children! Though remarked less often, the commitment to fatherhood has also been undermined, in part because fewer men now earn "a family wage". Partly in consequence, the proportion of white children born out of wedlock has risen to over a quarter, and for black children, up to almost three-quarters.

More germane here are changes in the professions. Medicine and law are both increasingly "businessified", with practitioners and clients suffering as a result.

Physicians (and pharmaceutical firms) openly advertize for customers. Their patients are forced—by employer or cost—to participate in a health maintenance organization, for-profit "provider network", or other new form of "health care delivery," the success of which seems to depend in part on denying services physicians might prefer to offer and patients to receive. Physicians can no longer find an outlet for the desire to aid others that typically attracted them to their profession; nor can they hope for the same financial security their predecessors had. They chafe under the new paperwork, the need to explain decisions to cost-control clerks many miles away.

Lawyers have similar difficulties. The field has turned from its communal and moral foundations. "Rampant individualism", a

tendency to think in terms of "economic survival" and to regard oneself as a "profit center", endangers not only the well-being of individual lawyers but, according to Benjamin Sells, "the Soul of the Law" itself.

The same is true for journalism. Broadcasters used to consider news an essential public service. But as economics has forced out other considerations, newscasts have come to be judged much as any other programming is—and been distorted accordingly. What do we have now? Sensationalism, "infotainment", talk radio that angers rather than edifies.

Shrinking Common Commitments

As a political scientist and public administrator, I am especially concerned about the effect that this narrowly economic attitude is having on government.

Government and market are fundamentally different. Government is the system through which we pursue mutual objectives: protection from enemies, education of our children, smooth roads, pleasant parks, unpolluted water. The market, on the other hand, merely satisfies individual wants: a good job, fine meal, camcorder, new car.

Government and market are nonetheless interdependent. Markets work best under stable, effective government. A review of the U.S. Constitution shows that many of its provisions were included specifically to establish institutions—postal service, patent protection, uniform currency, standard weights and measures—that are prerequisite to an efficient market. At the same time, the

market, not government, generates the wealth upon which government services depend. Government and market are the yin and yang of America's prosperity and glory.

Yet government, like so much else, has been a victim of the increasing "economicization" of the last twenty years. In the 1960s, the country could still "afford" to improve schools, extend health care to the elderly and poor, strive to reduce poverty, and put a man on the moon. Since then we have had tax revolts, attacks on economic and environmental regulation, and charges that government itself is the cause of our problems, not a resource in solving them. Hostility to government is now widespread even though every day's news includes a business's plea for government's help (for example, airlines asking Washington to pay part of the cost of new security measures).

Even more general is (what might be termed) "the corporatization" of the public sphere. Some politicians have come to rely on marketing consultants, focus groups, and oversimplified or misleading ads to communicate (or even formulate) policies. Public employees are told to regard those they serve as "customers" rather than as taxpaying citizens. They are urged to view themselves as "entrepreneurs" rather than as executors of legal mandates. There are calls for the "privatization" of important governmental functions, among them prisons, highways, hospitals, and social security. Whatever the merit of particular proposals, the underlying assumption seems to be that government is always

inefficient and generally unnecessary, a burden on society rather than the precondition of both economic success and non-economic well-being. It too has been marginalized.

Conclusion

Not one of these problems— income stagnation, the over-commercialization of professions, work pressures that limit the attention of parents to their children or each other, or the declining regard for government—has an easy remedy or even an obvious one. All that seems certain is that the trend of the last twenty years, an increasingly narrow focus on the economic short-term—on "cost savings" and "tax cuts"—cannot long sustain us.

Efficiency is a virtue, but our success in invention, industry, commerce, and the professions, the vigor of our public life, depends on other virtues—including trust, integrity, and civility—that transcend a simple calculus of profit and loss. Acting otherwise, we have lost much of the popular confidence our professions and institutions once enjoyed. If the next twenty years renew our recognition of the importance of such non-economic virtues, we will be much better off.

"Have Twenty 'Lean Years' Starved Ethics?"

Robert F. Ladenson,
Humanities, Illinois Institute of
Technology

Has the ethical climate of American society undergone a significant decline over the past twenty years, a decline affecting every important area of life, including the professions? David Beam argues that it has, linking the decline principally to the widespread economic anxiety and insecurity that began in the 1970s, as the post-World War II boom ended, and still continues. Throughout American society, economic anxiety and insecurity are expressed, according to Beam, in an excessive preoccupation with economics that crowds out serious attention to any other considerations, even ethics.

A Different Interpretation

Major changes in the American and world economies over the past two decades certainly have had a significant impact upon ethical issues related to many important areas of life. But I would describe that impact differently than Beam does. Since the end of the affluent 1960s, individuals and institutions have had to make many difficult choices concerning the allocation of scarce resources. Many people strongly disapprove of some of these choices. Yet even they need not conclude that the choices themselves are part of an overall decline in ethics. The choices might instead, in the main, express an ethical response to the economic side of important, but extremely complex and difficult, issues, a response allowing much room for intense but reasonable disagreement in good faith.

Beam points to developments over the past two decades affecting professions such as medicine, law, journalism, and public administration to illustrate the excessive subordination of

ethics to economics that he regards as endemic in American society. While such subordination has sometimes occurred, at least as often what occurred was, I believe, something ethically more complex, a difficult balancing of ethically appropriate considerations.

Psychotherapists

Here is an example of what I have in mind: Recently, the *New York Times* reported that managed-care companies now routinely require psychotherapists to submit treatment plans, diagnoses, descriptions of symptoms, and even therapists' notes for review. One company, the *Times* reported, even told an affiliate, a small psychotherapy group, to include a company representative in sessions where the group's members discuss cases.

Such developments diverge sharply from the strict norms of confidentiality traditional in psychotherapy. (The *Times* quoted one psychotherapist's bitter protest: "Managed care is like having a third person in the room.") There is another side to this story, however. Before managed care, psychotherapists rarely had to account to anyone for treatment recommendations. Therapy could continue many years without any effort to compare its effectiveness with less expensive alternatives.

To say that this *Times* story poses the dispiriting question of which is worse, managed care or psychotherapy as traditionally practiced, would be both cynical and misguided. What the story does is bring out the need for an accommodation between two concerns of great ethical importance, confidentiality and

accountability. In this case, the two concerns appear to pull in opposed directions. The advent of managed care did not, by itself, force this choice between confidentiality and accountability. What did that was a change in economic circumstances, the need for increased cost effectiveness in the expenditure of social resources for health care. Deciding, after full deliberation in good faith, that cost and effectiveness are important enough to outweigh some concerns about confidentiality cannot be equated with blatant, callous, or heedless pursuit of economic profit whatever the ethical loss.

CSEP's Role

Widespread economic anxiety and insecurity can adversely affect the ethical climate, leading people to make disastrously wrong ethical choices with full awareness of doing so, for example, stealing or embezzling. But Beam's concern is another kind of adverse effect, a preoccupation with economics so intense and narrow that individuals fail to keep important ethical considerations in focus. This adverse effect, though real and significant, must be kept in perspective. Other factors besides economic pressure can make ethical considerations go out of focus. One of these, familiar to CSEP, is the process of value formation connected with education, work, and collegial interaction through which individuals acquire a professional identity. "Thinking like" a lawyer, doctor, engineer, or college professor tends to keep certain aspects of situations in sharp focus—those amenable to analysis in terms of one's professional expertise—while allowing others to go out of focus, ethical considerations among

them.

Over the past two decades, the principal purpose of most CSEP activities has been to help keep important ethical issues in focus for students, educators, and practitioners in engineering, the sciences, and other professions. Those activities have proceeded on two key assumptions. First, insufficient attention to ethical issues in the professions more often stems from loss of focus on such issues than from any deeper lack of ethical concern. That is to say, most people are fundamentally decent. Second, helping to keep a reasonable focus on ethics in the professions is not a matter of "pointing the way," that is, of telling people *the* ethically correct solution. It is, instead, a matter of getting the profession to think about the problems seriously and with an open mind. Issues of ethics in a profession tend to be complex, multifaceted, and subject to more than one reasonable interpretation.

Despite the economic stringency, there is, I believe, as much basic good will as ever in American society, and more openness about ethical issues than twenty years ago.

"At the Center"

I began this At The Center in the latter part of November while on the way back to the U.S. after a professional ethics workshop in Kuwait University. In view of the pace of change over the last ten years, I had concluded that my 20th Anniversary column should

concentrate on the present. The Kuwait workshop was the second that Michael Davis and I conducted outside the country this year. In April, we journeyed to Taiwan, to direct a similar effort at Chung Yuan Christian University and to meet with philosophers at National Chung-Chen University. Later in the same month, I participated in ethics across the curriculum" planning at Mayaguez University in Puerto Rico.

Ethics Across the World

At all these universities, we found a common language, English, and familiar institutional practices and folkways. So it appears that being at the center" is being part of a world-wide university system, one in which efforts to incorporate practical and professional ethics in the curriculum are gaining momentum. It is most striking that with all the differences in local customs, traditions, and historical experience, we found that our common morality is our common morality.

The Kuwait University workshop included a case in which a Muslim student, citing religious authority, challenged Professor X's teaching about interest in an economics course. After some unsettled discussion of ethical issues, a member of the science faculty, wrapped in a black abaya," her head covered by a black scarf, spoke up. The ethical issue," she said assertively, is simply academic freedom and personal liberty." Her remark won instant assent from the other members of her discussion group of about twenty faculty from the sciences, engineering, and the administrative sciences. In Taiwan, the nightly newscast on television showed scenes of an

unfolding airport scandal that evoked a little lonesomeness for O'Hare Airport.

Our Anniversary Celebration

Evidently people at universities in the middle east, east Asia, and Latin America want to move up the learning curve quickly, taking advantage of over two decades of work in the U.S. on practical and professional ethics. As we mark our Center's twentieth anniversary, we too are concentrating on gaining the benefits of two decades of work.

One effort is to move toward dealing with the macro" issues, policy issues. Though we are not yet confident of having the conceptual apparatus at hand, we have identified at least one problem area to tackle—the revitalization of city neighborhoods like the one in which our university is located. After a long and steep decline from being a vital area of the city in the 20s when it was known as Bronzeville, our neighborhood is beginning to recover. There are still opportunities for genuine revitalization rather than gentrification.

As part of our anniversary celebration, our Center presented a panel in early October on Justice in Upgrading City Neighborhoods: A Challenge to Professionals." We wanted to begin discussion of the responsibilities of professionals, institutions, individuals and community organizations in neighborhood revitalization. We brought together a panel of distinguished professionals with commitments to upgrading neighborhoods and an invited audience providing a wide range of perspectives on neighborhood

redevelopment, along with students and faculty.

Two conclusions emerged. One is that professionals who devote their careers to improving city neighborhoods can make a good living and an important contribution to society. The second is that genuine involvement with those living in the neighborhoods is practically necessary and ethically required of those who choose such careers. Professional-school educators and professional societies should begin to figure out how to prepare new and seasoned professionals for this work and how to devise mechanisms for connecting with people in the neighborhoods.

As part of our anniversary celebration, Roger Boisjoly, famous as a whistleblower, gave a public lecture titled Learning from the Challenger Disaster: An Ethics Survival Kit." He told his story of opposing the launch at Morton Thiokol and of testifying to the Presidential Commission about the flawed decision making that led to the launch. Adding earlier work experiences in a number of companies, Boisjoly explained how forthright commitment to high professional standards had earned him a successful engineering career, even at Morton Thiokol. In the discussion about neighborhood revitalization, he noted the relevance of his theme of professionals' putting out their best. Boisjoly had a powerful impact on the campus.

Change of Address

The most current happening at the Center is our move to new quarters in a building just to the north of our former quarters. The move came just before the end of

the semester and is not quite complete. When all the dust has settled, our situation will be improved, with our library in one very large space with the Center. Renouncing predictions, I nevertheless profess confidence about our Center's next decade. Location, as our recent move confirmed, is always important. The south side of Chicago has given us a vantage point from which to anticipate ethical concerns. That is one reason for confidence.

-Vivian Weil

"Announcements"

Ethics Across The Curriculum:

A Practical Workshop

During the last two weeks of July 1997 (July 21-29), IIT will be offering a workshop on how to integrate ethics into technical courses (anything from calculus to thermodynamics, from technical writing to genetics). The emphasis will be on practice, on what works in class and what doesn't, not on theory. This workshop is similar to those we offered our own faculty 1991-93 and to faculty at other schools in 1994.

Our funding, which comes from the National Science Foundation, should pay for most reasonable expenses, plus \$500 in stipend, on condition that your institution puts up another \$1000. This condition has at least two purposes:

First, it is our way of assuring that your institution will want to get its money's worth out of you when you get back.

Second, the \$1500 stipend should be large enough to make it financially possible for the faculty who consult, teach, or otherwise earn money during the summer to take ten days off in Chicago and devote significant time after they get back to working on ethics across the curriculum.

Attending the workshop commits you to: a) devoting seven days (full time) to the workshop (and related activities)-with a weekend off; b) integrating professional ethics into one of your technical courses in the fall by using what you prepared in the summer workshop; c) doing a course evaluation of that material; and d) writing a report describing what you did and what happened. You will not have "graduated" from the workshop until you have done all that. Once you have done all that, you will, we believe, be ready to help faculty at your institution integrate ethics into their technical courses.

To apply, you need only send us: a) a short letter describing your reasons for wanted to take the workshop, your background, an the courses you will be teaching next fall; b) a cv; and c) a letter of commitment from the appropriate administrator indicating that your institution will pay its share of the \$1500 stipend if you are accepted.

DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION IS FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1997. We will have funds for no more than twenty faculty. So, don't delay. We will try to notify applicants by March 17. For more information, contact: Michael Davis, Senior Research Associate, Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology, 10 W. 31st Street, Room 102, Stuart Building, Chicago, IL

60616-3793, ph. 312-567-3017, fx. 312-567-3016, e-mail csep@charlie.cns.iit.edu

Center News in Brief

The Center has a new librarian/information specialist, Jing Li, the first librarian to have an undergraduate degree in engineering. She received her engineering degree in China and her Masters in Library Science from Indiana University.

CSEP hosted two Sabbatical scholars in the fall of 1996. Professor H. Samuel Wang, who had just completed his term as Dean of Engineering at Chun Yuan Christian University in Taiwan, arrived in late August to spend the academic year at CSEP. His research interests include engineering ethics and quality in industrial production. professor Lawrence Busch, a sociologist at Michigan State University, was a visitor in the autumn term. His current work draws upon political and ethical theory and his earlier investigations of agricultural development.

Last Spring, the Center received a grant from the National Science Foundation to put its file of over 850 codes of ethics online so that researchers, members of the professions, students, and others can access the codes directly. Included with the codes will be an introduction, study guide, bibliography on codes, and tools for searching by topics. Watch our Web Page for details.

The Ethics Bowl has expanded to a national competition to be held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics on March 6, 1997. Fourteen teams are scheduled to compete.

The final event in CSEP's 20th Anniversary Celebration will be a talk on March 26, 1997 by engineering, William J. LeMessurier, the designer of the Citicorp Building in New York City. The title is "Why Citicorp Did Not Fall on Bloomingdale's."

Announcements:

During the summer of 1997 (mid-June through mid-August), the Ethics Institute of Dartmouth College will offer a faculty summer institute for the purpose of developing undergraduate, multi-disciplinary courses on the ethical, legal, and social implications of die *Human Genome Project*. To partially off set costs, each participant will receive \$2500 in support toward travel, room, and meals. Additional support from the participant's home institution will be needed. Contact: Barbara Hillinger, 6031 Parker House, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, Tel: 703?646?1263, Fax 603?646?2652, E?mail: barbara.hillinger@dartmouth.edu

CALL FOR PAPERS: The Institution for Nonprofit Organizational Management, University of San Francisco, is asking for ethics cases in nonprofit organization management to be included in a revised and expanded addition of *Ethics in Nonprofit Management*, the university's collection of teaching cases on ethical dilemmas faced by managers and board members of nonprofit organizations. A grant from the Lilly Endowment will award \$1000 for each case accepted into the collection. Topics to be covered include human resource management (paid or volunteer), board activities, financial management, fundraising, and

marketing. Contact: Ken Koziol, Director of Publications, College of Professional Studies, USF, 4306 Geary Blvd., Suite 201, San Francisco, CA 94118-3004, Tel: 415-750-5180, Fax: 415-752-5427, Email: koziol@usfca.edu.

The Eleventh Conference of the European Society for Philosophy of Medicine and Health Care, Padova, Italy, August 21-23, 1997, will be devoted to the topic *Research in Health Care: Philosophical, Ethical, and Historical Aspects*. Deadline for abstracts (500 words or less): March 1, 1997. Contact: Prof dr. Hank ten Have, secretariat ESPMH, Dept. of Ethics, Philosophy, and History of Medicine, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Catholic University of Nijmegen, PO Box 9101, 6500 NB Nijmegen, The Netherlands; Tel: ++31-24-3615328; Fax: ++31-24-3540254.

The Third International Congress on *Peer Review in Biomedical Publications*, Prague, Czech Republic, September 17-21, 1997, seeks abstracts on such topics as the mechanisms of peer review in scientific publications, editorial policy, authorship and responsibility for published material, online peer review, quality assurance for reviewers and editors, breakdowns, weaknesses, and biases, evaluations of peer review's validity and practicality, or the history of peer review. Deadline: January 15, 1997. Contact: Annette Flanagan, JAMA, 515 N. State, Chicago, IL 60610; Tel: 312-464-2432; Fax: 312-464-5824; Email: aff@ix.netcom.com.

CONFERENCES: A conference on the Ethics of Human Genetics: Christian, Jewish, and Secular

Perspectives, sponsored by Duquesne University and St. Francis Medical Center, will be held at Duquesne on May 14, 1997. Speakers include Ron Cole-Turner, Fred Rosner, Thomas Murray, and James Walter. Panel will discuss cases. For information, write: The Center for Critical Care Medicine at St. Francis, 400 45th Street, Pittsburgh, PA 15201, Attn: Christine Sedlack, telephone: (412) 622-6191.

The Sixth Annual Meeting, *Association for Practical and Professional Ethics*, March 6-8, 1997, Washington, DC, will include a Keynote address by David B. Wilkins, Director of Harvard Law School's Program on the Legal Profession, an ethics center colloquium on "Innovative Projects of Ethics Centers: Center Development and Outreach", a mini-conference on "Practicing and Teaching Ethics in Engineering and Computing", and a special colloquium on "Networking the Ethics Committee Networks". Contact: APPE, 410 N. Park Ave., Bloomington, IN 47405; Tel: 812-855-6450; Fax: 812-855-3315; Email: APPE@INDIANA.EDU.

PUBLICATIONS: The Minnesota Center for Health Care Ethics has issued a report, *Improving Coverage for Unproven Interventions*, 45 pp, \$10. The report reviews the criteria and information needed for decisions concerning coverage eligibility, the perspective from which such decisions should be made, the objectives that should shape coverage decisions, and the process for deciding whether and in what way health plans should cover an unproven intervention. Contact: Margie Noonan, College

of St. Catherine, 601 25th Avenue South, Minneapolis, MN 55454, Tel: 612-690-7895, Fax: 612-690-7774.

Michael Davis, *Justice in the Shadow of Death: Rethinking Capital and Lesser Punishments* (Rowman & Littlefield, 1996).

SEMINAR: The Center for Literature, Medicine and the Health Care Professions, a collaborative project of Hiram College and Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine, announces its sixth annual summer seminar: *Narratives of Care: Constricting an Ethic of Clinical Practice*, June 7-13, 1997. Seminar Directors: Jack Coulehan, M.D. and John R. Stone, M.D. Faculty Leaders: Cortney Davis, RN, Hilde Nelson, MA, Laurence Thomas Ph.D., and Rosemary Tong, Ph.D. Center Faculty: Carol Donley, Ph.D., Martin Kohn, Ph.D. and Delese Wear, Ph.D.

Cost for the Seminar, including readings and room and board, is \$950. If you wish to apply or want more information, contact the Center for Literature, Medicine, and the Health Care Professions, Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio 44234. Telephone (330) 569-5380 or fax (330) 569-5449. Send e-mail correspondence to DONLEYCC@HIRAM.EDU or mfk@neoucom.edu. Application deadline: April 1, 1997. Enrollment is limited.

POSITION AVAILABLE: The University of Minnesota invites applications for a faculty position in the Center for Biomedical Ethics which will emphasize graduate education and research in bioethics. This position is a tenure/tenure track 12 month

annually renewable position at the Associate or Assistant Professor level. Additional departmental appointment as appropriate. Salary and rank commensurate with experience.

The person in this position will be expected to provide leadership for Center programs in graduate education; to teach biomedical ethics courses at the graduate level and to conduct research in the field of bioethics. The successful applicant will be conversant in theoretical bioethics and have a Ph.D. degree or highest degree in bioethics or related field. Closing date of application is February 1, 1997.

Start date on or after July 1, 1997. Send a letter describing your research and teaching interests, and career objectives, a CV, and names of three referees to: Dianne M. Bartels, RN, MA, Chair, Search Committee, Center for Biomedical Ethics, 2221 University Avenue SE, Suite 110, Minneapolis, MN 55414-3074 e-mail:

bartc001@maroon.tc.umn.edu. The University is an equal opportunity educator and employer.

The Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions (CSEP) was established in 1976 for the purpose of promoting education and scholarship relating to ethical and policy issues of the professions. *Perspectives on the Professions* is one of the means the Center has of achieving that purpose.

EDITOR: Michael Davis
MANAGING EDITOR: Rebecca Newton
EDITORIAL BOARD: David Beam, Robert F. Ladenson, Jing

Li, Martin Malin, Ullica Segerstrale, Warren Schmaus
CSEP Director: Vivian Weil

Opinions expressed in *Perspectives on the Professions* are those of the authors, and not necessarily those of CSEP or the Illinois Institute of Technology.