

# CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL ETHICS

AT CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

SPRING/SUMMER 1999

VOLUME 1, Number 3

## Richard Weisberg; author & scholar, to address CWRU

### ***IN THIS ISSUE:***

***Richard Weisberg.....1***

***Ethics Fellows.....1***

***Andrew Trew.....2***

***Porn on Campus.....6***

***Director's Corner.....8***

***Good-bye to Tom Murray...9***

This April 21, 1999 at 4:30 p.m. at Harkness Chapel, the 4<sup>th</sup> Robert W. Clarke Memorial Lecture will feature **Richard Weisberg**, Walter Floersheimer Chair in Constitutional Law at the Benjamin N. Cardozo Law School of Yeshiva University. The title of Professor Weisberg's speech is "Vichy Law and the Holocaust in France."

The event is co-sponsored by Baker-Nord Center for the Humanities; Center for Professional Ethics; College of Arts &

Sciences; Samuel Rosenthal Center for Judaic Studies; School of Law. Directly following, a reception will be held at the School of Law. Richard Weisberg holds a Ph.D. in Comparative Literature from Cornell and a J.D. from Columbia University. He is the author of three pioneering books in the field of Law and Literature; and a major work in legal thought and history, entitled Vichy Law and the Holocaust in France. **FREE AND OPEN TO THE PUBLIC.** (Call 368-5349 for info) ♦

## ***UPDATE ON ETHICS FELLOWS AND ASSOCIATES***

This is the place where you can see what our **CWRU/CPE Ethics Fellows** have been up to, on and off campus.

**Tom Murray**, who served as director of the Center for Biomedical Ethics, since 1987, has accepted the position of president of the Hastings Center in Garrison, New York, which is regarded, in many circles as the progenitor in the field of bioethics think-tanks(from *Centerviews*).

**Peter McCall**, who directs the honors program which focuses on leadership and community service,

met Lech Walesa at CWRU's College Scholars Breakfast. McCall told the 1983 Nobel Peace Prize winner that he could not think of a more appropriate person to talk to the students about the honors program focus (from *Campus News*).

**Sharon Watts**, nursing instructor at the Bolton School of Nursing, accompanied nursing students to Solforeno, a small village in Mexico. There, Sharon and the students worked with other health care providers to evaluate and treat more than 1,000 Mayans on this medical

mission (from *Campus News*).

**Katherine Wisner**, professor of psychiatry and reproductive biology, has been selected as only one of 36 senior women to participate in the Executive Leadership in Academic Medicine (ELAM) Program (from *Campus News*).

**Caroline Whitbeck** was the conference coordinator for the International Conference on Ethics in Engineering and Computer Science here at CWRU, March 21-24(from *Campus News*). ♦

# Regulating Ethics

Professor Andrew Trew, Visiting Professor of Philosophy at John Carroll University and an English lawyer and bioethicist, spoke to a dinner meeting of the Center for Professional Ethics on November 23, 1998. He began his presentation with: "Everyone is talking about ethics. The real question, to me, is how are they working with ethics, where ethics come from and what will they do with ethics once they get them?"

"As a lawyer, I am fairly committed to the idea, which is not very welcome in American circles, that there is a role for legal regulation as an underpinning for ethics. In this country, regulation is probably the last issue that you are going to deal with," said Professor Trew. Professor Trew explained that there is a difference between the British way of doing things and the American way of doing things. He remarked that "Americans don't just sit back; in America, people go leaping ahead." On the other hand, he noted, "the British approach in the past is to be very non-entrepreneurial, rather non-aggressive and very self-effacing in the area of bioethics, especially biotechnology and genetics." He further added, "in some [cases], Britain and Europe stand back and say, 'Well, these things sound a bit dangerous...we should pause and regulate.' "

"Moving around bioethics circles in this country, I am always shocked to find the extent to

which people really do treasure their constitutional freedoms to do things," said Professor Trew. "[The American way] is looked on by a vast range of other cultures as dominated by aggressive business interests, so ethics in the area of biotechnology and genetics are increasingly being driven by business expectations."

"The big problem is that there is no philosophical underpinning for these new science ventures which make sense for the 21st century. People try to say we can adapt existing underpinnings, pick out [pieces] of religious view points, a bit of natural law here and there — and this will be useful in guiding us in what we ought to do," said Professor Trew.

"[Some] people stand back and say 'sanctity of life; life has supreme value.' Other people say, 'let's take it case by case, there is something fresh here. [Why don't] we look at a few past precedents [and] legal approaches or [they say let's] approach it on a step by step, case by case approach? Others will say we live in a pluralistic society and there is no ultimate moral direction." He also observed, "the founding fathers might have thought of [these ethical questions] in terms [of] deriving constitutional freedoms from natural law — the law of nature and of enlightenment. But today, [it seems] everyone has the right to anything they want.

[People have an attitude of] 'let's just do it,' and if you tell me I can't do it, I want some very, very good reason why I can't do it.' "

In this vein, he continued, "that seems to be reflected in the supremacy of relativism in this country. Everything is relative. Everybody has the right to say anything they want, to do whatever they want. Every position is possible, understandable, and to be sympathized with and accepted. The only unacceptable position is to take a position.

## THE CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL ETHICS at CWRU

**Robert P. Lawry**  
*Director*

**Jeanmarie Gielly**  
*Department Assistant and Editor*

**The Center for Professional Ethics at Case Western Reserve University provides opportunities for students, faculty, administrators and professionals to explore more fully the foundations of personal and professional ethics.**

**We encourage you to join. Please fill out the form on the back page of the newsletter.**

He then posed the queries--“Do ethics just happen? Do they just hatch? Do they just drop on us from somewhere, and if they do, where do they come from?” To these questions, he said, “Obviously, we can find sources of ethics in terms of our personal upbringing and individual family relations; in the social context in which we work, in the professions. Religion, natural law, society, government, law and the international community also embody ethical concepts. In a sense, you could argue, [ethics] exist independently of law and regulation. Some would say, that’s not the case. Some would say, in the closed system of law, that’s all there is. If there is a rule, follow it, if there isn’t a rule, we can do anything we like. Others would say the “normative” side of law is important. If there is something missing, if you don’t have any regulation, than you ought to be looking outside the system to the higher norm — some basic value or ethical principle, which would justify your intervening in some activity.”

Professor Trew then brought the discussion back to the issue of bioethics. “I think we look at regulating bioethics and genetics in a number of different ways. The ethics that get presented in a clinical or research setting tend to be self-regulatory. That is a very acceptable model for regulating ethics. You regulate ethics

according to professional expectations. [This, in turn, means] good practice and good conduct, and seems to work fairly well,” he observed. Professor Trew then brought up the point of the importance of public awareness, more accurately, what he termed

“Simply, the assumption that Europe is going on is that this whole business of commodifying people, treating human beings as no more than an object is wrong.”

“external social need.” “How far does self-regulation take into account the public and social good; the public interest? Codes of practice, certainly in Great Britain and Europe, are fashionable as a matter of regulating business activity and [as well as] a number of other issues, but are they enough?”

Professor Trew used assisted reproduction as an example of the regulatory approach in Britain. “[Assisted reproduction], in Britain is governed by legislation. It licenses the centers, provides for uniform enforcement, sets up a regulatory authority, and encourages standard practice throughout the country,” he stated. He mentioned that a number of European countries

have a similar approach. “The idea of federally regulating assisted reproduction in America would be badly received,” remarked Professor Trew. “It might be seen as interfering with privacy, freedom and reproductive rights.”

Professor Trew explained that “our ability to control and manipulate DNA involves something new and strange, like genetic manipulation, cloning and patenting genetic material from animals and human beings.”

“The ability to be ‘masters of the game of life’ must, I think, give us reason to pause,” he warned. “We haven’t had the time to stop and consider whether there is, for instance, a good case for some form of regulation in these areas and what sort of philosophy or value in these new sciences. Do we say, go ahead, do what you want; or are there certain, what I call, ‘no trespassing signs’ in nature here? Maybe [the signs] are inherently there to protect the totality of the individual; the dignity of the human person,” he speculated.

Professor Trew explained that “in Europe, [when looking] at these new frontier areas, [there is] a tendency to form an international convention or have national

*continued on page 4*

## Regulating

*continued from page 3*

legislative provisions, which delegate the powers of enforcement, to a technical body that knows the science as well as the ethics.” However, in the United States, “the nearest thing you’ve got to that is the President’s National Bioethics Advisory Commission. Beyond that, there seems to be a great reluctance to intervene,” he noted.

Professor Trew brought up the example of a government conference that focused on transferring animal tissues into human beings -- xenotransplantation. “A colleague was cut short when he dared to suggest that, maybe, this was an area where regulatory pausing ought to be the order of the day. [He] was sort of pooh-poohed, [people were saying], ‘you are over estimating the risk,’ even though scientific evidence showed a risk of unknown animal-based viruses spreading to humans,” he recalled.

“This reminded me of the Asilomar convention in 1975, when the scientists got together and discussed ‘we know we are dealing with something new and special.’ We are able to design people, to develop people in test tubes, to genetically enhance or cut and splice human DNA,” he said. “If you are going to mess with the gene pool of humanity forever...what are the risks in taking these steps? We clearly don’t know, we can’t possible

know. We have a picture of the human genome developing which is simply a blueprint of how everything connects together, genetically speaking, but how does the whole system work? At the end of the day, if we start messing with our futures, are we doing something dangerous?”

Professor Trew remarked that we have “messed with” plant and animal life and that was acceptable because we considered ourselves “in control of the natural world.” “Then we find ethics hasn’t only to do with interpersonal relationships in the 21st century. [It consists not only] of standards and conduct, and how to regulate our interpersonal social activities. It has to do with the whole world,” he stated. “Ethics is, by definition, becoming a planetary exercise. It’s an interaction with nature.”

Professor Trew spoke of UNESCO-sponsored conference he addressed in Denmark this summer. “It was very interesting, because what [I] found there was a whole group of people [examining] the division between law and ethics. Regulatory control (as a social engineering exercise) is completely cut through by this new power of science. We are no longer looking at people as the only ethical issue. [Now] the question is whether the power that we have to redesign people and animals ought to be subject to regulation,” he pointed out. “The Europeans are clear that

genetics ought be regulated.”

He also explained how risk assessment comes into this scenario. “When it comes to the application of risk management to these scientific areas, my perception as a nonscientist, is that [risk assessment] is impossible to do. Do we have a method of dealing with it? [Of course], we can conceptualize it, we can have a nice academic discussion about it. But take for example, xenotransplantation. This is an area where the risks cannot be quantified -- the risk to the public of viral infection is potentially devastating.”

“Dr. Bach wrote a very interesting article in *Nature*; which got huge coverage because he dared to say ‘the public ought to know; how will the public know if there is no social regulatory framework; if there is no established method of communicating a lot of the science to the average person?’ he paraphrased.

Professor Trew continued with his own thoughts on this matter. “In the new genetics and biotechnologies, we don’t have the ability to synthesize the implications easily. It’s got to be to be an interdisciplinary discussion. It’s got to fit the time scale of instant global communications network and the world markets for all these things. [We are] the Internet generation. You have an instantaneous ability to pick up on new science. There are no boundaries; no political or

geographical boundaries for the transfer of information, [that is] except the patent rights of major biotech companies. This why I say business ethics are the key,” he asserted.

“The public interest is not really being served. Each one of us has a highly technical understanding of certain bits of this whole jigsaw about ethics and the new sciences and medical dilemmas. How do you translate this to the public and synthesize the key issues, beyond the media presentation?”

“In areas like cloning and the patenting of genetic material, including animals, something is going on that the general public is completely unaware of; it is all driven by business, at the end of the day. Biotechnology companies are standing to make billions of dollars in the 21st century. “Costly licensing is required for access to their knowledge. The access to information at a certain point ought to be a lot freer than it is,” he said.

He noted the great deal of money that is put into patenting, citing drugs and Dolly the sheep, as examples. “The animals, objects and new creations are all patented,” he said. “

Professor Trew said “there is discussion now about] some hybrid, so in the new technology arenas of patenting software and biotech invention, we could have a

short term [patent]. 20 years is a long time to exercise a monopoly. [Some people have said], ‘Let’s have a five year patent; you are bound to recover all of your money in that time, and then let’s release this information for the benefit of the public.’ ”

“The purpose of patents,” he clarified, “was, historically, to [not only] control and to access the fruits of your invention, but also to encourage others to produce new and better things in the future.” He added, “The founding fathers of this country would never have had any concept of patenting life-forms.” He concluded, “The public interest in preventing someone from owning life is ignored here.”

Professor Trew then spoke of the convention on Human Rights and Biomedicine, which was passed in 1998 by the Council of Europe, following the U.N. convention in this area. He then asked, “Why would we want to have a new Human Rights declaration? There was one in 1948, followed by the 1950 European Convention on Human Rights in Europe. So why do Europeans want to reinvent the human rights wheel, and why does the United Nations [want to] reinvent its original declaration?”

Professor Trew explained. “The simple assumption that Europe is proceeding on is that this whole business of commodifying people,

treating human beings as no more than an object, is wrong,” he said. “This is a reaction to the idea that by unlocking the secrets of the building blocks of nature through DNA, through the human genome project, the frontiers of medicine have become some sort of playthings for international business to be owned by use of the patent system.”

“It’s time to reassert rights over our humanity,” he said. “The big shift in Europe is to start reasserting the absolute, nonnegotiable right to the integrity of the human being. Not the body, not the soul, the whole thing.” He continued, “It does suggest that autonomy isn’t enough. Bioethics in the United States is driven by a very strong sense of autonomy, which is fine. What the European model is suggesting is that because autonomy ultimately leads to the idea that you own yourself, it has all sorts of bad implications.”

He then brought back around the issues of regulation. “Is there a regulatory line you can draw? For example, in assisted reproduction, is there a difference between a medical infertility treatment, which would be assisted reproduction at its best, enabling a couple to fulfill a procreative expectation, and somebody walking into an assisted reproduction center and saying, ‘I am single and I want to have a baby. Can I just buy myself a baby?’ Is that the point where one should draw the line?”

*continued on page 6*

## Regulating

*continued from page 6*

he asked.

“Equally, there is a movement towards accepting posthumous reproduction. A person is on life support and [their spouse] comes in and asks to take gametes from that person before he or she dies so the survivor “can complete my procreative purpose in life,” he noted. “It has happened in Britain in the Diane Blood case where a woman asked urologists to retrieve sperm from her comatose, dying husband. The legal approach in Britain, from the courts perspective is to say ‘where does it say you can do this?’ One looks in the assisted

reproductive statute, the Human Fertilization and Embryology Act of 1990. It says you have to have written consent from each partner before you can retrieve gametes for the purpose of assisted reproduction. The man in this case is unconscious; he is unable to give consent. But the court asks, ‘what is the legalistic regulatory response?’ There was no discussion, whatsoever, of any significant ethics or principles in this case,” he informed the group.

“There is a different perspective in America,” he noted. “In America, legal regulations are lacking in the biotech arena. The Supreme Court is ethics controller, [that is], if other regulatory

agencies don’t come up with the right sort of answers. I am not saying that Britain or Europe has a better way of regulating, I am saying that perhaps the U.S.. Constitution is not adequate to deal with these things.”

He wondered, “Is the Constitution really capable of dealing with the 21st century power to manipulate human life, to rearrange people and animals?” Professor Trew ended by saying, “We are playing with the building blocks of nature. If we don’t have clear ethics and a clear method of asking the questions and involving the public, then I think we are in real trouble.” ❖

## Porn on Campus: What are the Issues?

On February 22, 1999, a discussion sponsored by the Office of Student Affairs and the CWRU Share the Vision Committee, gathered students, faculty and staff to discuss the idea of an “adult film” being shown on campus at the end of the semester. Bob Lawry, the Director of the Center for Professional Ethics and Professor of Law, served as the moderator

on the panel, which consisted of Amanda Booher, Association of Women Students; Clare Dibble, CWRU Film Society; Professor Louis Giannetti, English Department; Professor Beth McGee, Theater Department and Center for Professional Ethics Fellow; Professor Angela Woollacott, History Department; Richard Zdanis, University Provost.

The panel and audience was comprised of various people, some for the showing of the film, some against the showing of the film, and some remaining neutral. The talk moved quickly, and centered almost immediately on freedom of speech by those comfortable with CWRU Film

Society showing the film, and, on the side of those against the CWRU Film Society showing the film, sexism and creating a hostile environment for women.

Various panel members stated their cases, and most presented, along with their opinions, details, facts and statistics.

The discussion opened with Professor Giannetti explaining the history of the CWRU Film Society which was established in 1970. At that time, CWRU had various film groups, including one group of students who gathered to watch “dirty movies.” Due to the high number of members in these separate groups the atmosphere was chaotic and out of control; so the groups were

consolidated, and out that consolidation the CWRU Film Society was born.

Eventually, because of various factors, the “porno film” was designated for the last week each semester. Giannetti added, “Just to let you know, one porno paid for as much as 50% of [the years costs]. They were immensely popular.” He explained that the pornographic movies were dropped from the CWRU Film schedule, not because of ethics or morality, “but because of technology” -- most of the pornographic movies had moved to video.

Clare Dibble explained that CWRU Film Society is a volunteer society which “anyone can join,” and is comprised of CWRU students. The decision to show “a porno” on the part of the Film Society occurred because there had been over 30 requests for [a pornographic movie]. *The Devil in Miss Jones* is the film that will be shown. A CWRU Film Society member from the audience said that he had done research of other university Film Societies via the web, and all but one showed a pornographic film, if not once a week, than at least once a month.

Professor Giannetti explained that there had been controversy with other movies shown on the CWRU campus in the past, including religious films, and films

that could be construed as racist. Professor Woollacott shared that this semester, at CWRU, there are 59% males and 41% females, which successfully supported her assertion that the female voice is a minority voice on the CWRU campus. After presenting her facts, she addressed the freedom of speech issue. “I suggest that this is not an issue of individual free speech. Any student on this campus can watch whatever they chose to, in the privacy of their own homes or residence halls. Nor is it an issue of academic freedom...or a question of some sort of censorship on the basis of morality,” said Professor Woollacott. “It is an issue that the message the university is sending to the CWRU community...and the world that this is an appropriate form of recreation.”

To this, Professor McGee added by reading part the CWRU sexual harassment policy which defined sexual harassment as “creating an intimidating, hostile or offensive work or educational environment.”

She explained that she thought that this choice was made without thinking. “Most of the professors on this campus are men, most of the decisions made on this campus are made by men -- it’s a male point of view that permeates many of things that go on on this campus. It’s not a hostile point of view, it’s a point of view that’s not thinking about women’s issues,” she continued.

Clare Dibble disagreed by saying, “Women were involved in this decision. I am a female, I have very female issues. I also like pornography. I will go to this movie and view it with my boyfriend. Who are you to tell me that I can’t?” she said. She explained that the movie that was being shown [*The Devil in Miss Jones*], was being in shown in the spirit that most revivals are shown in: the chance to see, in effect, a film not readily available on the big screen.

One female audience member explained that she felt that “a porno” being shown would not add to her feeling unsafe on campus -- she explained that she feels unsafe on campus anyway, regardless of what movie is being shown. Another female audience said, if there was, indeed, even one, single woman harmed in the making of a pornographic film, that we [as a campus] should not support the adult film industry.

Near the end, Professor Giannetti mentioned that groups that had protested other films have picketed or left leaflets outside the theater.

At the end of the discussion, Bob Lawry congratulated everyone for sticking to the issues, and listening to each other with civility and respect. ❖

In his 1985 book, Amusing Ourselves to Death, Neil Postman claims that television has transformed the way we understand and react to the world. Postman believes that we have become the society of Brave New World, infantile, narcissistic, in a constant rush to feel good and be entertained. Although Postman's vision may be exaggerated, there are curious signs that he is dead-on right. The moral implications, if he is correct, are crystal clear.

Recently, after careful investigation and verification, Minnesota's second-largest newspaper blew the whistle on a systematic academic cheating practice involving the state university's basketball team. When four players were suspended prior to the first NCAA tournament game, the editor of the paper was inundated with nasty letters. Not only were epithets like "toilet-sniffing journalism," tossed about, but the newly-elected governor Jesse Ventura jumped into the fray. Remembering, no doubt, his roots as a professional wrestler, the governor damned the editor for taking away "the pleasure of these young people who worked so hard to get to that tournament," and for somehow trying "to spoil it for them." Maybe I missed the governor's point. Maybe this nefarious newspaper story robbed the Minnesota basketball fan of the pleasure of being entertained by

these less-than-scholarly athletes.

I wish I could report that the tale told above was simply an anomalous story from Lake Wobegon. It is not. On the first day of the recent NATO bombings in Yugoslavia, The New York Times featured an article on a number of highly incensed television watchers. Seems their favorite sitcoms were being interrupted by "stuff about Kosovo." They did not know where Kosovo was, nor did they care. They just wanted their "shows" returned intact. Aldous Huxley warned we could become a trivial culture -- "preoccupied," as Postman puts it, "with some equivalent of the feelies, the orgy porgy, and the centrifugal bumblepuppy."

Actually, and perhaps surprisingly, Postman is not much concerned with what he dismissively refers to as "junk." To quote him: "I raise no objection to television's junk. The best things on television are its junk, and no one and nothing is seriously threatened by it. Besides, we do not measure a culture by its output of undisguised trivialities, but by what it claims significant." I think he is wrong here, but his concern is larger than mere content. It is the medium itself and what it has done to our ways of knowing and responding to the world. It is television's epistemology and the "peek-a-boo" way it captures the world that scares all hell out of Professor Postman. Look at how he dissects the effects of those omnipresent twenty second or

thirty second commercials. First, he astutely asserts the commercial is not about the product advertised, but about the consumer -- "the character of the consumers as products." He goes on to say that commercials ask us to believe that "all problems are solvable, that they are solvable fast, and that they are solvable through the interventions of technology, techniques and chemistry." He concludes with a critique of the way commercials have transformed politics. "For example," he says, "a person who has seen one million television commercials" -- meaning all of us -- "might well believe that all political problems have fast solutions through simple measures -- or ought to. Or that complex language is not to be trusted, and that all problems lend themselves to theatrical expression. Or that argument is in bad taste, and leads only to an intolerable uncertainty."

When the country was so divided over the affair Lewinsky and so united over our bombing attacks on evil Iraq, I was a mite uncomfortable. Now, here we are bombing again, without much deliberative discussion; and need I remind you how powerful the night bombing of several buildings in downtown Belgrade looks on T.V. Or how surgical bombing and air sorties project image over thoughtfulness. Or how tired and annoyed we already are that it is not yet over. If those politicians and military people mass with baseball season, they are clearly going to be in for it. But it's going to be OK, I am sure. We can always just change the channel. ❖

# CWRU Says Good-bye to Tom Murray... With a Smile

Tom Murray, ethics fellow and director of the Center for Biomedical Ethics since 1987, has accepted the position of president of the Hastings Center in Garrison, New York. The Center for Biomedical Ethics threw a "going away party/roast" on Wednesday, January 27, 1999, from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 pm at Thwing Center in the 1914 Lounge.

"Individuals from the University community as well as those with whom Tom had worked with outside of the community were invited. There was a steady stream of people who came through the reception to wish him well, many bringing gifts and remembrances for Tom and his wife, Cynthia," said Carol Ardine, editor of CenterViews, the Center for Biomedical Ethics newsletter.

According to Eric Juengst, Associate Professor of Biomedical Ethics and Tom's co-worker, "Tom's leadership was characterized by a light touch and a great sense of humour; both quite necessary to trying to guide a group as unruly as the Center for Biomedical Ethics faculty."

Professor Juengst added, "He managed to shield his faculty from much of the anxiety that goes with keeping an academic center

afloat, and let us act on the assumption that if our ambitions were exciting, the resources would be there to support them. That was very clever, because the enthusiasm it generated usually worked to distract us from the fact that he then quietly delegated the task of raising those resources

**"Tom's leadership was characterized by a light touch and a great sense of humour....."**

**--- Eric Juengst**

back to us!"

Finally, he added, "We will miss Tom terribly at the Center, once it finally sinks in that he is not just off on another extended speaking tour of exotic locations. As Stuart Youngner reported at Tom's goodbye party, when Tom's decision to leave CWRU for the Hastings Center was announced to the faculty last fall, one of our immediate reactions was, 'Oh, is he back?' "

The party itself was emblematic of Tom's good humor, as the "psuedo" theme dealt with "Toasting and Roasting" Tom. At 6:00 p.m., Eric Juengst began the roast. He explained a few of the

good-bye jokes Biomedical Ethics had in store for Tom.

"For example," Professor Juengst said, "to replace Tom's endowed chair with something he could take with him to sit on at the Hastings Center, we awarded him the 'Art Modell Ejection Seat of Bioethics' -- a spring-loaded captain's chair designed for people who jump ship at the least enticement. To remind him of the good life he is leaving behind, we gave him a large chunk of rust, hand-quarried from the infrastructure of a local parking garage, and to remind us of the national fame that attracted the

Hastings Center to Tom, Max Mehlman showed us the results of his world-wide-web search for Tom's name, which, unfortunately, only yielded a certain 'Tom Murray's Wolf Den' site."

On a more serious note, the Center for Professional Ethics Director, Bob Lawry said, "Tom Murray did an incredible job building the the Center for Biomedical Ethics into a model of its kind. And he did so with warmth, intelligence and style.

Tom Murray will be missed by a wide array of the CWRU community. We here at CPE wish him well. ❖

### INTERNET

#### Electronic Moral Dialogue

The Center for Ethics Capital Markets and Political Economy of Charlottesville Virginia, a new member of APPE, has developed an operational prototype for an Internet based electronic dialogue on issues in practical ethics. The working title is **The New Dialogue.**

The World Wide Web is an excellent vehicle for sustained, connected moral discourse. The medium is accessible to a broad and diverse audience and, with interactivity, represents an unparalleled opportunity to hear and keep track of ethical viewpoints. The initial content includes, as a

conversation starter, the edited text of a three day retreat on "the moral crisis" held among ethicists, philosophers, theologians and professionals in law, medicine and economics. Among other features, the site allows visitors to add comments to the dialogue and to access an archive of commentary and subjects discussed. Please visit the site and give us your comments. **The address for the Center homepage is:**

[www.iath.virginia.edu/cecmpc](http://www.iath.virginia.edu/cecmpc).

### PUBLICATIONS

Oregon State University, announces a special issue of its **Reflections** newsletter that is devoted to ethical questions in academic life.

**"Academic Ethics: Case Studies from University Life"** is comprised of 11 situations of ethical questions that arise between faculty, students, and administrators, accompanied by short commentaries. The scenarios, which focus on issues of academic freedom, integrity and deception, professional relationships, and moral complicity include: Should an outstanding student deliberately miss questions on a final exam in order to help out the class curve? How should students and faculty respond when offensive or bigoted comments arise in classroom discussion? Can faculty be advocates for political issues? Should a student accept an internship that involves activities that may compromise her ethical values?

# NEWS AND NOTES

**SPRING / SUMMER 1999**

If you would like to receive a copy of this newsletter at no cost, please contact Sandra Shockley at: [PESE@orst.edu](mailto:PESE@orst.edu) or 541-737-5648.

## SUBMISSIONS

The *International Scope Review*, a global, interdisciplinary, and cross-cultural electronic journal is seeking submissions for a special issue on "The Erosion of the Social Link in Advanced Societies." They are particularly seeking a communitarian approach to the increasing demand for psychologists and psychological support.

Send submissions and/or inquiries via e-mail to Professor Legall at [Legall@criuc.unicaen.fr](mailto:Legall@criuc.unicaen.fr).

If you would like to visit the journal, please go to: [www.internationalscope.com](http://www.internationalscope.com).

## SEMINARS

**7th Annual Summer Seminar at Hiram College**

### **TALKING OURSELVES TO DEATH: NARRATIVES AND CAREGIVING AT THE END OF LIFE JUNE 22-27, 1999**

The Center for Literature, Medicine, and the Health Care Professions, a collaborative project of Hiram College and Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine, announces its seventh annual summer seminar. The seminar seeks to collaboratively convert theory, text, story and experience into teaching

materials for use in the classroom and clinical setting. Seminar Coordinators: Carol Donley and Martin Kohn. Faculty Leaders: Sandra Bertman, Thomas R. Cole, Jack Coulehan, Cortney Davis, Amy Haddad, Kenn McLaughlin, Anna Romer, and Marian Secundy. Cost for the seminar, including tuition, resource materials, and room and board is \$900. Make checks payable to: **Ctr. Lit & Med/Hiram College. Contact the Center for Literature, Medicine, and the Health Care Professions, Hiram College, Hiram, OH 44234. Telephone -- 330-569-5380, fax -- 330-569-5449 or e-mail: [donleycc@hiram.edu](mailto:donleycc@hiram.edu) or [mfk@neoucom.edu](mailto:mfk@neoucom.edu).**



**C**ENTER FOR **P**ROFESSIONAL **E**THICS  
at Case Western Reserve University

10900 Euclid Avenue  
233 Yost Hall  
CWRU  
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7057

**MEMBERSHIP**  
**CENTER FOR PROFESSIONAL ETHICS**

NAME\_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS\_\_\_\_\_

CITY\_\_\_\_\_STATE\_\_\_\_\_ZIP\_\_\_\_\_

PHONE\_\_\_\_\_ SCHOOL\_\_\_\_\_

**SEND TO:**

Center for Professional Ethics  
233 Yost Hall  
CWRU  
10900 Euclid Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7057

**Membership:**  
**GENERAL \$25.00**  
**STUDENT \$5.00**