

Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 Definition of profession, professionalism and professional

What is profession? What is professionalism? Who is professional?

Defining profession and professionals is difficult. Thus many authors, instead of defining profession or professionals, identified some features that can be taken as necessary for an occupation to be a profession. Hence, profession refers to the knowledge, skill, and ability, which can be acquired through formal educational institutions such as universities, colleges and training centers that are filed by those persons who possess such knowledge and skills in any field of study.

Professionalism means behaving in an ethical manner while assuming and fulfilling your rightful responsibilities in every situation every time, without fail. To get a bit more granular, one can say that it means, in part, conducting your affairs in such a way as to engender trust and confidence in every aspect of your work. It means having the requisite ability to be worthy of the confidence others place in you. It means having already made the right choices so that you attract the right sort of client and work under good circumstances rather than having to continually make the best of bad circumstances and take whatever is tossed your way, regardless of its quality.

Perhaps most importantly, professionalism means, in every situation, willfully gathering responsibility rather than avoiding it. Doing so is important because if you don't acknowledge and assume the onus of responsibility in every aspect of your work you will seldom if ever make the right choice to do what is necessary to achieve consistent success for your employer, your employees, your clients, or yourself. Quite simply, if the buck doesn't stop with you, you're not a professional.

For example, you might now be thinking:

“This is silly, you're making this all too complicated. I'm not the CEO of a corporation, I'm just a designer. As a design professional, my job is to create beautiful designs for my clients. It's not my choice who the sales guy gets us as clients so it's not my fault that half of them don't trust my designs and want to fiddle with them too much. It's not my fault if the owner of my agency always changes my designs before we show the client. It's not my fault if the project manager gives me a ridiculously short deadline or if the client didn't explain her business to me well enough so that I could understand what she really needs. I do the best I can with what I have and all I really need to know is how to design really well.”

Something like this is probably a common response to the challenges put forth in this treatise, but any portion of this sort of response would be the wrong response. Yes, you will always make do with what you have, but what you have is entirely of your own making and it always will be.

If the response above could have come from you, remember that you choose to work where you work. You choose to work with the people you work with. You choose to take on the clients that the sales team feeds you. These are your choices and you've chosen to hold to them rather than to make different ones.

It's your responsibility to demonstrate your competence and professionalism to your clients before you ever start designing for them. Otherwise you'll seldom be allowed to give them your best work. If you know that most of the clients you work with are business owners, it is your responsibility to study how to run a business in order to better understand and serve their needs. It is your responsibility to know how to conduct discovery in order to determine how best to design for your clients. It's your responsibility to present your design decisions in a compelling manner so that your clients don't needlessly corrupt your work. In short, it's all you...every time and in every circumstance.

I hope that after reading and digesting this treatise you'll come to appreciate just how important it is for you to assume all of the responsibilities for your work, and how assigning blame to others completely undermines your ability to work professionally.

Here are some important distinctions between professionals and those who are not:

- A professional makes **deliberate choices** where others have choices made for them or they simply react to what comes their way.
- A professional is afforded the luxury of making deliberate choices because he has made **deliberate preparations**.
- A professional can make deliberate preparations because his understanding of and familiarity with the relevant (professional) landscape informs him on how to prepare. Also, like the chess master, he is trained to understand the inevitable results of hundreds of different patterns; he has disciplined himself to observe the whole board and not just the most immediate features or the area with the most tension in the game.
- A professional is seldom caught off-balance. The discipline for deliberate preparation and the understanding that comes with it allow that even when something unexpected or unfamiliar is introduced, a professional can quickly understand its basis and easily extrapolate the appropriate tactic, strategy, or process for ethically and successfully resolving issues.
- In this capacity, and most fundamentally, a professional habitually makes the right choices because all of his choices are based on the integrity provided by his moral and ethical foundation. Any choice of expedience over integrity can quite easily be recognized by anyone as the wrong choice. Here, the professional simply acknowledges what is obvious, makes the right choice, and acts deliberately (and now we're back at the start of this list).

If we know these features of professionalism, we can then use them as a guide to build a fundamental blueprint for design professionalism. So let's do that!

Professionals are people working in acknowledged professions and exercise specialist knowledge and skill. How the use of this knowledge should be governed when providing a service to the public can be considered a moral issue and is termed professional ethics.

Professionals are capable of making judgments, applying their skills and reaching informed decisions in situations that the general public cannot, because they have not received the relevant

training. One of the earliest examples of professional ethics is probably the Hippocratic Oath to which medical doctors still adhere to this day.

1.2 Characteristics of a profession

1. Accountability

Professionals hold themselves ultimately accountable for the quality of their work with the client. The profession may or may not have mechanisms in place to reinforce and ensure adherence to this principle among its members. If not, the individual professionals will (e.g. guarantees and/or contractual provisions).

2. Based on specialized, theoretical knowledge

Extensive, training significant intellectual component in the training and community services (Callahan, 28). Extensive training takes a long period. This training must be in a particular field. Thus, a person who has completed a high school cannot be said to have undergone extensive training because there are no specializations at high school. For example, a person must have at least diploma to practice law before Ethiopian Federal Courts according to Proclamation No. 199/2000. Thus, university or college studies are extensive training. The extensive training must involve significant intellectual component. It must enrich mental faculties of the trainee. It also requires caliber to undergo such training. Training for drivers mechanics, carpenters etc. does not involve intellectual component. It involves physical skills. On the other hand, training to, for example, teachers, accountants, and lawyers involves intellectual component. It focuses on intellectual tasks or skills.

Persons who have undergone through extensive training involving intellectual component provide services to the organized functioning of society. Modern complex society requires the services of many professionals. It needs, for example, the services of teachers, engineers, lawyers and physicians. In addition, there are features common to most profession but these features are not necessary for an occupation to be a profession. They include process of certification or licensing, organization of members and autonomy of the professional in his or her work.

Profession is a vocation requiring advanced education and training (Garner, 982). Professional is a person who belongs to a learned profession or whose occupation requires high level of training and proficiency. Professionals render specialized services based on theory, knowledge, and skills that are most often peculiar to their profession and generally beyond the understanding and/or capability of those outside of the profession. Sometimes, this specialization will extend to access to the tools and technologies used in the profession (e.g. medical equipment).

3. Institutional preparation

Professions typically require a significant period of hands-on, practical experience in the protected company of senior members before aspirants are recognized as professionals. After this provisional period, ongoing education toward professional development is compulsory. A profession may or may not require formal credentials and/or other standards for admission.

4. Autonomy

Professionals have control over and, correspondingly, ultimate responsibility for their own work. Professionals tend to define the terms, processes, and conditions of work to be performed for clients (either directly or as preconditions for their ongoing agency employment).

5. Clients rather than customers

Members of a profession exercise discrimination in choosing clients rather than simply accepting any interested party as a customer (as merchants do).

6. Direct working relationships

Professionals habitually work directly with their clients rather than through intermediaries or proxies.

7. Ethical constraints

Due to the other characteristics on this list, there is a clear requirement for ethical constraints in the professions. Professionals are bound to a code of conduct or ethics specific to the distinct profession (and sometimes the individual). Professionals also aspire toward a general body of core values, which are centered upon an uncompromising and unconflicted regard for the client's benefit and best interests.

8. Merit-based

In a profession, members achieve employment and success based on merit and corresponding voluntary relationships rather than on corrupted ideals such as social principle, mandated support, or extortion (e.g. union members are not professionals). Therefore, a professional is one who must attract clients and profits due to the merits of his work. In the absence of this characteristic, issues of responsibility, accountability, and ethical constraints become irrelevant, negating any otherwise-professional characteristics.

9. Capitalist morality

In order to be a professional, it should stand for the well being and improvement of human society.

10. Practical

A profession should be practical. That is, a professional person must change the knowledge and skills to practical and tangible way of line.

11. organized

It should be organized; this is to mean that a profession must be strong, respected,

12. Great responsibility

Professionals deal in matters of vital importance to their clients and are therefore entrusted with grave responsibilities and obligations. Given these inherent obligations, professional work typically involves circumstances where carelessness, inadequate skill, or breach of ethics would be significantly damaging to the client and/or his fortunes.

13. Prestige

It refers to a degree of esteem. As such, in order to be a professional, this is to incorporate: a body of knowledge that includes general, specialized, and professional knowledge. A body of skills, which includes needs science its own. The responsibilities inherent to the practice of a profession

are impossible to rationally maintain without a moral foundation that flows from a recognition of the singular right of the individual to his own life, along with all of its inherent and potential sovereign value; a concept that only capitalism recognizes, upholds and protects.

1.3 Difference between Occupation and Profession

The word occupation and profession are used inter-changeably. Occupation and profession are almost the same with minor differences between them. The difference between can be stated with example: Designing a building would be called a profession, whereas, constructing a building is an occupation. A profession needs extensive training and specialized knowledge. On the other hand, an occupation does not need any extensive training. A person with an occupation need not have specialized knowledge of his trade.

A profession can be called an occupation when a person is paid for his particular skills, and his deep knowledge. Doctors, engineers, advocates, journalists, scientists, and many others, fall under the professional category. On the other hand, persons engaged in an occupation are not paid for their knowledge, but only for what they produce. Drivers, clerks and technicians fall under the category of occupation.

Unlike a person engaged in an occupation, a professional has to undergo higher education. It is noticeable that a profession tends to be autonomous. When considering responsibilities, a profession demands that the responsibility lies with the individual. Moreover, only a professional will be able to assess fellow professionals. In regards to an occupation, no one has autonomous power; he or she is supervised by another person. Moreover, any person can make assessments, as this type of work does not require high degrees of knowledge and skill.

Well, professionals enjoy a higher social status than a person engaged in an occupation. Another difference that can be seen between profession and occupation is that the former is guided through certain ethical codes, and is regulated by a certain statute.

Summary:

1. A profession needs extensive training and specialized knowledge. On the other hand, an occupation does not need any extensive training.
2. A profession can be called an occupation when a person is paid for his particular skills, and his deep knowledge. Persons engaged in an occupation are not paid for their knowledge, but only for what they produce.
3. Unlike a person engaged in an occupation, a professional has to undergo higher education.
4. A profession tends to be autonomous, whereas, for an occupation, no one has autonomous power; he or she is supervised by another person.
5. Unlike occupation, a profession demands that the responsibility lies with the individual.
6. A profession is guided through certain ethical codes, and regulated by certain statute.

With a profession, this could be a job that you spent previous years study throughout a certain course. It is your main point of study, and a career you wanted to obtain maybe through out your life.

In this chapter, we'll cover what professional ethics is all about, fundamental codes and principles of professional Ethics, what's expected of you in your profession and how ethical dilemmas can be approached.

1.4 Professional Ethics

The term professional ethics has at least two broad senses:

1. **Professional Ethics as a norm:** the norm and standard of behavior of members of specific occupational groups and the ethical issues and dilemmas that arise in their practice.

Professional ethics is the personal and corporate standards of behavior expected of the members of a particular profession. Professional ethics is a set of standards adopted by a professional community. Professional ethics are regulated by standards, which are often referred to as codes of ethics. It encompasses the personal and corporate standards of behavior expected of professionals. Professional ethics refers to ethics that enables professionals to distinguish what is right from what is wrong using morality as standard of evaluation. It serves as parameter by which action and behavior of a professional can be judged as right or wrong. Each profession as a profession has its own codes and principles (standards) of ethics. The code of ethics is very important because it gives us boundaries that we have to stay within in our professional careers. The one problem with the code of ethics is that we can't always have the answers black and white. Sometimes there are grey areas where the answers aren't so simple. Professional ethics are also known as Ethical Business Practices.

2. **Professional Ethics as study:** the study of these norms and ethical issues.

In this second sense professional ethics is a branch of applied ethics. The term applied ethics tend to be used to refer to moral philosophy that is applied to practical as opposed to theoretical ethics, which focuses more on the development and evaluation of ethical theories. But this distinctions is somewhat artificial, as all ethics is the about the practices of how human being behave towards each other.

The intention in applied subjects is to work more directly on problems and issues experienced in the real world , and perhaps even (although not always) to make a difference to people's understanding and action in relation to issues. The biggest growth in the field of applied ethics in recent years has been in areas such as bioethics, environmental ethics and professional ethics. Thus, Professional ethics may entail the application of ethical theories to specific and general professional practice.

Chapter Two: Professional Code of Ethics

In this chapter, we'll cover what professional code of ethics is all about, fundamental codes and principles of professional Ethics, what's expected of you in your profession and how ethical dilemmas can be approached.

2.1 Codes of Professional Ethics

Many professions that are trusted by the public to apply expert knowledge (doctors, teachers, engineers, surveyors, accountants and the like) have a **code of ethics** which sets out their **expectations** of a member's behavior and the **boundaries** within which members have to operate. The **Hippocratic Oath**, generally recognized as the earliest expression of such code in relation to medical practice, seems to build upon a simple principle to the effect that the doctor's first **concern should be the well-being of his or her patients above any personal interest or profit**. From this point of view, doctors are enjoined to abstain from abuse of their power or authority for the financial, sexual or other exploitation of **patients**.

What is code of ethics?

A code of ethics is usually a **written document** produced by **professional association**, occupational regulatory body or other professional body with the **stated aim of guiding the practitioners** who are members, **protecting services used** and **safeguarding the reputation of the profession**. Strictly speaking a code does not have to be written.

Contemporary codes generally contain all or some of the following:

- Statement about the **core purpose or service ideal of the** profession for example :that the primary mission of the specific profession is to enhance human well-being,
- Statement about **the character /attributes of the profession** –for example professional practitioners should be honest, trustworthy and reliable,
- Ethical principles – **general statement of ethical principles underpinning the work**: for example respect for autonomy of services users : promotion of human welfare
- Ethical rules-**some general do's and don'ts** for example do not permit knowledge to be used for discriminatory policies , protect all confidential information,
- Principles of **professional practice-general statement about how to achieve what is intended for the good of the services users** , for example collaboration with colleague,
- Rules of professional practice –**very specific guidance relating to professional practice**, for example, declare a bequest in a client wills, advertising should not claim superiority.

What are the main purposes of code of ethics?

Many code, but not all have some kinds of preamble, which states the core purpose and broad aims of the profession. The following are some the common purpose of the code of ethics:

- **Protection of clients or service users** through the public pledge to be trustworthy and by explicitly stating what can be expected of a professional practitioner,
- **Guidance to practitioner** about **how to act** and **how to make ethical decision** ,either through encouraging ethical awareness and reflection or through explicit rules,

- **Enhancement of professional status**, through the mere existence of a code of ethic, since this is supposed to be one of the characteristic of a profession,
- Creating and maintaining **professional identity** through the **explicit statement** of the service ideal, key ethical principles, the kinds of qualities expected of people who belongs to this profession and the kinds of conduct required,
- **Professional regulation** requiring members of a professional group to adhere to the code and using it for disciplinary purpose in cases of misconduct.

2.2 Fundamental Codes of Professional Ethics

A code of ethics helps to clarify the profession's values provides a reference point for decision making and can be used as a framework for discipline. Most codes of ethics are principles based, providing guidance as to the principles (much broader than rules) on which professional judgment and decisions should be based, rather than a rigid system of rules. There tend to be some common themes, so for example most professional establish the following fundamental principles must be applied: integrity, objectivity, professional competence and due care, confidentiality and professional behavior.

Different professions may have different **codes of ethics** and **rules of conduct** with in which their professional's actions and behaviors are judged as right or wrong against their profession. But there are also **common codes of ethics and rules of conduct of workers in all professions**. Hence, these rules, which will be discussed in the following section, are universally applied and must be applied across all professions. They are:

- 1. Act with integrity:** Never put **your own gain above the welfare of your clients or others** to whom you have a professional responsibility. Respect their confidentiality at all times and always consider the wider interests of society in your judgments.
- 2. Always be honest:** honesty basically refers to the art of **telling truth**. Employers and institutions expect their workers to be honest, but many workers and instructors (teachers) are not. Be trustworthy in all that you do – never deliberately mislead, whether by withholding or distorting information.
- 3. Be open and transparent:** Share the full facts with your clients, making things as plain and intelligible as possible.
- 4. Be accountable:** Take **full responsibility for your actions**, and don't blame others if things go wrong.
- 5. Act within your limitations:** Be aware of the limits of your competence and don't be tempted to work beyond these. **Never commit to more than you can deliver**.
- 6. Be objective at all times:** Give clear and appropriate advice. Never let **sentiment** or your own interests cloud your judgments.
- 7. Always treat others with respect:** Never discriminate against others.
- 8. Set a good example:** Remember both your public and private behavior could affect your own, and other members' reputations.
- 9. Have the courage to make a stand:** Be **prepared to act if you suspect a risk** to safety or malpractice of any sort.

10. Punctuality: refers to the state of **being strictly observant of an appointed regular time**. Across all professions, a worker is said to be and should be, punctual not only when he/she comes to work place on the time but also when he/she meets deadlines and he/she is always available during working hours.

10. Proper utilization of instruments of labor

This implies that any worker of a given profession should **use resource be it financial, material etc efficiently and effectively and in a just and proper manner**. A worker in any profession, be it a teacher, or physician, should handle the instruments, in a way that he/she can use the instruments for longer time. This is particularly applied by public institutions that deliver service to the public by any worker in a given profession.

11. Loyalty and self efficacy

“Do not bite the hand that feeds you.” Any worker in a given profession must stand for not against your relationships with your employer or institution. Therefore, always think what you can do to promote the organization or office or university you work for.

12. Working in cooperation with colleagues

A worker of a given profession should make sure that he/she has **a good relationship** with other workers. The main rationale behind these codes of professional ethics is to create:

- ✓ Fertile and good atmosphere conducive for cooperation and better productivity.
- ✓ He/she should serve hand in hand with other professional workers in the interest of effective provision of service.

13. Anti corruption spirit

It is well known that corruption severely hampers development and it is an impediment for building democracy. One way of fighting corruption is by making professionals to comply with the laws, rules and regulation of the state. But most importantly, it is plausible that every professional should enhance or develop the spirit, (mentality) that is **anti or against corruption** so that development, equality, democracy and justice can remarkable be fostered.

14. Confidentiality: a worker of a given profession conspicuously needs to keep some **information that should be kept secret**.

15. Commitment: a professional should help his/her client and the whole community to maintain and satisfy societal (public) demands.

16. Persistent tolerance and democratic culture: any worker or professional have to develop the ability and willingness to accommodate differences in ideas, outlooks, views etc due to various behaviors of human beings.

17. Respecting the dignity of people: a professional or worker should **respect the dignity of the persons serving them in accordance with their basic needs, irrespective of their sex, personal status, and religion or by other supernal factors involved**.

18. Impartiality (non-partiality): a professional should be impartial I’e, non-parties are to his client or all persons that he/she contacts, rather he/she **treat all equally in this delivery to his clement or people without any discrimination**.

- 19. Accountability and responsibility:** any worker in a given profession has professional responsibilities or duties. In an organization where you are engaged, you have to be obedient for the chain of command, which are presented to you. As you are part of a given organization you have to **be answerable for your actions**.
- 20. Transparency:** it is also imperative for professional to be transparent I'e his/her words **must be open to the public to whom he delivers public service**. A confident professional is who work for the people effectively and efficiently are usually transparent.
- 21. Responsiveness:** refers to the extent that a **professional satisfies the needs, preferences, or values of his clients and or the society**. Since he/she has connections and professional relationship with his clients or public, he/she has to able to reply or respond to the people's demand.

2.3 Criticisms of Code of Ethics

Critics maintain that codes of ethics are **often only nice, banal and meaningless words without carrying any obligation**. However, if the code has been developed jointly with staff and other relevant stakeholders, if it is visually supported by management and the board of directors and if it is constantly reviewed and revised in the face of changing circumstances and new experiences, **it has great value**.

The process of developing a code of ethics tends to be more important than the actual content. Critics also often see a **code merely as an opportunistic marketing and public relations instrument**. However, a lived code proves its value in crisis situations rather than in trouble free times. Cynical employees or customers will be the first to painfully experience the results of a disregarded written ethics code, i.e., the loss of its value.

Detractors doubt that management really expects employees to adhere to the moral principles of its code of ethics when it would mean losing business or reducing profits. **Maintaining high ethical standards is essential to staying in business and maintaining long term profitability**. Consequently, management and the owners of the business expect employees to always act according to ethical principles.

It has been suggested that a code of ethics is not in the interest of every company. The more an industry sticks to a code the greater may be the advantage for one of them to cheat. I believe this is a frivolous suggestion. An industry that believes in ethical behavior will quickly take action against the black sheep in its midst that is hurting the entire industry's reputation. The trade association, the market, any consumer protection group as well as government can make the code categorical and severely punish non-compliance.

Sometimes it is felt that a **code is encouraging unrealistic expectations** that it is sanctimonious talk and mystical beliefs about what is possible in a hard, realistic business world. Such criticism is the result of a **romantic code** of ethics that does not take the real world into consideration, one which is not lived and has not been tested by applying it to real situations.

Being ethical in business has been described as some kind of theft. As Milton Friedman (Friedman, 1970) says: the business belongs to its owners and management's job is nothing more than to maximize the returns for them. A business should be "ethical" only insofar as it will

maximize profits. Spending time and money on ethical issues is likely to divert efforts and assets that belong to the owners. The owners alone are the ones who have the right to decide what they wish to do with their assets. A business that will only be “ethical” insofar as such “ethics” will maximize profits will not, in the long run, optimize shareholders’ value; rather it may destroy it as has been shown many a time in this report. However, management should guard against “social responsibility” projects that conflict with long term profits and it should involve the board of directors, and through it, the owners, in the company’s code of ethics.

A similar critical remark to the one immediately above is that if business ethics is gauged by business’s support for “worthy causes,” then the focus shifts away from the manner in which business behaves in its own every day, ordinary activities. As has been shown in this report, it is not business’s primary duty to champion “worthy causes.” Ethics and the need for business to earn profits and create long term wealth for its owners must promote one another, and, as we have seen too, ethics is a necessary ingredient for the building of a healthy and growing business. Although, a code of ethics is useful and important, it can lead to blind reliance on the written code which may result in people not developing moral sensitivity of their own. Unthinking compliance with a code can lead to wrong decisions. A code is only a guideline, which may require careful interpretation and reflection in difficult situations. Regular discussions of case studies and debates about new moral issues can counter this. One needs skill to use a moral code. Training in moral analysis and ethical decision-making should complement the code. An ethical code can lead to silencing other views. The debate on ethical matters must remain open and it is important to make provisions for and invite all staff members to make their input into a regular revision of the code of ethics.

An ethical code can be counterproductive, which happens when there is a discrepancy between actual and professed behavior. It can also suppress moral autonomy through the belief that the code is the gospel and independent, that original thin king is not permitted. Clearly these objections are based on a wrong understanding of the code or, on a failure by the company to explain the workings of the code or on poor control and communications.

Finally, ethics is sometimes considered as a new fad, as another issue which - according to some wise guy - needs the support of top management, which requires a lot of time and therefore takes staff’s eye off the ball, or which is just another expensive fancy in a time when everyone should know that the primary duty of management is to reduce costs. I hope that this report has shown that none of these objections is justified; to the contrary, those managers who espouse such views have no right to be called “managers.”

2.4 Law versus Ethics

Behavior can be unethical without being illegal, and professional ethics covers a wider area than the law. For example tax evasion (the deliberate misrepresentation of personal or corporate affairs to the tax authorities) is illegal and not something that most people would wish to condone. However, many citizens used a legal tax avoidance scheme to significantly reduce the tax on their earnings which gave rise to widespread criticism by the media and politicians

(including the prime minister) who questioned the morality of their actions. Although not illegal, there is an ethical issue concerning the payment of a fair/just amount of tax by the wealthy.

Similarities between Ethics & Law

Both Ethics and Law are complimentary to each other and are made:

- ❖ to guide user from misusing computers
- ❖ to create a healthy computer society, so that computers are used to contribute to a better life
- ❖ to prevent any crime

The Differences between Ethics and Law

In general, ethics is a moral philosophy where a person makes a specific moral choice and sticks to it. Law is a legal system comprising of rules and principles that govern the affairs of a community and controlled by a political authority. Law differs from one country to another but is not much as law.

ETHICS

- **Guideline:** as a guideline to computer users.
- **Moral Standards:** Ethical behavior is judged moral standards.
- **Free To Follow:** people are free to follow or ignore the code of ethics.
- **No Punishments:** No punishment for anyone and other violates ethics. law
- **Universals**
- **Immoral**

LAW

- Control:** As a rule to control computer
- Judicial Standards:** Law is judged by law
- Must Follow:** people are must Follow regulation and law.
- Punishments:** Penalties, imprisonments for those who break the law.
- Depends On Country:** Depends on
- Crime**

An attitude of mind

Thus, professional ethics is not just about complying with the letter of the law but also about applying the [spirit of principles, rules and guidelines](#). Really it is about cultivating the right attitude of mind. Ethical issues are not always clear-cut. Claiming expenses for amounts that have not been incurred or were incurred for personal rather than business use might be considered unethical by most but what about the taking home from the office of pens, paper and other stationery? A useful test is to consider what a reasonable person who is well-informed, well-intentioned and unbiased would do in a similar situation.

Conflicts of interest

Many professional ethics issues are about conflict and in particular the conflict between **professional duties** and **personal interest**. In order to act ethically a professional expert must be

sure that they are protecting the interests of others rather than themselves. In situations of possible conflict, professionals need to balance the commercial pressures of the business environment with the need to treat people fairly and act with integrity. So with the Face book flotation, there were concerns about the ethics of how Face book's professional advisors disclosed information, when estimates of revenue growth were revised downwards a few days before the company went to market, but this information was only provided to selected investors. The unequal dissemination of information meant that individual investors were left buying shares at prices that the institutional investors already knew were over-valued.

Implementation

Most professions have internally enforced codes of practice that members of the profession must follow, to prevent exploitation of the client and preserve the integrity of the profession. This is not only for the benefit of the client but also the benefit of those belonging to the profession. Disciplinary codes allow the profession to define a standard of conduct and ensure that individual practitioners meet this standard, by disciplining them from the professional body if they do not practice accordingly. This allows those professionals who act with conscience to practice in the knowledge that they will not be undermined commercially by those who have fewer ethical qualms. It also maintains the public's trust in the profession, encouraging the public to continue seeking their services.

Internal regulation

In cases where professional bodies regulate their own ethics, there are opportunities for such bodies to become self-serving and to fail to follow their own ethical code when dealing with renegade members. This is because the nature of professions is that they have almost a complete monopoly on a particular area of knowledge. For example, until recently, the English courts deferred to the professional consensus on matters relating to their practice that lay outside case law and legislation.

Statutory regulation

In many countries there is some statutory regulation of professional ethical standards such as the statutory bodies that regulate nursing and midwifery. Failure to comply with standards can thus become a matter for the courts.

Examples

For example, a lay member of the public should not be held responsible for failing to act to save a car crash victim because they could not give an appropriate emergency treatment. This is because they do not have the relevant knowledge and experience. In contrast, a fully trained doctor (with the correct equipment) would be capable of making the correct diagnosis and carrying out appropriate procedures. Failure of a doctor to help in such a situation would generally be regarded as negligent and unethical. An untrained person would not be considered to be negligent for failing to act in such circumstances and might indeed be considered to be negligent for acting and potentially causing more damage and possible loss of life.

A business may approach a professional engineer to certify the safety of a project which is not safe. Whilst one engineer may refuse to certify the project on moral grounds, the business may

find a less scrupulous engineer who will be prepared to certify the project for a bribe, thus saving the business the expense of redesigning.

2.5 Ethics in Practice

An ethical code is a rational construct and built upon a foundation of values. Those in the habit of moral discrimination—the practice of automatically comparing issues to their own core values and deciding and/or acting accordingly—are people of integrity. But not everyone is practiced at or has disciplined themselves to evaluate and make decisions in this manner. There are many who approach each situation afresh and evaluate based merely on immediate factors and/or emotional primacy. This fact is one reason why so few are suited to a profession.

It is probably quite obvious to you that rules and codes of conduct are not made for circumstances where it is easy to do what is right, but rather for when immediate factors might otherwise render the proper move unclear or obscured by ideas of expediency. More to the point, codes of conduct are made to guide us toward consistently proper or ethical choices so that we habitually avoid difficult and ambiguous situations. However, despite rules, constraints, training, or promises, human beings can only be trusted to act in accordance with their morality. Since a professional must unfailingly adhere to the rules of professional ethics, perhaps you can perceive the potential for problems presented by any allowance for relativism.

A code of ethics precludes merely immediate factors in favor of inviolate standards. In order to be of use or relevant to a professional, a code of ethics requires internalization and habitual reference. Specifically, it requires a strong, consistent internal standard; quantifiable, integrated into every element of practice, and each component related to the others. The result of this standard put into practice is known as professionalism.

Chapter Three: Ethical Theories and Dilemma

3.1 Introduction

Ethics, like logic, metaphysics etc, is one branch of philosophy. Ethics is the study of the general nature of morals and of the specific moral choices to be made by individuals in his relationship with others. [It is the philosophical study of morality](#). It is also called moral philosophy. As a field of philosophical inquiry ethics has three branches: Meta ethics, theoretically normative ethics and applied ethics.

Meta ethics is an analytical enterprise which involves trying to discern what moral terms (e.g. 'good', 'right') are generally understood to mean, how justification proceeds in moral discourses and what we are doing when we share moral judgments with others. "It is the attempt to understand the metaphysical, epistemological, semantic, and psychological, presuppositions and commitments of moral thought, talk, and practice". Meta ethics does not actually involve making moral judgments. Rather Meta ethics involves attempting to discern precisely what is going on when moral judgments are made and uttered and what conceptual justification in moral discourse involves.

Theoretical normative ethics involves making moral judgments at most general levels because the task of theoretical normative ethics is to develop general moral theories. Theoretical normative ethics is classified into moral axiology, virtue ethics and the theory of moral obligation. Axiology includes theory of good and evil, and tries to answer the question “what is good?” For example, John Stuart Mill says *good* is happiness. Virtue ethics includes theories of what is counted as moral excellence in character. It tries to answer a question like “what kind of characteristics should we foster in our children?” Theory of moral obligation includes theories regarding what kind of action and practices are morally permissible and impermissible and what is morally required of all moral agents. One of such theories is utilitarianism.

Applied ethics has the task of resolving specific moral issues and morally problematic and concrete cases which arise in different areas of life. It borrows insights from Meta ethics and theoretical normative ethics but the concentration in **applied ethics is on finding acceptable resolutions for moral problems of present and practical urgency**. Professional ethics is one area of applied ethics. Professional ethics is “the rule or standard governing the conduct of members of a profession”. Professional ethics is ethics in the form of formally framed rules governing professional conduct or conduct of particular class of people. Unlike ethics which applies to everyone, professional ethics applies to only members of the profession. Violation of professional ethics results in disciplinary measures.

3.2 Moral Issues and Moral Dilemmas

Issues are questions or problems to be answered or solved. Moral issues are issues that raise questions of value about rights and welfare of a person. They may be about the character of a person. **Questions of value** are best understood when they are compared with **questions of fact**. Answering questions of value involves important **value judgment** while answering questions of fact **does not involve value judgment**. Answering questions of value requires **moral principles** whereas answering question of fact requires **evidence**. Consider the following example:

Assume that there is a rumor about homosexuality of Mr. X whom you know very well. You want to answer two questions related with Mr. X. These questions are.

- a) Is the rumor about Mr. X’s homosexuality true (i.e. is Mr. X homosexual)?
- b) Is there anything wrong if Mr. X is homosexual?

To answer the first question you need evidence which may be an eye witness, video tape or other direct or circumstantial evidences. Thus, the first question is a question of fact. However, the second question cannot be answered by references to the evidences obtained under the first question. You judge the behavior of homosexuality. You have to resort to the value of the society or the moral principles. Thus, the second question involves value judgment.

The distinction between question of value and question of fact is similar to the distinction between question of law and question of fact. The only difference is that the question of value is ascertained by reference to a morality and the question of law is ascertained by reference to law. Therefore, the difference between question of law and question of value boils down to the difference between law and morality.

Moral issues involve value dilemmas (moral dilemmas) as depicted below by (Callahan)

“Moral dilemmas involve situations in which one cannot escape deciding in which not to decide is to decide and in which doing nothing has the moral status of doing something. ... [G]enuine moral dilemmas always involve sacrificing something of significant moral value since they involve conflicts of values we want to preserve or minimally values we think are worth respect—values like loyalty to a colleague, client’s right to privacy and confidentiality, a clients welfare, the public good veracity, personal integrity, legitimate self interest” (Ibid).

To illustrate let us see the conflict between two values: confidentiality of information and liberty of individuals. Art. 10 of Federal Courts advocates Code of Conduct Council of Ministers Regulation No. 57/1999 makes the information between client and advocate confidential to protect right to privacy under Art.26 of FDRE Constitution. If the advocate reveals this information, no client will consult an advocate resulting in no meaningful representation. Therefore, we value confidentiality of client’s information. On the other hand, we value justice and liberty. It is not just to imprison innocent persons. Art. 17 of the constitution guarantee the right to liberty. The following example, which is adopted from Callahan, shows how these two values conflict.

Imagine that you are a criminal lawyer defending a client who is on trial for aggravated homicide contrary to Art 539 of the Criminal Code. You are quite certain that she is innocent of the crime. The trial is going in her favor and the probability of acquittal is very high. You have established a good relationship with her and (bolstered by prospect of acquittal) she tells you that although she did not commit this homicide she did commit another homicide four years earlier. She goes on telling you that another woman with long criminal record was convicted of that homicide and is serving life imprisonment for it. You attempt to persuade her to confess to crime but she adamantly refuses. What would be your decision?

In this example you cannot escape from deciding. Your choice is not to decide amounts to decision. Your decision involves the sacrifice of one value. Thus you have two chances. One is to act upon the information of your client by rebating confidential information and obtain the release of the innocent convict. If it is possible this totally disregards or scarifies the other value, Confidentiality of client’s information. Your other choice is to remain silent. In doing so, you scarify the other value, liberty of individuals.

3.3 The Theory of Moral Obligation

What is the importance of studying theory of moral obligation for professional Ethics? The study of theory of moral obligation equip the students of Professional Ethics with some tools which they can use when they discover that there is “no rule on the point” or that the rule on the point is open textured” or that the rules on the point permits or requires conducts that seems morally repugnant.

There are many theories of moral obligations. For our purpose we limit ourselves to Utilitarianism, Categorical Imperatives and Golden Rule.

3.3.1 Utilitarianism

According to English philosophers and economists Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill, an action is right if it tends to promote happiness and wrong if it tends to produce the reverse of happiness—not just the happiness of the performer of the action but also that of everyone affected by it (Encyclopedia Britannica). Utilitarianism's theory of what is *right* is consequentialism, or the doctrine that the morally right option in any circumstance is that option which brings about the most good, or the best *consequences*. Any other option is wrong. An option which produces the most good also produces the least bad consequences. Hence, there can be a right alternative even if the only alternatives produce bad consequences. For example, all dentists cause pain but the degree of pain differs. Thus, the right dentist to go to is the one who produces the least pain.

According to Utilitarians, what is good is *utility*. Utility is human well-being or welfare. Utility, according to Jeremy Bentham, is 'that property in any object, whereby it tends to produce benefit, advantage, pleasure, good, or happiness...or...to prevent the happening of mischief, pain, evil, or unhappiness' (*Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* (1789)). There are different kinds of utilitarianism. For our purpose, we focus on the following two: Act utilitarianism and Rule utilitarianism.

A. Act Utilitarianism

An act Utilitarianism holds that *an action is right if and only if it produces the best consequences*. Act Utilitarianism tells us that what determine whether a given *action* is right are *that action's* consequences. It tells us that the one and only right action to perform in any given situation is that action which produces the best consequences of all those actions that are available to the agent at a given time and place. Any action that produces less than the best consequences is therefore wrong. Hence, lying is wrong in a given situation if and only if telling the truth or remaining quiet produces better consequences. By the same token, lying is right in a given situation if and only if lying produces better overall consequences than either telling the truth or remaining quiet.

According to act utilitarianism, an action cannot be judged right or wrong abstractly. It depends upon the situation in which an act is performed. Thus, stealing, murdering, telling lie etc may be right or wrong depending on the situation in which they are performed. That is, stealing is right if it produces the best consequences. For example, X steals certain food items from B, who is the richest person in the village, the lives of his family members. Stealing in this case is right.

James Rachels summarizes act utilitarianism in the following terms:

First, actions are to be judged right or wrong solely in virtue of their consequences. Nothing else matters. Right actions are, simply, those that have the best consequences.

Second, in assessing consequences, the only thing that matters is amount of happiness or unhappiness that is caused. Everything else is irrelevant. Thus, right actions are those that produce the greatest balance of happiness over unhappiness.

Third, in calculating the happiness over unhappiness that will be caused, no one's happiness is to be counted as more important than anyone else's. Each person's welfare is equally important.

One difficulty with act Utilitarianism is that it seems quite possible for it to conflict dramatically with our conscience and many of our deeply held convictions like justice and rights. For instance, we believe that in most cases torture is wrong even if it produces the best consequences. Read the following illustration taken from Schwartz.

York V. Story (U.S court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit)

In October, 1958, appellant (Ms. York) went to the police department of Chino for the purpose of filing charges in connection with an assault upon her. Appellate Ron Story, an officer of that police department, then acting under color of his authority as such, advised appellant that it was necessary to take photographs of her. Story then took appellant to a room in the police station, locked the door, and directed her to undress, which she did. Story then directed appellant to assume various indecent positions, and photographed her in those position. These photographs were not made in any lawful purpose. Later that month, Story advised appellant that the pictures did not come out and that he had destroyed them. Instead, Story circulated these photographs among the personnel of the chino police department.

Ms. York brought suit against these officers and won. Her legal rights had clearly been violated. But, what about the morality of the officers' behavior? Utilitarianism says that actions are defensible if they produce a favorable balance of happiness over unhappiness. This suggests that we consider the amount of unhappiness caused to Ms. York and compare it with the amount of pleasure taken in the photograph by Officer Story and his cohorts. It is at least possible that more happiness than unhappiness was caused. In that case the utilitarian conclusion apparently would be that their actions were morally all right. But this seems to be perverse way to approach the case. Why the pleasure should afforded Story and his cohorts matter at all? Why should it even count? They had no right to treat Ms. York in that way, and the fact that they enjoyed doing so hardly seems a relevant defense.

The moral to be drawn is that Utilitarianism is at odds with the idea that people have rights that may not be trampled on merely because one anticipates good result. Ms. York's right to privacy was violated; (and in other cases other rights may be at issue) — the right to freedom of religion, to free speech, or even the right to life itself. It may happen that good purposes are served, from time to time, by ignoring these rights. But we do not think that our rights should set aside so easily. The notion of a personal right is not utilitarian notion. Quite the reverse: it is a notion that places limits on how an individual may be treated, regardless of the good purposes that might be accomplished (Ibid).

In general, it seems quite possible that our deeply held beliefs about what we ought or ought not to do could conflict with what the act utilitarianism standard tells us to do. In response to this problem, many utilitarian's have opted for rule Utilitarianism instead.

B. Rule Utilitarianism

According to rule Utilitarianism, an action is right if and only if it is in accordance with a set of rules conformity which produces the best consequences. A rule Utilitarianism does *not* depend on its consequences. Rather, it depends on whether the action is in accordance with a set of rules of conduct. Which set of rules? Set of rules conformity which have the best overall consequences. For example, suppose the following rules are members of the set of those rules conformity which produces the best consequences:

1. Everyone shall tell the truth
2. No one shall steal the property of another
3. No one shall torture other person
4. Everyone shall help others who are in need and
5. Everyone is entitled to develop his/her talents

Suppose further that in a particular case, lying would have the best consequences overall of all alternative actions that I could perform. Based on the view of act utilitarianism lying would in this case be the right thing for me to do. But on the rule of Utilitarianism view, it would be the wrong thing for me to do. It would be wrong because it is not in accordance with the set of rules conformity which produces the best consequences.

Rule Utilitarianism does not, however, specify whose conformity is at issue. Is it the agent's (doer's) conformity that matters for determining the set of rules that produce the best consequence? Or is it everyone's or general conformity? Most commonly it is taken to be the latter. Hence, an action is right if and only if it is in accordance with a set of rules general conformity which produces the best consequences.

Rule Utilitarianism, in this sense, implies that an action is wrong if it is in accordance with a rule which, if everyone followed it, would have bad consequences. Consider this example (from D. Lyons, *Forms and Limits of Utilitarianism*). Suppose you and your friend are walking beside an orchard. Your friend says "Let's pick a couple of apples". You well object, "No, Which would be wrong, because it would be stealing". However, your friend responds, "Two too fewer apples out of this huge orchard won't harm the owner, and we will get great pleasure out of them." The intuition behind Rule Utilitarianism is that violating the rule "Don't steal" is wrong, not because in this case stealing will produce bad consequences. Nor is it wrong because your violation of this rule will produce bad consequences. Rather, "What if everyone did that?" That is, if everyone were to follow the rule "pick apples for yourself in these circumstances", then, the orchard owners income would be broken broke. Hence, it is wrong for us to steal apples in this case because if everyone were to follow this as a rule in such a case, it would have bad consequences.

3.3.2 The Golden Rule

The golden rule is also called **ethic of reciprocity**. The Parliament of the World's religions, an international organization that facilitates dialogue among all religions, calls the golden rule a "**global ethic**". There are expressions of the golden rule in great religions of the world.

Let us consider an example of how the rule is used. U.S President, J.F. Kennedy in 1963 appealed to the golden rule in an anti-segregation speech at the time of the first black enrollment at the University of Alabama. He asked whites to consider what it would be like to be treated as second-class citizens because of skin color. Whites were to imagine themselves being black - and being told that they could not vote, or go to the best public schools, or eat at most public restaurants, or sit in the front of the bus. Would whites be content to be treated that way? He was sure that they would not - and yet this is how they treated others. He said "the heart of the question is ... whether we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want to be treated."

The golden rule is best interpreted as saying: "Treat others only in ways that you're willing to be treated in the same exact situation." To apply it, you would imagine yourself in the exact place of the other person on the receiving end of the action. If you act in a given way toward another, and yet are unwilling to be treated that way in the same circumstances, then you violate the rule.

To apply the golden rule adequately, we need **knowledge** and **imagination**. We need to *know* what effect our actions have on the lives of others. And we need to be able to *imagine* ourselves, vividly and accurately, in the other person's place on the receiving end of the action. With knowledge, imagination, and the golden rule, we can progress far in our moral thinking.

The golden rule is best seen as a **consistency principle**. It doesn't replace regular moral norms. It isn't an infallible guide on which actions are right or wrong; it doesn't give all the answers. It only prescribes consistency - that we should not have our actions (toward another) out of harmony with our desires (toward a reversed situation action). It tests our moral coherence. If we violate the golden rule, then we're violating the spirit of fairness and concern that lies at the heart of morality.

The golden rule, with roots in a wide range of world cultures, is well suited to be a standard to which different cultures could appeal in resolving conflicts. As the world becomes more and more a single interacting global community, the need for such a common standard is becoming more urgent

3.3.3 Categorical Imperative

According to Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), the great German Idealist philosopher of the 19th century, imperative is any proposition that declares a certain action (or inaction) to be necessary. There are two kinds of imperatives. They are hypothetical and categorical imperatives.

Hypothetical Imperative is a rule of action for achieving certain ends. It guides an action in an instrumental way. Hypothetical imperatives tell persons the best way to achieve their goals. For example, if you want to score 'A' in Professional Ethics, you must study hard. Your end is scoring 'A' and the way to achieve this end is 'studying hard.' Hypothetical imperative is conditional. It depends on the existence of certain end.

Categorical Imperatives are unconditional commands that are binding on everyone at all times. Categorical imperatives command the performance of an action that is intrinsically right. Categorical imperatives are unconditional and independent of any things, circumstances, goals,

or desires. Although he held that there is only one categorical imperative of morality, Kant found it helpful to express it in several ways. Kant provides the following three formulations of categorical imperatives:

1. Act only according to that maxim by which it can at the same time will become a universal law.
2. Act in such a way that you always treat humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, never simply as a means, but always at the same time as an end.
3. Act as though you were, through your maxims, a law making member of a kingdom of ends.

According to the first formulation, we have a perfect duty not to act by maxims that result in logical contradiction when we attempt to universalize them. Maxims are rules for action that guide us in making decision. Every action has an underlying maxim. For example, to determine the moral worth of “stealing,” we must determine the maxim underlying it. Thus, we ask “what is the maxim on which the action is based?” The underlying maxim is that “it is permissible to steal.” Then we ask “when universalized, is the maxim logically consistent? Can it still occur (is it still possible) when universalized, or is it self-defeating? [If everyone did this, would it still be possible?]

Stealing presupposes the existence of private property. If there is no private property there is no stealing. If we universalize the maxim that it is permissible to steal, then no private property exists. As a result, there is nothing to be stolen. For this reason, universalizing the maxim that it is permissible to steal is self-contradictory. In other words, this maxim cannot be universalized. If the maxim cannot be universalized, we have a perfect duty not to follow it. Therefore, we have a perfect duty not to steal.

Our inquiries do not end if the maxim can be universalized. In such case we ask the following questions. Does willing the maxim as a universal law lead the will to contradict itself? Can it be willed whatever position one is in? Can one reverse positions (change places) and still will it? Let us determine the moral worth of “helping the poor.” The maxim here would be that it is permissible never to help those who are poor. This maxim can be universalized as it is not self-contradictory. However, no one could consistently will that it become the universal law, since even the richest among us rightly allow for the possibility that we may at some future time find ourselves in need of the help of others. If a maxim can be universalized, but not willed without contradiction, then one has an imperfect duty not to follow it. For example, a prosperous person has an imperfect duty to help those in distress.

The second formulation simply states that we should never use people for our own benefit, thinking nothing of them as people. Instead, we should see the benefit of others as our end goal, rather than merely a means. Do not exchange human being with a thing, say a car. Nothing is of equal worth with human beings. Human’s beings are priceless. Thus, if we use people for our own benefit, that is not moral. In short, we should avoid *using others as a mere means* and we should *treat others as ends in themselves*. Read the following passage taken from (Mortimer D. Schwartz) on these two concepts.

A. Using Others as a Mere Means

We use others as mere means if what we do reflects some maxim to which they could not in principle consent. Kant does not suggest that there is anything wrong about using someone as a means. Evidently every cooperative scheme of action does this. A government that agrees to provide free or subsidized food to famine relief agencies both uses and is used by the agencies; a peasant who sells food in a local market both uses and is used by those who buy it. In such examples each party to the transaction can and does consent to take part in that transaction. Kant would say that the parties to such transactions use one another but do not use one another as mere means. Each part assumes that the other has its own maxims of action and is not just a thing or prop to be used or manipulated.

But, there are other cases where one party to an arrangement or transaction not only uses the other but does so in ways that could only be done on the basis of a fundamental principle or maxim to which the other could not in principle consent. If a false promise is given, the party that accepts the promise is not just used but used as a mere means, because it is impossible for consent to be given to the fundamental principle or project of deception that must guide every false promise, whatever its surface character. Those who accept false promises must be kept ignorant of the underlying principle or maxim on which the “undertaking” is based. If this is not kept concealed, the attempted false promising the deceived party becomes, as it were a prop or tool—mere means—in the false promisor’s scheme. Action based on any such maxim of deception would be wrong in Kantian terms. Whether it is a matter of breach of treaty obligations, or contractual undertakings, or of accepted and relied upon modes of interaction. Maxims of deception standard use others as mere means, and acts that could only be based on such maxims are unjust.

Another standard way of using others as mere means is by coercing them. Coercers like deceivers, standard do not give others the possibility of dissenting from what they propose to do. In deception, “consent” is spurious because it is given to a principle that could not be the underlying principle of that act at all; but the principle governing coercion may be brutally plain. Here any ‘consent’ given is spurious because there was no option but to consent. If a rich or powerful landowner or nation threatens a poorer or more vulnerable person, group or nation with some intolerable difficulty unless a concession is made, the more vulnerable party is denied a genuine choice between consent and dissent. While the boundary that divides coercion from mere bargaining and negotiation varies and is therefore often hard to discern, we have no doubt about the clearer cases. Maxims of coercion may threaten physical force, seizure of possessions, destruction opportunities, or any other harm that the coerced party is thought to be unable to absorb without grave injury or danger. A moneylender in a Third World Village who threatens not to make or renew an indispensable loan, without which survival until the next harvest would be impossible, uses the peasant as mere means. The peasant does not have the possibility of genuinely consenting to the “offer he can’t refuse.” The outward form of some coercive transactions may look like ordinary commercial dealings: but we know very well that some action that is superficially of this sort is based on maxims of coercion. To avoid coercion, action must be governed by maxims that the other party can choose to refuse and is not bound to be

accepted. The more vulnerable the other party in any transaction or negotiation, the less their scope for refusal, and the more demanding it is likely to be to ensure that action is non-coercive. In Kant's view, acts done on maxims that coerce or deceive others, cannot in principle have the consent of those others, are wrong. When individuals or institutions, or nation states act in ways that can only be based on such maxims they fail in their duty. They treat the parties who are either deceived or coerced unjustly. To avoid unjust action it is not enough to observe the outward forms of free agreement and cooperation; it is also essential to see that the weaker party to any arrangement has a genuine option to refuse the fundamental character of the proposal.

B. Treating Others as Ends in Themselves

For Kant, as for utilitarian's, justice is only one part of duty. We may fail in our duty, even when we do not use anyone as mere means (by deception or coercion), if we fail to treat others as "ends in themselves." To treat others as "Ends in themselves" we must not only avoid using them as mere means but also treat them as rational and autonomous beings with their own maxims. If human beings were wholly rational and autonomous then, on a Kantian view, duty would require only that they should not use **one another as a mere means**. But, as Kant repeatedly stressed, but later Kantians have often forgotten, human beings are finite rational beings. They are finite in several ways.

First, Human beings are not ideal rational calculators. We standardly have neither a complete list of the actions possible in a given situation nor more than a partial view of their likely consequences. In addition, abilities to assess and use available information are usually quite limited.

Second, these cognitive limitations are standardly complemented by limited autonomy. Human action is limited not only by various sorts of physical barrier and inability but by further sorts of (mutual or asymmetrical) dependence. To treat one another as ends in themselves such, beings have to base their action on principles that do not undermine but rather sustain and extend one another's capacities for autonomous action. A central requirement for doing so is to share and support one another's ends and activities, at least to some extent. Since finite rational beings cannot generally achieve their aims without some help and support from others, a general refusal of help and support amounts to failure to treat others as rational and autonomous being, that is as ends in themselves. Hence, Kantian principles require us not only to act justly, that is in accordance with maxims that do not coerce or deceive others, but also to avoid manipulation and to lend some support to other's plans and activities.

3.4 Ethical Dilemma

Moral philosophers love an ethical dilemma. Dilemmas show something deep about ethics. They make us question our moral beliefs and theories, search for an understanding of what is going on below the surface. Above all, ethical dilemmas provide an opportunity for philosophers to test their theories against real-life hard cases.

What is a dilemma? It is not clear at first sight that the term 'ethical dilemma' picks out a class of situations which all share the same common characteristics. So far we have offered a negative criterion:

a moral dilemma is different from a merely difficult decision. In a dilemma, the difficulty arises from the very nature of the *situation* with which we are faced rather than our mere lack of wisdom or ethical knowledge.

It is true that, in ordinary speech, we are inclined to use the term 'dilemma' for any decision where we are uncertain which of two alternatives we should choose; in other words, as synonymous for a 'difficult decision'. However, as we have seen, what is problematic to one person may be much clearer to another person who has stronger moral perceptions or insight. If someone insists on calling every difficult decision a 'dilemma', then they still need a word for the variety of 'dilemma' which does not refer to something merely subjective in the mind of the agent, but rather denotes an objectively existing situation in the world. This raises a deeper issue about subjective versus objective which I will return to later. For now, let's just look and see if we can describe in broad outline the characteristics which give an ethical decision the aspect of a dilemma.

Consulting etymology, the term 'dilemma' comes from the Greek: 'di' for two and 'lemma' for proof. A dilemma is two proofs, or reasoned arguments, which entail logically inconsistent courses of action. In the ideal example of a dilemma, there is an irresistible case for doing A, and also an irresistible case for doing B. But it is logically impossible to do both A and B. It follows that either one case can after all be resisted, or both can. To assert that both cases are (truly) irresistible would imply the existence of a irresistible case – combining the cases for A and for B – for seeking to do what is logically impossible: an absurdity. It is fair to say that the majority of cases of moral reasoning are not like this. Often, when we face a tough decision, we weigh the relative strength of the cases for A and B. The case for A would be deemed sufficient for action, were it not for the fact that there is also a case for B, and vice versa. Provided that one case is stronger than the other, however, there is no real dilemma. We may regret that circumstances were such that we could not avoid having to choose, but all we were looking for were sufficient reasons for action and we have found them. It only remains to do what is necessary: to act.

This glib summary hides the fact that decisions like this can cause deep anxiety and anguish; for example, a manager facing the decision of which of two loyal employees to make redundant. In truth, there may be very little to choose between the two individuals. Either employee will be devastated by the decision. However, a decision must be made, so the only remaining question is how do decide as fairly as possible, without secrecy or deception so that the grounds of the decision are clearly understood by all parties concerned. If a dilemma is not just a difficult or painful decision, are there any genuine dilemmas? I believe that there are. What all ethical dilemmas have in common is that, to a greater or lesser extent, the relative strength of the two cases *cannot be meaningfully compared*. There is no common standard, no common coin for evaluating the strength of the case for A against the strength of the case for B. whereas the 'ideal' dilemma – according to our original definition – pits two irresistible arguments against one another, in real-life cases of ethical dilemma the two arguments simply do not connect. There is no rational procedure for comparing them. Let us see how this comes about. I will look at three imaginary, but hopefully realistic cases. The issues raised will be discussed in more detail in later unit

Steps to Resolving an Ethical Dilemma

How do you decide what to do if you are presented with an ethical dilemma? There are two major approaches that you might draw from. One approach focuses on the practical consequences of what we do and might be summed up rather brutally by the phrase “no harm, no foul”; the other concentrates on the actions themselves. In contrast, the **deontological** approach would lead you to ask whether an action is, in itself, right. For example, does an action uphold a promise or demonstrate loyalty. The essence of deontological approaches is captured by the phrase “Let justice be done though the heavens fall.” Whilst there is an extensive record of philosophical debate about the relative merits of these two positions, they can serve as useful starting points for complementary strategies of coping with ethical dilemmas.

The first school of thought basically argues “no harm, no foul”; the second claims that some actions are simply wrong. Thinkers have debated the relative merits of these approaches for centuries, but for the purpose of getting help with handling ethical dilemmas, think of them as complementary strategies for analyzing and resolving problems. Here’s a brief, four-step strategy that shows you how to combine them. By the way, we’re going to assume that if there are any laws involved, you plan to obey them. This isn’t to say that it’s always morally wrong to break laws. But in ethical dilemmas that arise in business, the laws generally establish at least a bare minimum for how you should act. Besides, if a business regularly breaks laws, it becomes an anti-social force in society. And no matter how much money’s involved, at that point, there’s not a huge difference between a business and organized crime.)

1. What Are The Options?

- List the full range of alternative courses of action available to you.

2. Consider the Consequences

Think carefully about the range of positive and negative consequences associated with each of the different paths of action before you.

- Who/what will be helped by what you do?
- Who/what will be hurt?
- What kinds of benefits and harms are involved and what are their relative values? Some things (e.g. healthy bodies and beaches) are more valuable than others (e.g. new cars). Some harm (e.g. a violation of trust) is more significant than others (e.g. lying in a public meeting to protect a seal colony).
- What are the short-term and long-term implications? · How does all of this look over the long run as well as the short run. And if you’re tempted to give short shrift to the long run, just remember that you’re living with a lot of long-term negative consequences (like air and water pollution and the cost of the S&L bailout) that people before you thought weren’t important enough to worry about. After looking at all of your options, which one produces the best mix of benefits over harms? Now, on the

basis of your answers to these questions, which of your options produces the best combination of benefits-maximization and harm-minimization?

3. Analyze the Actions

You now have to consider each of your options from a completely different perspective. Disregard the consequences, concentrating instead on the actions and looking for that option which seems problematic. How do the options measure up against moral principles like honesty, fairness, equality, and recognition of social and environmental vulnerability? In the case you are considering, is there a way to see one principle as more important than the others?

Do any of the actions that you're considering "cross the line," in terms of anything from simple decency to an important ethical principle? If there's a conflict between principles or between the rights of different people involved, is there a way to see one principle as more important than the others? What you're looking for is the option whose actions are least problematic.

4. Make Your Decision and Act with Commitment

Now, bring together both parts of your analysis and make your informed decision. Act on your decision and assume responsibility for it. Be prepared to justify your choice of action. No one else is responsible for this action but you.

5. Evaluate the System

Think about the circumstances which led to the dilemma with the intention of identifying and removing the conditions that allowed it to arise.

What is the ethical decision?

A question that arises when confronted with an ethical dilemma is: *"Should I act in a way that will help someone else when this act will go against my self-interest?"* This question often results in a debate that is a tug-of-war between differing moral principles. A frequent occurrence, many countries have universally accepted moral principles held by its people already embedded within the nation's laws. For example, many widely accepted Western moral principles lie within American laws. However, morally accepted principles often differ within countries and cultures throughout the world. We can find differing moral principles with one region, state, city, neighborhood, or even family.

Chapter Four: Medical Ethics

4.1 Definition of the Terms

Ethics is the branch of philosophy which deals with moral aspects of human behavior. Some differentiate between ethics and morals. Ethics deals with the theories and principles of values and the basic perceptions and justifications of values, whereas morals include the customs, and normative behavior of people or societies. Nevertheless, these terms are often used interchangeably, their meanings now overlap and they are becoming virtually synonymous.

Medical Ethics is the study of moral values and judgments as they apply to medicine. Ethical principles heavily govern the practice of medicine and ethical theories form the basis of ethical argument. With high profile cases regarding malpractice of doctors and the recent medical advances in technology, more and more clinical practices are coming under the scrutiny of both the media and the general public. For example, hand-washing was once a common courtesy, but now it could be deemed unethical to not do so.

Medical ethics in the narrow historical sense refers to a group of guidelines, such as the Oath of Hippocrates, generally written by physicians, about the physician's ideal relationship to his peers and to his patients. Medical ethics in the modern sense refers to the application of general and fundamental ethical principles to clinical practice situations, including medical research. Individuals from various disciplines may author these principles.

However, medical ethics is not an exact science. In certain situations it may be difficult to know what is ethically "correct". Ethical debates commonly arise on medical wards; therefore, a comprehensive knowledge of medical ethics is paramount to deciding the best course of action.

This chapter discusses historical background, modern medical ethics, basic principles of medical ethics, and ethics teaching in medical schools.

4.2 Modern Medical Ethics

Modern medical ethics is based on concepts derived from various disciplines, including the biomedical sciences, the behavioral sciences, philosophy, religion and law. Modern medical ethics is essentially a form of 'applied ethics,' which seeks to clarify ethical questions that characterize the practice of medicine and to justify and weigh the various practical options and considerations. Thus, medical ethics is the application of general ethical principles to ethical issues. The application of such an ethic is not specific to medicine but also relates to economy, law, journalism, and their like.

In the past, only a few individuals, mostly physicians, devoted themselves to medical ethics. Beginning in the second half of the *twentieths* century, the field underwent explosive expansion and experts from numerous disciplines entered the field. The rapid advances in medical diagnosis and treatment and the introduction of new technologies have produced numerous new ethical dilemmas, resulting in the maturation of medical ethics as a specialty in its own right.

Research institutes of medical ethics have been established. Medical ethics is now part of the curriculum in schools of the health professions at all levels. The medical ethics literature has proliferated, with numerous books and journals devoted entirely to the subject. Nearly all

medical periodicals devote considerable space to ethical topics. The general public is also vitally interested in this subject, and public lectures, newspaper articles, legal discussions and legislation on medical ethical issues are numerous.

In many countries medical ethicist has emerged as a new professional. These individuals generally have specialized in one or more of the fields of philosophy, ethics, law, religion and medicine, and serve as advisors in hospitals to physicians, patients and their families. They attempt to resolve difficult ethical questions posed to them by the medical team or by patients and their families. Most of the medical staff found ethical consultation and advice to be valuable but only half of patients or families found it to be valuable. A number of reasons are responsible for the enormous recent interest in medical ethics:

- Significant technological and scientific advances and changes in clinical medicine and research have produced totally new ethical dilemmas and exacerbated old ones.
- The change in philosophy from paternalism to autonomy in the physician-patient relationship has removed from the physician the monopoly on decision-making.
- The involvement of additional caregivers (various medical specialists, a variety of health professionals, students, administrators and investigators), each with their own cultural and social value systems, have increased and sharpened ethical debates and discussions.
- The involvement of society at large (through the mass communication media, courts, legislators) has created the necessity to redefine the societal parameters of the physician-patient and physician-societal relationship.
- Broad social changes throughout the world have damaged the image of the unique nobility of the physician. This change has been enhanced by the commercialization of medical services and the greater sense of consumer criticism. Moreover, in recent years physicians have come to view medicine more in terms of their careers, honor, self-fulfillment and income. There is a call nowadays to return to the historic principles of the medical profession, which differs from most other professions. Medicine should be viewed as service to the sick and the needy, with humility, honesty, empathy, intellectual integrity, and effacement of self-interest.

A number of significant socio-ethical changes have occurred in the portrayal by society of medical practice and the medical profession. In the past, it was thought that all illnesses had a limited number of causes with only minor variations between people. Thus, a holistic view of people was prevalent. The limited armamentarium of diagnostic testing and therapeutic interventions enhanced close communication between the physician and the patient because a detailed history and physical examination were virtually the physician's only diagnostic tools. Scientific knowledge of medicine was limited, and the art of medicine was emphasized. By contrast, modern medicine has traced disease causation to a multitude of processes in individual organs, tissues or even cells. The diagnostic and therapeutic approaches focus primarily on the illness and less so on the patient, changing the physician-patient relationship dramatically. Since most diagnostic tests and many therapeutic interventions are performed in specialized laboratories and treatment centers, there is far less need for communication and interaction

between the patient and the physician. Science and technology are glorified at the expense of humanism, and this is reflected in medical education.

Public pressure and the profound realization of the purposes of medicine and its roles resulted in attempts to balance the technological and scientific advances with the humanistic and ethical approach to medical practice. Medical ethics attempts to help resolve some of these issues.

Economic issues engendered as a result of the high cost of modern medical care have created new dilemmas which require resolution, both on an individual and on a societal level. Economic pressures have added a new dimension to the physician-patient relationship. The physician's responsibility to his patient often conflicts with those to his employer, the insurance company or the government. The physician must skillfully and ethically balance these ethical conflicts.

Furthermore, governmental, political and economic considerations often influence the appointment and financing of medical ethics task forces or commissions, leading to biased results. If ethics is to have a major impact on society there needs to be greater motivation on the part of society and intensive education towards appropriate ethical conduct and concern for one's fellow human being.

Medicine is not an exact science. It deals with people and not objects. Therefore, its scientific and humanistic components must be combined. Better and more knowledge *per se* does not necessarily lead to better medical care since the subjective feelings of the patient, which are based on personal, social, cultural, and economic value systems, must also be considered. Therefore, clinical and research medicine need to combine technical knowledge and advances with human feelings, ethics and social justice. Only optimal synthesis of these two elements can educate ideal physicians who can "serve mankind with respect, honor and dignity." Many areas in medicine do not involve pure science but are built on interpersonal relationships, feelings, morality and appropriate psychosocial conditions. If medicine's function was only to cure illness, it would be a pure science without any relationship to morality or justice. However, since medicine's goal is to cure people of their illnesses it has major humanistic and ethical components.

The basic concept of medical ethics is that the physician has a moral (and at times legal) obligation to act for the patient's good, using the most up-to-date information. The question is how to establish that "good," who defines it, and what are the components thereof. One of the most important areas of discussion in ethics is the doctor-patient relationship which is portrayed in one of several ways:

Paternalism is an approach in which the physician chooses the treatment for the patient because the physician's professional knowledge, experience and objectivity best qualify him to judge the ideal treatment for the patient. This attitude assumes that the physician and the patient have a common interest but that the doctor is better equipped for the necessary decision-making with minimal or no patient involvement. A number of significant criticisms of paternalism are as follows:

- It impinges on the basic rights of the patient to decide for himself what should be done with his body.

- Many decisions are not purely medical but involve personal and cultural aspects in which the physician has no particular expertise. Such decisions require the patient's input.
- Many diagnostic and therapeutic decisions involve ethics, secular law. For example, the decision as to whether or not to abort a fetus with Down's syndrome is not a medical one, but an ethical, legal and religious one. Similarly, the decision whether or not to attempt to resuscitate a terminally ill patient is an ethical rather than a purely medical one.

Autonomy means that only the patient knows what is best for him and only he has the right to decide. In order to do so he needs to receive from the physician all the appropriate information about his condition to permit him to make an informed decision. The physician's values, and even less his professional knowledge and experience, play no role in the final decision. Traditionally, the physician's role was viewed as giving "orders" to nurses and to patients. In the atmosphere of autonomy, physicians must use a different language such as advice, recommendation, position, etc. The main criticism of pure autonomy is the relegation of the physician to the role of a technical consultant, with little influence on the patient's decision, which is often based on a lack of full understanding of his condition. Such a decision may cause unnecessary and avoidable harm to the patient.

A compromise or middle position between paternalism and autonomy is one in which the physician provides the patient with the relevant information, the physician and patient discuss the medical and ethical issues and then arrive at a joint decision. This approach preserves the patient's autonomy on the one hand, and the physician's obligation to advise the patient about the best decision, on the other hand. This is considered to be the best system, permitting responsible decisions according to the relevant individual circumstances while preserving the obligations and rights of both patient and physician. The development of medical ethics in general and the physician-patient relationship in particular can be viewed from three perspectives:

- The Hippocratic view, which is based on a paternalistic physician-patient relationship, and the basic ethical principle to prevent or minimize harm to the patient, and on professionalism between physicians;
- The modern view, which is based primarily on autonomy, the four ethical principles, the multidisciplinary approach, the discussion and resolution of every medical ethical problem, the use of guidelines and the view that medical ethics is a specialty in its own right.

Generally, scientific progress in technology and in knowledge precedes discussions and debates about the ethical, religious and legal aspects of that progress. The recent extraordinarily rapid pace of advances in knowledge, science and technology have made it even more difficult for the ethical, legal and religious analysis of these issues to keep pace with the scientific advances. There is a need now to change this approach so that ethical, religious, legal and social implications of innovative scientific and technological measures will be anticipated and acted upon in advance rather than *post factum*.

Modern medical ethics involves a wide range of topics which produce ethical dilemmas in the conduct of physicians, other health professionals, patients, families and society in general.

Medical ethics may be divided into general biomedical ethics which deals with fundamental principles, societal issues and policy determination, and clinical ethics which deals with the application of practical medical ethical principles in the day-to-day care of patients.

The identification and characterization of a medical ethical dilemma is not always obvious. On one general medical ward in a university hospital, while one of every six patients posed an easily identifiable ethical problem many ethical problems were under-identified by the medical staff.

The goals of medical ethics include the analysis of the relative merits of alternative actions in medical ethical dilemmas. Definite and absolute decisions are not always attainable or implementable. Therefore, medical ethics is satisfied with decisions defining the relationship between what is desirable and what is practical or in the choice of the lesser of two evils. Medical ethics is generally pluralistic and multidisciplinary in its approach. Its main function is to identify and characterize the component elements of a given medical situation and to provide an analytic process for assessing and applying the relevant values and principles of ethics.

In general, modern medical ethics does not see its function as providing definitive ethical directives in every case. In this respect, ethics differs from law. The latter establish specific guidelines, whereas ethics provides pluralistic approaches and clarification and precision of understanding of the ethical aspects of medical questions.

With respect to the relationship between ethics and the law – law by its very nature in contrast to ethics, demands that it be followed precisely. Ethics at times may conflict with the law. Many situations in medicine are not “covered” by the law and their resolution is decided solely on ethical grounds. The place of legislation in regard to medical ethics is debated. Some writers would like to see major involvement of the law in medical ethical issues and thereby to set ethical norms for society. This view assumes that the legal system is capable of coping with the varied ethical dilemmas created by the rapid advances in medicine. By contrast, others argue that legislators and judges should be involved minimally only as a last resort in ethical conflicts. The legislative process is by its very nature conservative and slow-moving and therefore ill-suited to deal with the dynamic changes occurring in medicine and the dilemmas thereby engendered.

A common alternative in a pluralistic democratic society is the dealing with medical ethical issues by multidisciplinary ethics committees, which analyze issues and recommend policy or guidelines. There is also considerable utility in the creation of national non-political commissions to study new issues in medical ethics and to recommend policies and procedures and, if necessary, legislation.

4.3 Ethical Principles in Medical Practice

The ethical principles that govern medical practice should act as a framework when making medical decisions. When ethical dilemmas arise the best approach is to think through these ethical principles logically and methodically.

Beneficence and Non-maleficance

Beneficence is the act of "doing good" while **non-maleficance** is the act of "not doing bad". In practical terms, medical practitioners have an ethical responsibility to strive to do what is in the best interests of their patients. However, it is important to remember that some medical

interventions may seem beneficial but may also carry with them the possibility of causing harm. In fact, nearly all medical treatments and procedures, it could be argued, harm the patient in some way, but it is more to do with the magnitude of the benefit versus the magnitude of potential risks.

Clinical Example

*A doctor has diagnosed an elderly lady with rheumatoid arthritis and wants to prescribe an NSAID to relieve the pain and reduce the inflammation. - **Beneficence***

*However, he does not want the patient to develop gastrointestinal bleeding, a common side-effect of NSAIDs, especially in the elderly - **Non-maleficence***

Autonomy and Consent

Autonomy is the right of a patient to make an informed, uncovered decision about their own health management. If this principle is disregarded by a medical professional because he/she believes another decision would be better for the patient, then it is termed paternalism. An autonomous decision should **never** be overruled by a medical professional, but not all decisions are autonomous. For patients to have autonomy, they must have the **capacity** to receive, retain and repeat the information that is given to them, provided the information is complete and given to them in a manner that they can understand.

Clinical Example

*A patient with breast cancer is told by her oncologist that there are two treatment options, a total mastectomy or a partial mastectomy with radiotherapy. The patient decides to have a total mastectomy - **Autonomy***

*An oncologist decides that a patient with breast cancer should receive a total mastectomy - **Paternalism***

Consent is an extension of autonomy and has many types. **Implied consent** is when a doctor assumes that certain actions or body language from a patient imply that the patient has consented to the planned action of the doctor. **Expressed oral consent** is when a patient has verbally given the doctor permission to proceed with the intended action. **Expressed written consent** is documented evidence that the patient has, usually with a signature, given consent to a procedure. Written consent should only be obtained after oral consent. **Fully informed consent** is consent given after being given all the information about the procedure. When possible, fully informed consent, both written and oral, should be obtained before any procedure, examination or treatment.

Clinical Example

A patient with tonsillitis is in the ENT ward and a doctor approaches with a syringe. The patient stretches out her left arm in the direction of the doctor. The doctor takes a sample of her blood. -

Implied Consent

The doctor then asks if she can take the patient's blood pressure. The patient says yes. -

Expressed oral consent

*Then the doctor asks the patient to consent for surgery by reading and signing a form consenting to a tonsillectomy after explaining to the patient the risks and benefits of the procedure. The patient reads and signs the document and expresses her wish to have the procedure. - **Fully informed written and oral consent***

Truth-telling

The ethical principle of **Truth-telling** is the process in which a doctor gives the patient all known information about their health. It allows the patient to be fully-informed and, therefore, allows for the ethical principles of autonomy and consent. A point of note that always needs to be considered is the fact that some patients do not want the information. Therefore it is important to ask the patient if they want to know or not. The only other (extremely rare) occasion when it is acceptable not to tell the patient the truth is when the patient may come to harm when being told, e.g. "If you tell me I have cancer I will kill myself!".

Confidentiality

The ethical principle of **confidentiality** ensures that the medical information held about a patient is accessible only to those to whom the patient has given access via autonomous and full-informed consent. In order to achieve trust between medical professionals and their patients, confidentiality must be maintained. Confidentiality may be broken if information shared by the patient refers to a potential danger to public safety or if it is ordered by a court.

Clinical Example

*A doctor informs a patient that he cannot drive because of his recent diagnosis of epilepsy. The patient agrees but, when driving to work one morning, the doctor sees the man driving. The doctor **must** inform the local driving authority due to concerns regarding public safety.*

Preservation of life

The ethical principle of **preservation of life** is a will to treat a patient's illness with the aim of prolonging life. After all, most patients want to live longer; most doctors may have joined the profession to save lives. This principle may be overruled if the patient has made a living will stating their desire not to be resuscitated.

Justice

Justice refers to the distribution of things and positions of people within society. In a medical setting, justice involves the allocation of health-care resources in a fair way. This may be an equal distribution (egalitarianism) or a maximization of the total or average welfare across the whole society (utilitarianism).

4.4 Teaching Medical Ethics

Because of the need in modern medicine to be knowledgeable in medical ethics and because medical students are exposed to medical ethical issues throughout their medical studies, it has become necessary to teach medical ethics formally in schools of the health professions. The teaching of medical ethics has advanced greatly in recent years. Nearly every medical and nursing school in the Western world now offers courses of instruction in medical ethics. Such teaching may take place in both the preclinical and clinical years, during postgraduate training and as part of continuing medical education. There are valid reasons to continue the study of medical ethics throughout the careers of physicians and other health professionals.

The goals of education in medical ethics are:

- To enhance the sensitivities of the student to medical ethical dilemmas.
- To provide the student with the specific knowledge to be able to identify and characterize medical ethical dilemmas.
- To acquaint the student with terminology, views, values, and relevant basic principles in philosophy, religion, law and sociology.
- To provide the student with the intellectual tools and fundamental thought processes to analyze and resolve ethical problems.
- To present the student with the approaches of philosophy, law, culture and religion in the resolution of medical ethical dilemmas.
- To enhance the student's ability to examine and analyze unresolved ethical issues logically.
- To instill in the student the principles of respect for individuals with different points of view, the empathy and compassion toward patients, and to emphasize the centrality of the patient rather than the illness, and the importance of human values.
- To educate medical specialists and experts in medical ethics.
- There are many obstacles to the teaching of medical ethics. These include the following:
 - Pressures of other medical studies and duties and the lack of time for medical ethical instruction.
 - Lack of interest in the subject.
 - Lack of support from departmental chairmen and medical faculty.
 - Logistical problems of adequate numbers and types of trained staff available for medical ethical teaching.

Medical ethics teaching can be implemented in several ways:

- Frontal teaching about ethical principles and issues. Common medical ethical situations may be illustrated and discussed. The material presented should include basic ethical principles, methods for decision making and resolution of medical ethical dilemmas and the application of ethical principles to clinical situations. One approach advocates supplementing teaching of medical ethics by the addition of studies of the humanities. Such an approach could broaden the horizons of the physicians beyond science and technology.
- Theoretical discussions of ethical aspects during seminars of clinical situations. Various teaching aids such as films, videos and computer programs are widely available.
- Multidisciplinary "ethics rounds" at the patient's bedside with discussion of the ethical issues.

In every kind of teaching, a multi-disciplinary approach is to be preferred. It is essential to integrate the teaching of medical ethics into all facets of medical practice and not confine it to a few theoretical lectures squeezed into the busy schedule of medical students.

CASE 1

The Hippocratic Oath

(Original Version)

I SWEAR by Apollo the physician, Aesculapius, and Health, and All-heal, and all the gods and goddesses, that, according to my ability and judgment, I will keep this Oath and this stipulation.

TO RECHON him who taught me this Art equally dear to me as my parents, to share my substance with him, and relieve his necessities if required; to look up his offspring in the same footing as my own brothers, and to teach them this art, if they shall wish to learn it, without fee or stipulation; and that by precept, lecture, and every other mode of instruction, I will impart a knowledge of the Art to my own sons, and those of my teachers, and to disciples bound by a stipulation and oath according the law of medicine, but to none others.

I WILL FOLLOW that system of regimen which, according to my ability and judgment, I consider for the benefit of my patients, and abstain from whatever is deleterious and mischievous. I will give no deadly medicine to any one if asked, nor suggest any such counsel; and in like manner I will not give a woman a passerbly to produce abortion.

WITH PURITY AND WITH HOLINESS I will pass my life and practice my Art. I will not cut persons laboring under the stone, but will leave this to be done by men who are

Case 2

Heinz dilemma

Heinz's dilemma is a frequently used example in many ethics and morality classes.

Heinz's wife was near death, and her only hope was a drug that had been discovered by a pharmacist who was selling it for an exorbitant price. The drug cost \$20,000 to make, and the pharmacist was selling it for \$200,000. Heinz could only raise \$50,000 and insurance wouldn't make up the difference. He offered what he had to the pharmacist, and when his offer was rejected, Heinz said he would pay the rest later. Still the pharmacist refused. In desperation, Heinz considered stealing the drug. Would it be wrong for him to do that?