

# 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. 8, No. 1

August 1988

### "Business and Ethics"

Michael Davis, Editor, CSEP,  
Illinois Institute of Technology

Business ethics and professional ethics are generally thought to be quite distinct. Professions are defined (in part at least) by a commitment to public service *rather than* profit; business, by its commitment to profit. Each profession has its own code of ethics. Such a code sets a standard of conduct higher than that to which people are ordinarily held. Business, as such, has no such code. Indeed, the chief question of business ethics has seemed to many to be not whether business should be held to a higher standard than ordinary people but whether business is held to a lower standard.

The distinction between professions and business has always been clearer in theory than in practice. But practice is almost daily making the distinction less clear. On the one hand, professionals are generally engaged in business. Many professionals sell their own services; many more work for organizations that do. Increasingly, these organizations are profit-making. Even many doctors now work for for-profit hospitals. Businesses, on the other hand, have begun to "professionalize." Most large American corporations now have

an "ethics document" of some sort, though many of these documents are too general to be called a code of ethics. All express a concern for more than profit. A few even put profit after service.

Those who run such corporations have changed as well. Management has come to look more and more like another profession, one the members of which are dedicated to looking after the capital and reputation of the businesses they manage. Schools of business administration or management now sit beside older colleges of engineering, medical schools, and law schools on many campuses. The graduates of these schools, especially the MBA's, seem increasingly concerned about ethics. Many business schools teach a course in business ethics or include problems of business ethics in other business courses. Many more are considering doing so.

Though the Center does not have "business" in its title, it has increasingly found its concern with professions leading it to engage in what might be called business ethics. For some time, the Center has done ethics workshops for such trade groups as the Institute of Gas Technology or the Chicago Builders Association. Distinguishing trade associations from professional

associations is not as easy as it should be. Several of the projects in Vivian Weil's report of Center activities clearly mix business and professional concerns. This is especially true of the recently completed AAAS collection concerned with *corporate-university* research relations and the recently begun project, funded by Hitachi, on the problems of combining engineering judgment with *management* decision.

These brushes with business have led us to reflect on ethics in business. This issue is one result of that reflection. We have tried to avoid abstract discussions. There are too many of those already. What we have ended up with are three stories with a single theme. In one, the chief executive officer of a Chicago corporation talks about the problem of mixing business and friendship and asks us to think about the importance of trust in running a business. In another story, we hear an employee tell how his superior involved him in improper activity. We are asked to think about the abuse of an employee's trust. The third story is about how hard getting such first-hand accounts of business ethics can be. Once trust has broken down within an organization everyone seems to be always on his guard-like inhabitants of Hobbes' state of nature.

To these three stories of ethics in

business, we have added a brief look at the "ethics business" and two of our own problems of business ethics. Plainly, we have only sampled one corner of a vast field.

---

**"Betrayal and the Moral Life  
Cycle of Management"**

John A. Wing, President,  
Chicago Corporation

My first job after college and the Army was working at the Securities and Exchange Commission. During the first couple of years, I learned a lot about accounting, law, and finance. By the time I left, I probably knew enough to have been hired in the first place!

Washington in the early 1960s was an exciting place to live. John F. Kennedy was President. He called it the "New Frontier" and the magazine writers called it "Camelot." As a young lawyer at the SEC, I felt I was on the side of the angels. I was certain that the devil lived and worked on Wall Street! Feeling like God's chosen instrument and wielding the power of the U.S. Government was exhilarating. I was very enthusiastic and worked hard at bringing law suits for the Commission. I was even fortunate enough to be assigned to work on the first big "inside information" suit brought by the SEC, the Texas Gulf Sulphur Case.

My first job sounds like a very good experience, doesn't it? From an intellectual point of view, it was-I learned a lot. From a professional point of view, it was-

I made a lot of good contacts. Unfortunately, there was a darker side to that experience. As a person, I went from being naive to being cynical. That may not sound surprising or even serious. After all, isn't the function of the 'first job' to provide a practical sense of the real world? I think not. Becoming cynical is a serious infirmity. Now, I am not an advocate of retaining the naivete of a school child. On the other hand, to replace naivete with cynicism can create even greater problems.

By the time I left the SEC, I no longer felt I was on the side of the angels. I realized that the SEC could bring almost any securities firm to its knees and that the prosecutor's discretion was often exercised somewhat whimsically. I found that investors who lost money could easily be led to claim that the most outrageous promises had been made to them. After five years at the SEC, I found myself somewhat disillusioned and quite cynical about the way the business world works and very distrustful of human nature. During the next twenty years of my life, I managed to get over most of my cynicism without returning to the naivete of my youth. This has been valuable.

The problems of cynicism are many, but at least one is easy to see: the unwillingness to trust others. Not being able to trust others is fatal to the chances of success in building, managing or leading an organization.

Cynics usually believe that trusting is a serious and dangerous mistake; so they avoid trusting people. However, to be successful in an organization, you must be able to obtain the trust of others.

Managers and employees who aren't trusted by their associates, are not very useful or successful. Trust is obtained in two ways: First, by being trustworthy. That, however, is not enough. Secondly, you must trust others. Trust is similar to love-it is a two-way street. No one trusts anyone who doesn't trust them. The key to building trust is to trust others. The first issue in a relationship becomes, "How can I let this person know that I can and will trust him?" To trust people requires getting over being cynical. . .without becoming naive.

If you are willing to offer your trust, you find the trust you need is usually forthcoming. Conversely, if you withhold your trust and thus are perceived as suspicious and doubting, you will frequently find that your associates will deal with you defensively. If you are their manager, they probably will lack loyalty to the organization. Taking the risky step of offering one's trust is not always rewarding. On occasion, you will be criticized for naivete. The price not withstanding, rising above cynicism to obtain the loyalty derived from mutual trust is critical to building, managing and leading an organization.

"Betrayal" sounds like a strong word for the everyday world of business, but it is not. The first time I had to fire a good friend brought the word "betrayal" in focus. The experience was probably no tougher for me than it was for anyone else, but that does not mean it was easy. (I have never had to close a plant, but I expect the experience is similar, if not more intense.) Thinking about what I was doing, I wondered if there were some limits to loyalty

behind which I could hide. I wondered, "Is this `betrayal' and if so, was what I had done going to get easier with practice?"

In thinking about loyalty and betrayal in an organizational setting, you quickly realize that loyalty is necessary for an organization to survive. You also soon realize that you sometimes must place the organizations interests ahead of your personal feelings. You will be told that there has been a betrayal, and indeed, there has been one.

I have found no panacea for the remorse and guilt that I feel when I am understandably viewed as a betrayer. The only thing that seems to help is caring and letting your feelings show. It isn't pleasant to deal with the aftermath of betrayal. It may seem easier to hide behind your desk, comfortable with the justification that "I didn't want to do it, but it had to be done." In my view, along with the authority to make such decisions, goes the responsibility for sharing actively in the grief that results.

It is through dealing personally and actively with the sadness and pain you have precipitated that you can maintain trust and self-respect. Compassion is necessary to maintain the trust upon which loyalty is based. Equally important, compassion is needed for you to maintain the self-respect required for you honestly to hope for that loyalty.

The wounds incurred from youthful naivete usually lead to cynicism. I hope cynicism can be overcome by the recognition of the effectiveness and pleasures of shared trust. Shared trust builds the loyalty which an organization must have to thrive. This loyalty

must sometimes be betrayed. The betrayal leads finally to compassion. The moral life cycle of building, managing, and leading an organization is not easy but, finally, it's painfully rewarding.

---

### **"A Case of the Creeps"**

Ralph Davis, Director of the Executive MBA and JD/MBA Programs, IIT

The body of this article is what an employee of a regional office of a multinational marketing service company told me about how he handled the unethical demands of his general manager. He had been an employee for approximately four years before he decided he had to resign. The names of those involved have been withheld at his request and that of his former employer. His story is a tale of creeping ethical compromise:

"I have to start out by saying that when I began working for this guy [the general manager], I had stepped up my lifestyle-a new apartment with a status address, collector furniture, that sort of thing. In a way, I helped tighten the vice-grip this guy would have on me because I drained most of my spare cash. More than ever, I needed my job.

'Also, I have to say that I

should have gone straight to my father [a senior partner at a medium-sized urban law firm] when things started coming down. When I finally consulted him, he told me, `Look, this guy has asked you to do something wrong. You've taken a couple of steps, but now's the time to act against his instructions-even if you lose your job.'

"Well, I could see that if I went along with this guy, eventually the house of cards would fall down and he would have set me up to hold the bag because he was asking me to do his dirty work for him. After everything's over, what do I say to the people who were hurt along the way? Well, it's kind of hard to say, `I had to do it because I had to keep my job.' What kind of an excuse is that?

"This whole ethical thing started small. His first request that made me feel uncomfortable involved an advertisement for an ingredients company client. The ingredient was used in soft drinks, and the ad portrayed a lady relishing the taste of a soft drink. The packaging of the soft drink in the ad had to be generic that is, not showing Coke, Pepsi, and so forth. One of our other clients is a packaging association. Our creative department recommended use of a package type different from our packaging association client's. The general manager ordered the ad be changed in the

interests of the packaging association. This order presented a conflict-the interest of the client paying for the ad versus the interest of the other client.

"The conflict issue did not escalate, but soon afterward we were 'pitching' a new client who wanted to use a modified version of a famous poem in its ads. We secured agreement for the rights to use the poem, but were instructed that the poem could not be altered. Counsel from our New York parent company advised us that under no circumstances could the poem be changed. The general manager decided to take the chance anyway; he changed the poem, had the ad made, and just hoped that he didn't get caught. He had a back-up plan. He figured he could slick his way out of the problem by placing the advertising in a sister publication of the copyright holder. But even then, some other client's money would be used to cover this guy's behind instead of [being used] in the best interest of the client.

"Some time passed before the requests really got big. And then, they seemed to all come at once. One of the requests presented the biggest issue for me, and it was the last one. I was assigned a project which required that I lie to my co-workers, take out false client job numbers, and act in conflict with one of our existing clients. The general manager had accepted some business from a

client's competitor and intended to keep it quiet from everybody in the company. He instructed me to put together a press kit, direct-mail brochures, and a custom-made mailing list-all on the 'QT' I immediately told him that the whole thing wasn't right. He told me to sleep on it. Then, two days later, he told me, 'you gotta do it.' I was told to lake out false job numbers-which I did. Somehow... somehow, he was going to intercept the ultimate bills and retype them or something. Also, I was to put all expenses under a different client's name and number. I didn't really understand how this whole thing was actually to be handled.

"It was at this time that I sought my father's advice-[his] advice [was] that I get on the next flight to New York and tell the top brass what was going down. I didn't go to New York. I basically stalled. Shortly thereafter, I decided to leave the company. But on the day of my resignation, I went to a company executive at the same level as the general manager. Files and evidence in hand, I spilled all the beans to him."

The general manager has since resigned from the company-"just ahead of the drop of the axe," as one of the company's top executives put it. Company officials are still discovering the extent of the manager's

unethical behavior.

---

**"The Story Behind 'A Case of the Creeps'"**

Ralph Davis, Director of the Executive MBA and JD/MBA Programs, IIT

A frequent criticism of the cases we use to teach business ethics is that they are irrelevant to the average business person. For example, the well documented insider trading cases involve big-money executives. Most business people will never be in their place.

We try to overcome this disadvantage by using our own "what if" situations. Though hypothetical cases can be constructed to resemble situations business people are likely to confront, these cases tend to be too schematic, too obviously fictional, for students to take seriously. I often wondered why there are so few cases of the right sort. Now I know.

Last year I happened upon a real life ethics case. Four people, two who remain today with the company involved and two who do not, told me how they (and others) handled the unethical demands of the general manager of their regional office. This, I thought, was just the sort of ethics case I was looking for.

It was not. What I had found was not so much a first-class ethics case as an introduction to the substantial disincentives, both legal and extralegal, that exist for anyone who wants to prepare a real-life ethics case.

As a lawyer, the author of articles on free speech, I was, of course, aware that great caution would be needed to avoid a defamation suit. Caution dictated that names, places and identifying details be excluded from the case. The facts would have to be checked and double-checked.

I selected testimonials as the case format. A first-person report seemed more likely to engage the reader than a god's-eye, third-person description. I then embarked upon securing the appropriate testimonials.

At once, two of the four participants got cold feet. One feared job dismissal. The participant's spouse had recently become unemployed. The couple did not want to put already tight personal finances at risk. The other participant with cold feet anticipated a legal action involving the company.

When word got around the company that I was working on an ethics article, I received as many as a dozen phone calls a day from persons willing to "snitch" but unwilling to go any farther. All my informants wanted their reports to be kept confidential. Many also wanted me to assure them that I was not keeping a written record of what they said. I gave that assurance to keep the information coming.

In the end, only two people gave testimonials. One of these had unflinchingly taken the ethical high ground and had taken his lumps for doing so. His testimonial was simply too "goodie two shoes" to be a case study by itself. It would not be useful without a foil, that is, one or more other testimonials reporting alternative courses of

action.

*In its original form*, the other testimonial provided a perfect foil. But it did not keep that form for long.

I supplied the prepublication draft to an officer of the company for review. I also advised the person who offered the testimonial that he should have his own lawyer review it.

Within a couple of days, the officer who had received the prepublication draft reported to me that the company's chairman might request that I withdraw the testimonial. Executives within the company had somehow fastened onto the idea that the prepublication draft was final.

Soon afterward, the chairman called me home. His voice revealed deep concern. I sensed that he expected a fight. He was caught a little off-guard by my expressions of cooperativeness. It took some time, however, to convince him that the testimonials were not an exercise in investigative reporting but rather an effort to do an ethics case study. He did not understand that I had submitted the testimonials to his company to solicit company reaction, just in case my judgment on exclusion of identifying details was faulty. Before ending the conversation, he indicated that his legal department would have to be involved.

During the next few days, after a few rounds of phone calls, fax transmittals and revisions, all of the company's suggested changes were accommodated except one minor optional revision (changing the word "creeps" in the title to "creep"). For each revision

modifying the testimonial, I had to secure agreement from the participant offering it. The testimonial lost a little life with each revision, but it survived.

Another showdown still lay ahead of me-with the former general manager. The *legal* safeguards against a possible defamation action were already in place. Each major fact could be supported by more than one source. The truth is an absolute defense in a defamation suit. But such safeguards are not enough. As one reviewing attorney commented, "you can go broke asserting your defense." A sad feature of defamation defenses is that one can win the suit (if it goes to trial) and still spend lots of money on legal fees.

To publish the testimonial safely, I would have to be sure that bringing a defamation action would be against the former general manager's own interests. I had to be able to look him in the eye and say-Clint Eastwood style-"Make my day."

The first point in my favor was that if the former general manager brought suit, he would publicly identify himself as the creep in "A Case of the Creeps."

Second, some of his business connections would necessarily be drawn into the suit as defense witnesses. Depositions, court appearances, and the like involving his business connections would certainly cast doubt upon his integrity. The doubts would be spread among those he would least want to doubt his ethics.

Third, by bringing suit he would open up evidence otherwise

closed to me. For example, he kept copious business notes in hardbound diaries. These spanned his tenure at several organizations. Since many people in the company had seen them, he could not destroy them without also providing a basis for impeaching his testimony. Modification of the hardbound diaries could probably be detected by even a novice in scientific evidence.

The fourth point in my favor was that the former manager would have a difficult time securing a reputable lawyer-unless he lied. The code of professional responsibility for lawyers prohibits the filing of frivolous suits. A lawyer who knowingly forwards a false claim risks court sanction and loss of license. If the manager deceived his own lawyer, he would not only risk having the lawyer resign, he would also risk eventually facing a charge of criminal perjury.

Fifth, legal action would probably cost the former general manager dearly. It is doubtful that he could secure a contingency fee arrangement lasting longer than the early stages of legal discovery. No sensible lawyer would absorb the cost of expensive litigation clearly destined to fail.

Finally, if the former manager filed a defamation suit, he would face the possibility of countersuit-for tortious abuse of process, a legal action which, if won, would impose not only actual damages but also punitive damages.

The showdown occurred the week after I had submitted "A Case of the Creeps" to *Perspectives*. The manager called and asked if I had prepared an article concerning him. I answered yes. I also informed him that I had done my

best to conceal identities. He requested a prepublication copy of the article. I refused. He asked the name of the publication. I refused to tell him. He asked that I offer him a chance to tell his side. I replied that his side was unnecessary because the article was about how people reacted to his demands-not about the rationale behind his demands.

So, if he decided to initiate a legal action before publication, he would have to come after me. I had not identified any other person or institution as having cooperated on the article. I then waited to see what would happen.

Nothing happened. Yet, even now, the risk of a law suit is still there. No wonder there are so few good ethics cases based on primary sources. I doubt that I'll ever try to assemble such a case study again.

---

### "Another Side of Business Ethics"

John Snapper, Illinois Institute of Technology

I received a call from Ms. Roe last week, the secretary to Mr. J. Doe of the XYZ Corporation. (The story is true; the aliases are not.) Ms. Roe said that her boss wanted a course in some area of professional ethics. I described IIT's offerings in ethics, each addressing some professional area such as engineering, business, or architecture. Ms. Roe, however, did not think that her boss really wanted a semester course that met three hours a week for sixteen

weeks. She finally explained that Mr. Doe had agreed to attend a course in professional ethics as part of the settlement of a criminal case. He had to complete the course before regaining his license to practice. He really wanted something he could get out of the way in one day. A half-day seminar would be ideal. Poor Ms. Roe had been calling local universities all day, trying to find something convenient. Checking the bulletin board, I found the announcement of a one day event at a nearby state university. Ms. Roe was extremely thankful.

---

### "What Would You Do If...?"

#### QUALITY OR QUANTITY.

You manage the evening shift at the GoGo Motors assembly plant in Gotown. Like the day shift, your shift has had trouble meeting the quota set at headquarters. You even wrote headquarters a memo explaining why you could not average more than 200 chassis an hour. You were informed in writing (1) that the assembly line is capable of producing up to 220 chassis an hour and (2) that the company cannot run the plant profitably on 200 chassis an hour.

Claim (1) is true in a sense. The assembly line can produce 220 chassis for an hour or two, but only by exhausting the workers (and provided no machinery breaks down). But the only way to get even 210 chassis an hour for much longer than an hour or two is by counting "chassis assembled" rather than "chassis fit

for shipment," that is, chassis without significant defects. Defective chassis are either rebuilt (at considerable cost) or scrapped.

Claim (2), in contrast, is more a threat than a statement of fact. It's a polite way of saying that if the assembly plant doesn't meet its quota, it will be shut down and you will be looking for another job.

You ask the plant manager what to do. His response is chillingly simple, "Do the best you can-and then include enough defective chassis in your shipment to bring the night's work up to quota. If the bastards in headquarters cared about quality, they would check for quality. They check numbers. They leave quality to you. Figure it out for yourself."

The plant manager will say nothing more explicit and will put nothing in writing. He answers all such requests with a smile at once kindly and contemptuous, as if to say, "Come on now, I've said what I said as a friend, not as your boss, and I've already said more than I should. You know that managers sometimes have to do things they cannot talk about. Don't worry, everyone here will understand what you're doing and why you're doing it."

Then, just as you are sure he will say nothing more, he adds, "Remember, in the long run, the market will take care of everything. You can't fool the consumer."

Do you take the plant manager's advice? Why or why not? If not, what do you do instead? Why?

**SEARCH AND DESTROY.** You are a manager of a small

division of a large corporation. You have just been informed by one of your assistants that a buyer seems to be receiving substantial gifts from suppliers (a clear violation of company policy). But the operative word is "seems."

You wonder what to do. To ask the buyer outright would simply invite a denial (whether she is guilty or not). You therefore consider putting the buyer under surveillance, that is, monitoring her office phone, going through her desk each night, and perhaps having a detective watch her house, obtain bank records, and so on.

You like this plan. There is no telling what might turn up. But, if nothing does, the buyer will not know she has been under surveillance. That is important, not only because there is no reason to ruffle an employee's feathers unnecessarily, but also because this employee can be quite unpleasant when her feathers are ruffled.

Actually, you would like to get rid of her on any pretext whatever, and you are pretty sure your assistant feels the same. Both of you are tired of her complaints about discrimination, about the safety of products you sell, and generally about your lack of social conscience. What should you do? What *shouldn't* you do?

---

### "Announcements"

**CALL FOR PAPERS:** International Congress on Peer Review in Biomedical

Publications, Chicago, May 10-12 1989. Papers should investigate or analyze the process by which scientific journals select papers for publication. How do journal policies and practices affect patient care? How do authors, reviewers, and editors make decisions about submission and publications? How are editors and reviewers selected and evaluated? What are the responsibilities of authors, institutions, editors, and reviewers in maintaining the integrity of research? How much does it all cost? Abstracts due by November 1, 1988. For further information, write Drummond Rennie, MD, Congress Directors, Deputy Editor (West), JAMA, 535 N. Dearborn St., Chicago, IL 60610.

**CALL FOR HELP:** CSEP is now engaged in a project supported by the Hitachi Foundation to find ways to help managers and engineers work together more effectively, especially when there is disagreement concerning the ethics of certain options. If you know of any articles, case studies, institutionalized practices, corporate training, or the like that might be relevant to this project, please write Michael Davis, CSEP IIT Chicago, IL 60616.

**HELP AGAIN:** The National Science Foundation has funded a project to provide a data-based understanding of the professional values being developed by the next generation of scientists and engineers during their graduate education. The project includes a survey of graduate school deans, development of a questionnaire to learn how students and faculty define appropriate professional behavior under difficult circumstances, and focus sessions

organized with academic departments in physics, biology, social sciences, and engineering. The project welcomes the submission of case material, papers, or correspondence which may contribute to the object: lives of the study. The project is also seeking departments to organize focus sessions. Contact Dr. Judith Swazey, Arcadia Institute, 118 West St., Bar harbor, ME 04609.

**CONFERENCE:** Technology and Ethics: Genetic Screening, Gene Therapy and Reproduction-Developments and Implications, September 22-24, 1988, Westin Hotel Tabor Center, Denver. Sponsored by the AMA and the Hastings Center. Contact American Medical Association, 535 N. Dearborn St., Chicago, IL 60610.

Ethics of Organizational Survival: Managing Change in a Competitive World, Third National Consultation on Corporate Ethics, September 27-28, 1988, sponsored by the Center for Ethics and Corporate Policy of Chicago and the Trinity Center for Ethics and Corporate Policy in New York City. Contact David Krueger, Center for Ethics and Corporate Policy, 637 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, IL 60605.

Society for the History of Technology, Annual Meeting, October 20-23, 1988, will be held at the Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, Delaware. Contact Elizabeth Gray Kogen, Center for the History of Business, Technology, and Society, Hagley Museum and Library, Wilmington, DE 19807.

**BOOK:** Peter Bergerson, Ethics and Public Policy (Garland Publishing, Inc.: New York), a

comprehensive annotated bibliography dealing with ethics and public policy; covers journal articles, dissertations, and books; headings include "ethics and state and local government," "comparative government and foreign policy," "health care/bio-medical research," "ethics and the interrelationship of government and business," "criteria for analyzing alternatives and principles of decision-making," "multiple roles of policy analysts," and "case study applications."

**VIDEOS:** A library of five classic films on business and society, including Mad River and The Wall Street Connection, is now available in VHS cassettes for \$495 (plus \$10 for shipping). Contact: Stefan Rerriera, California Newsreel, 630 Natoma St., San Francisco, CA 94103, (415) 621-6196.

---

### "At the Center"

Vivian Weil, CSEP, Illinois Institute of Technology

In the past year, ethical issues of occupational life achieved unprecedented visibility. Revelations of misconduct left almost no sphere of professional activity untouched, and ethics itself became the cover story of an issue of Time. But, as often happens, coverage seems to lag behind events. What impresses me most are energetic, new responses to these issues by educators and professional societies, and the acceleration of activity in applied ethics.

CSEP received a marked increase in requests to provide help to engineering faculty preparing to introduce course work on engineering ethics. The exchanges which followed indicate that a number of schools are committed to going beyond mere compliance with accreditation requirements. At more than a half dozen institutions with which CSEP has been involved, faculty seek to create an environment in which engineering ethics courses can take root and thrive.

Those who are taking the lead in their institutions stress the need to impress their colleagues in a dramatic way with the importance and pervasiveness of ethical issues in order to elicit their support. Beyond that, they look for ways to prepare themselves and their colleagues to provide students with a framework for dealing with ethical problems. They are debating alternative notions of a framework. These efforts reflect a growing emphasis, in a number of schools, on training professional school faculty to teach ethics in a rigorous way. Ethics seminars bringing together faculty from a number of disciplines are appearing on campuses in various parts of the country. Indeed, the faculty development effort casts a wide net. As one proponent of these initiatives put it, "We regard all our faculty as educating professionals with a small p."

Engineering professional societies also are engaged in new enterprises. The National Society of Professional Engineers is trying to increase the scope of its ethics activity by establishing a national institute, with an eye to influencing engineering education as well as practice. CSEP has



been associated with this initiative. Several other societies, such as the American Society of Agricultural Engineers, have called upon CSEP for help in putting ethics on the programs of meetings.

This year also brought a notable increase in the range of occupations with which CSEP was involved. The scope of CSEP's activities was expanded by programs or workshops for major building contractors, vocational education teachers, administrative law judges, fundraising executives, financial analysts, grade school teachers, and state presidents of hospital auxiliary organizations. In almost every case, CSEP's involvement was part of an effort by a professional or trade association to begin giving serious attention to ethical issues arising in practice.

The range of institutions turning to CSEP for information or consultation has also expanded. Requests from entities such as the Federal Environmental Protection Agency, United Way in Indiana, and the Office of the Prime Minister of Canada have drawn the Center beyond its traditional constituencies of educational institutions, professional societies, and trade associations.

For the first time, announcements of the formation of new centers seemed to outpace the appearance of codes of ethics of occupational groups or companies. CSEP's Library contains a referral bank of centers, a comprehensive collection of codes of ethics, and a listing of the contents of each collection. The listings are available on request for a modest charge, and copies of materials on

file may be ordered.

A major new CSEP project, funded by the Hitachi Foundation began this June. It addresses the gap between engineers and managers in decision making in bureaucratic organizations (see p. 6 this issue). The project should develop programs for dealing with problems of professional responsibility, such as those revealed by the Challenger accident (see Perspectives, Spring, 1987, p. 2).

The research and writing project on "National Security, The First Amendment, and Scientific and Technical Information" (funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation) has reached the half-way point. In the two meetings held to date, assessment of alternative controls and the capacities of different institutions of government to deal with areas of conflict have proceeded in tandem with an examination of the foundations of free expression. Project investigators include: Professor Lee Bollinger, Dean, University of Michigan Law School; Benjamin DuVal, research attorney; James Ferguson, U.S. Attorney; Professor Robert Ladenson, HT philosopher; Mark Lynch, attorney, Covington and Burling; and Dr. Harold Relyea, researcher, Congressional Research Service.

The recently completed project on ethical implications of intellectual property protection for scientific and technical information will have as its final product a volume of essays to be published by Rutgers University Press. The volume includes edited versions of some of the papers from the 1985 National Science

Foundation-funded conference and additional essays specially commissioned for the volume. Six papers derived from the project were published in Science, Technology, and Human Values in the Winter, 1987 issue.

The project on Ethical Issues in Organizational Development, directed by Mark Frankel, former CSEP Director, was completed this year. The final stage of that undertaking will be a volume published by Jossey-Bass and titled Casebook on Ethical Issues in Organization Development. CSEP Steering Committee member Robert Ladenson is co-editor.

Nearing completion is a report deriving from an American Association for the Advancement of Science symposium organized for the 1987 annual meeting by political scientist Paul Deforest of IIT and Vivian Weil. Appearing as a publication of AAAS, the report, *Biotechnology: Professional Issues and Social Concerns*, will contain editors' introductions and six papers.

Authors include Roger Beachy, scientist, Washington University; Michael Davis, philosopher, CSEP; Clifford Grobstein, scientist, University of California, San Diego; Sheldon Krinsky, social scientist, Tufts University; Edward MacCordy, Administrator for Research, Washington University; and Dr. Jeffrey Price, Vice President for R & D, Cetus Corporation.

In the formative stage is a project on ethics in financial services. A core group of academics and practitioners is being formed to produce an in-depth, first-hand study of the financial services

industry, identifying ethical pressure points, ethical problems, and ways of dealing with them.

Again this year, with funding from the Crawford Foundation, CSEP presented public lectures dealing with broad, provocative questions. The two speakers addressed science policy issues with ethical dimensions. In February, IIT's new Provost, I. Melvin Bernstein, spoke on the topic "Can Your Professor Also Be An Entrepreneur?" In April, Professor Robert Kargon, Willis K. Shepard Professor of the History of Science at the Johns Hopkins University, lectured on "Uneasy Partnership: Science and Politics in 20th Century America:'

During the course of the year, Center staff and faculty associates produced a number of papers that have been added to CSEP's Publications List. Of particular note are Warren Schmaus' "An Analysis of Fraud and Misconduct in Science," (from the AAAS's volume, Project on Scientific Fraud and Misconduct), Michael Davis' "Vocational Teachers, Confidentiality, and Professional Ethics" and Fay Sawyers' "Philosophy and Children," the latter two appearing in the most recent issue of the International Journal of Applied Philosophy. A list of periodicals in which articles by CSEP staff or associates appeared includes Teaching Philosophy, Business Economics, Business and Professional Ethics Journal, Management Insight, Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics, and Journal of the National Association of Administrative Law Judges. Association Management, a periodical for association executives, carried an article in the May issue calling attention to

CSEP's resources for practitioners dealing with codes of ethics. In his introduction to the inaugural issue of the Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics, Summer, 1987, Thomas Ehrlich, then President-elect of Indiana University, noted that of organizations concerned with studying issues of professional ethics, two of the most significant are the Hastings Center and CSEP

Fay Sawyer, who was Editor of Perspectives from 1983 to 1987, retired this spring from her position as a tenured member of the Humanities Department. Fay plans to continue her work on philosophy for children in the public schools and her teaching at the University of Indiana, Gary. Both the philosophy section of the Humanities Department and CSEP strongly reflect Fay's creative and constructive energies. The Center extends to Fay very best wishes for a fulfilling and enjoyable "retirement." Her colleagues at CSEP look forward to future association with her.

Vivian Weil June, 1988

The Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois Institute of Technology was established in 1970 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, Vivian Weil, Michael Davis

Opinions expressed in Perspectives on the Professions are those of the authors, and not necessarily those of the Center for

the Study of Ethics in the Professions or the Illinois Institute of Technology. Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill. 60616.