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Translational Ethics at the Center

Much as translational research attempts to connect the laboratory scientist’s work to its implications for patient care, translational ethics focuses on bringing ethical scholarship into the sphere of personal and public action. This Ethics News and Views issue describes some of the ways that the faculty, staff and programs of the Center are currently involved in translating ethics in our teaching, research, scholarship, and community involvement.

The University has made a commitment to sustainable environmental, economic and social development in its strategic planning process. As we explore the ethics of sustainability, the Center welcomes physicist and sustainability advocate Dr. Vandana Shiva during an October 16-18 focus on sustainable development (pages 4 & 7). On October 16, prior to Dr. Shiva’s visit, we will show The Corporation – a controversial and Sundance award-winning film that details the development and power of corporations (page 12).

Exploring the persona of the workplace further, this issue also features an interview with our colleague in the Goizueta School of Business, Dr. Monica Worline, whose research focuses on courage and compassion in the workplace (page 5). She sketches some of the ways in which these moral values are translated in everyday life.

A successful, interdisciplinary Faculty Ethics Seminar this May complemented the Center’s other efforts to explore the nature of the “ethically engaged university.” A brief summary of major themes and challenges emerging from the seminar is given on page 13. The Center looks forward to hosting faculty luncheons in the coming year that will continue this exploration.

Also this summer, nine undergraduate students served as Ethics and Servant Leadership (EASL) interns in a variety of community settings. EASL internships provide an in-depth opportunity for the intern to reflect upon the ethical dimensions of an ethically-committed organization and upon their own role and moral agency. An article on page 11 describes the year-long EASL Forum in which 20 students participate in weekly sessions throughout the academic year.

Beyond the translational ethics commitments highlighted in this issue, Center faculty and staff are also:

- conducting funded research on patient safety and the hospital discharge process;
- researching and teaching human rights, including overseeing summer intern placements at CARE and at the Dekalb County Center for Torture and Trauma Survivors;
- drafting ethical guidelines with the CDC for use during possible flu pandemics;
- drafting, with a rich cross-section of interested parties, new advance directive legislation for Georgia that would combine the living will and durable power of attorney for health care in order to make these documents clearer to clinicians and loved ones;
- partnering with faculty and leadership at the School of Medicine on integrating ethics into the newly evolving undergraduate medical curriculum;
- and serving as workshop leaders and invited speakers at major conferences.

Over the last few months, the Center is grateful to have had a gifted, interdisciplinary committee further the University’s search for a Center Director. Candidate visits are now scheduled for late August and September and we anticipate introducing these candidates to as many as possible in the Emory community.

We hope that you will continue to be an active participant in the work of the Center, and will join us for events as we welcome the new academic year (page 15).
Be democratic: Eat local

by Paul Ficklin-Alred

Under the sponsorship of the Center for Ethics, noted physicist, author, and global justice advocate Dr. Vandana Shiva will speak at Emory on October 17th, 2006 at 7:00 pm in the Winship Ballroom. The title of her talk is Creating Food Democracy. Dr. Shiva is an internationally renowned speaker on issues around democracy, sustainable agriculture, women’s health and spirituality, nutrition, and corporate piracy.

“Food democracy,” Dr. Shiva writes, “is being evolved from the local to the global level. Food democracy and food sovereignty addresses all the dimensions of the crisis. By taking back control over our food systems, we can produce more food while using fewer resources, improve farmers’ incomes and strengthen their livelihoods, while solving the problem of hunger and obesity.”

Dr. Shiva is the founder of several initiatives that combine her training in science and her passion for advocacy: the Research Foundation for Science, Technology and Ecology, which addresses pressing ecological and social issues; Navdanya, a movement dedicated to protecting biodiversity; and Diverse Women for Diversity, a collective of women working on issues related to food, agriculture, patents, and biotechnology.

Dr. Shiva received her Ph.D. from the University of Western Ontario, and has been a visiting professor and lecturer at universities in India, Norway, Sweden, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

Her awards include the Order of the Golden Ark, the Earth Day International Award, and the Right Livelihood Award, also known as the Alternative Nobel Prize.

She was recognized by Asia Week Magazine as one of the five most powerful persons in Asia. Dr. Shiva is an adviser to governments and NGOs in her multiple areas of expertise, and is a leader of the International Forum on Globalization.

In a 2003 interview with Bill Moyers on the PBS series NOW, Dr. Shiva shared her perspective on globalization:

“I talk about Earth’s democracy, about all of us being citizens on the planet. And we need a globalization that is based on countries making their decisions, communities making their decisions. The current globalization is trying to build a roof by eating out the foundations. And there is panic because it’s a false building. It’s a building that’s going to crumble . . . I think what we really need is bringing back community, bringing back commons as the next step of humanity across the world. Not just in India. Also in the United States, also in England. And that will be a peaceful world.”

She is the author of over 300 papers in prominent scientific journals, and her books include Water Wars, Biopiracy: The Plunder of Nature and Knowledge, Staying Alive: Women, Ecology and Survival in India, and most recently, Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability, and Peace. See page 7 for a review of her latest book.

Dr. Shiva was also featured in the critically acclaimed documentary The Corporation. See page 12 to find out when and where we will be showing this entertainingly provocative film at Emory.
In your research, you talk about courage and compassion in the workplace and have described organizations as “sites of life.” In this interview, I’d like to discuss how moral imagination informs your research and what part you see sustainability playing in corporate life.

Let’s begin with why you focus on emotions and values in your research on organizations? We’ve lived for far too long with the myth that emotions should stay outside of the door of organizations and businesses. Human beings don’t work that way. It’s much better when you recognize that emotion has a place in human behavior and a place in the way business happens and is conducted. Then you try to understand how emotions work and impact people. Emotions don’t have to be dangerous, misleading things. Treated wisely, they can become guides for action.

How did you create your rather unique research focus on emotions and values? Before I did my Ph.D., I worked in Silicon Valley and started an organization with three friends that grew to about thirty-five people in a year-and-a-half. I had this idea that, because I’d worked in all these places and had so many bad jobs, it was now my turn to be in charge and to make a great place for people to work. It turned out to be harder than I had ever imagined to create a great place for people to work! The easiest things were the technical things: the financing, putting together an infrastructure for the organization, putting technology in place, setting up systems, etc. The hard part was creating actual incentives.

It turned out to be harder than I had ever imagined to create a great place for people to work! The easiest things were the technical things: the financing, putting together an infrastructure for the organization, putting technology in place, setting up systems, etc. The hard part was creating actual incentives.

How do you help build collaboration when people are highly creative and they’re going to disagree about things and you want them to disagree productively? How do you keep the great people that you hire? How do you create opportunities for them to grow and make sure that they are challenged?

In our field, it wasn’t about making sure that people were challenged. Instead, we were asking: how do you get people to stop and take a break? How do you make sure they stay healthy and take care of themselves? What happens to people when they work at such a stretched pace over long periods of time? In high-pressure, fast-paced organizations, how do you create a sustainable work life?

So I studied courage for my dissertation and compassion with some collaborators. I wanted a window into understanding when organizations are working at their best or when people are operating in a very fundamentally human way.

Have your ideas percolated from psychology into the business community? Can they be applied in a business setting? This is a very interesting time to be studying organizations and business. The study and understanding of economics from the social scientific perspective has changed the way businesses operate, the way leaders think about things, the foundations of the way decisions are made. And now economics is changing. The whole field of behavioral economics has really influenced psychology.

Business has the benefit of all this knowledge that has accrued from an economic lens. But people are discovering now that solely economic lenses become misleading at a certain point, and that decisions made on solely economic grounds are not always the best decisions. So businesses are becoming more open to and interested in other ways of thinking.

continued on next page...
Now is a time of opportunity for organizational psychologists, who can show that courage or conversational techniques actually have value and build a capability in organizations that’s very important.

**Do you think that’s because psychology, like economics, is a social science, and so they have that language in common?**

If you read the popular business press or the Harvard law review for the last few years, they are adding to their economically-focused articles and emphases. They’re adding things about high-quality leadership, how to retain employees in ways other than through economic means, how to build an organizational culture that helps people be productive, how to help people thrive in their work.

I think right now that there is a window of opportunity to talk to business people about values in an organization, to open up a dialogue about how and why those are important.

Goizueta seems to be very focused on principled leadership. I think that Emory University, as a whole, has an emphasis on ethics that is very refreshing and the business school shares that emphasis. Our tagline is “Principled Leaders for Global Enterprise.”

We have a brand new course called “Principled Leadership”, where students can spend a semester unpacking what that means. They can really ponder these questions: What principles? Whose principles? How do they fit with my own principles?

**Did you perceive that ethical emphasis when you first arrived at Emory?**

It is palpable in the community of people that are here: you can really become known and be fairly authentic here. People are embraced and taken care of here in a way that’s very important. This grows out of an emphasis on treating one another well, being conscious of values, and emphasizing the specific values of diversity, humanity, team-building and collaboration.

**How do you think that your research about courage and compassion in the workplace could apply to Emory?**

I’m very curious about how an organization adopts a value like courageous inquiry, one of the values that Emory has adopted in its strategic plan. How does it put that value to work in the everyday activities of the organization’s members? That is the fundamental question that I am asking in my research all the time.

When an organization (in this case, the University) espouses something like courageous inquiry, it becomes all the more important for the leaders of that organization, people in prominent positions, and people who speak to the public, to really act in a way that they feel is in line with those values. To try to make the lived, everyday experience of the organization match the rhetoric.

**Did you work on courage or compassion first as your research topic, and are you working with different groups of people around each topic?**

I started the work on compassion slightly before working on courage. The research on compassion is with a group of people from Emory University, the University of Michigan, and the University of British Columbia who are really interested in trying to unearth some of the stories of undocumented things that happen in organizations. Compassion, it turns out, is one such phenomenon. You can find a description of our group at www.compassionlab.com.

In our first project, we studied staff members at four different universities in four different parts of the US. We interviewed staff members and asked them about their experiences of compassion or of non-compassion at work.

We discovered that there is a kind of care-taking and flexibility that gets created between people when something comes up in someone’s life, and that it’s mostly invisible to the rest of the organization. For example, there might be a death in the family and coworkers may deliver food, send flowers, attend a memorial service, or cover work to give the person extra time off.

There are a lot of what might seem like very small gestures that happen in the workplace that are spontaneously compassionate. These gestures of compassion create a kind of flexibility in the organization that allows people to experience and recover from pain. When people experience compassion in their workplace, they tend to be much more committed to the organization, have a much lower intention to leave, and be more willing to help and to cooperate with other people.

We’ve also done some case studies, one of which appeared in the March issue of *Administrative Science Quarterly*. We try to build a theory about what happens when compassion becomes more than just a gesture between you and me. What, in the organization, is allowing for people to accommodate another’s pain?

We propose that there is a unique combination of values, routines, and intra-organizational networks that creates various kinds of interpersonal and psychological resources for people to draw on to spontaneously generate care for others.

**You’ve also done similar research on courage in the workplace?**

I first interviewed university students in order to uncover the culturally transmitted notions of courage. After that, I did lots of interviews about the idea of courage and whether it exists within organizations.

One of the largest projects that I have done so far involved using an open-ended questionnaire format to ask about 650 people in high technology companies if they had ever experienced courage in their workplace. The study is based on the narratives that people offered in response to that question and the follow-up questions.

**Why high technology? Because you worked in Silicon Valley?**

...continued on page 10
Motivated Reasoning Seminar

by John Banja

On October 26, we will be having one of our monthly clinical ethics seminars. This seminar will be entitled "Motivated Reasoning: Its Challenge to Moral Decision Making."

What is “motivated reasoning”?

“Motivated reasoning” occurs when the premises of an argument are selected in order to arrive at a particular conclusion, usually the one favored by the arguer. In effect, motivated reasoning is reasoning in reverse: I already “know” the conclusion I wish to reach, so I shall only select or give credibility to evidence that supports the conclusion.

While this may sound like no “reasoning” at all, neuroscientists are increasingly showing that beliefs (in contrast to factually or logically confirmable knowledge) can be highly affectively charged such that one often selects one’s beliefs on the basis of the affective state the belief affords. Indeed, research has shown that the more a particular belief is a matter of concern to an individual, the more the belief and the believer will resist contrary evidence.

It may well be the case that philosophers—even the “great ones”—were not immune to this phenomenon. This discussion will explore the implications of motivated reasoning in ethical reflection and theorizing.

Book Review

by Kate O’Dwyer Randall

In her most recent book, Earth Democracy, Dr. Vandana Shiva proves her earned reputation as an esteemed environmental leader, progressive thinker, advocate for local community, and a friend to the lay environmentalist.

She begins her book comparing current issues of intellectual property and patenting rights to the process of colonization. Namely, she warns against allowing entities with wealth from owning or buying resources that traditionally have been communal (seeds, water, plants). She argues that corporations must not be allowed to privatize natural resources and makes an intriguing case for communities to have more control over their local resources.

At the heart of her arguments is a call for all people to share the natural resources of the earth, to allow local people control over the selling and growing of local products, and to be critical of the assumption that globalization is a sustainable option for food production.

Writer Frederick Malvine claims that Shiva “connects the insecurity wrought by globalization with the ideologies of extremism and cultural nationalism that fuels war and terrorism” in Earth Democracy.

For Shiva, globalization discounts local sensibilities and produces human suffering. Local food networks, on the other hand, produce both human justice and sustainability for the earth.

Shiva writes like a poet and scientist, and does so in a way which everyone—including the non-scientist—can follow. She offers a rich critique of how the trend toward globalization contains values that are dangerous to the specific realm of food production. She claims that corporate ecology demands thoughtful planning. She speaks as a hopeful enthusiast for normal citizens and consumers who want to affect how the world manages these issues.

Earth Democracy is a must-read for any green reader or neophyte to the green movement. It is well thought-out, organized, and a perfect balance of science, sociology and anthropology. I anxiously await her next book.
I had some work to do, and an office with no window. I convinced my boss it would be a productive choice for the impending deadline if I took off for the corner coffee house to write. There, I hoped I would find inspiration in the cacophony of sounds and colors, people and objects. Ambient sounds turned muse.

It was crowded. Others in the city needed inspiration, too.

I ordered a cold green tea, paid too much for it and set up shop. My computer plugged in, my journal open, my cell phone off. Ritual started, deep breath – and – write.

She came in, sat right next to me and opened her laptop. I was mildly annoyed at her proximity, glanced up quickly and noted that this seat was her only option. I scooted left creating an inch more space for her.

She pulled a power cord from her bag with one hand, and began groping for an outlet under the bar to plug in with the other. Clumsy and harried, her hand knocked my plug out of the wall. My screen went black. She looked up.

“Wow – I figured you had a battery pack. Sorry.”

I nodded, squeezed out a polite grimace and shut my computer. Archaic pen and paper would be my tools today – I was too annoyed to reboot.

Within moments, her cell phone rang. “Yep – I’m here”, she said. “Let me pull it up and we’ll get started.”

Her office and her work for the afternoon were going to be done here, at the end of my elbow.

In choosing to move to a public space to write, I’d been hoping for an afternoon of “good noise”: mugs being washed, people chatting softly, a good jazz CD in the background. Coffee shop noise. Public noise. Not loud conference call, work space moved in next door noise.

A choice was upon me.

I could leave. I could translate my annoyance and confusion to the journal pages that lay before me wanting. Or, I could become a sociologist and watch as the next few hours unfolded. I chose the third option.

For the next sixty minutes she managed the intricacies of a three-way conference call, emailed statistics through her Blackberry, crafted a report on her laptop, cracked jokes with her colleagues, talked about problems in the office and drank two lattes.

Her voice ran through the coffee shop, over the noise I’d been hoping for, and over my very last nerve.

At the end of the call, she packed up her computer, answered her phone again, and walked out of the coffee shop still talking. She was on her way across town for a yoga class, and trying to get there before 4:20.

The door closed. A few customers shifted in their seats. One fiddled with his iPod.

I kept observing. What just happened here, I wondered?

For the past hour, this woman had operated freely in a shared space without consideration...
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I chose high technology because I wanted to investigate a place in our knowledge- and service-based economy where people were doing pretty typical kinds of work for the U.S. labor market, a place where the idea of courage is not something that would necessarily have been part of their everyday life.

In these typical kinds of jobs for today’s economy, I wanted to know if the word courage means anything. If you’re not studying soldiers or firefighters, what does courage look like? Would people be able to think of stories? If so, what kinds of stories would they tell? What would it look like?

**Did the results surprise you?**

Some of it was surprising. The first kind of surprise is that, even for people sitting at their computer typing away like you and me, they can think of something that qualifies in their minds as courage in the workplace. Only about two percent of my sample said that, no, they had never experienced courage at work. Another surprising thing is that more than 80% of the people tell stories that are about someone else and not about themselves.

**Why did you find this so surprising?**

It’s a surprise to psychologists, who tend to be very self-focused. In the world of psychology, we often lose our perspective on how influential other people are. Psychologists tend to study only what happens inside a person and what a person thinks about herself.

One way of explaining why the vast majority of stories are about other people is social desirability. That is, you know the right thing to do in this situation: a desirable thing to do is to talk about someone ELSE. You know that the interview is not a natural kind of task and so you’re going to try to give the interviewer what they want, to present yourself in the most socially acceptable way that you can.

That is part of the explanation. But, the more that I thought about these stories, the more I came to believe that courage in an organizational or work setting is not really a very individual thing. Since there’s always one actor who stands out in these patterns, it’s easy to say that that person is courageous. But **courage is a pattern of social interaction**.

Over and over again, no matter how the theme of the story changes (reporting sexual harassment, someone protecting a group from being laid off, someone persevering on a project that seems doomed, or someone admitting a mistake), the same pattern appears.

In this pattern, there is always some kind of threat to the collective – either to the group of people or to the project that they are gathered together to do. Someone, often multiple people, feel and recognize that duress. But one person who feels that duress has a particular and unique combination of resources – knowledge, the connections within the organization, the outside assets, etc. – that allows that person to act and remedy the duress.

**Did the results surprise you?**

Some of it was surprising. The first kind of surprise is that, even for people sitting at their computer typing away like you and me, they can think of something that qualifies in their minds as courage in the workplace. Only about two percent of my sample said that, no, they had never experienced courage at work. Another surprising thing is that more than 80% of the people tell stories that are about someone else and not about themselves.

**Why did you find this so surprising?**

It’s a surprise to psychologists, who tend to be very self-focused. In the world of psychology, we often lose our perspective on how influential other people are. Psychologists tend to study only what happens inside a person and what a person thinks about herself.

One way of explaining why the vast majority of stories are about other people is social desirability. That is, you know the right thing to do in this situation: a desirable thing to do is to talk about someone ELSE. You know that the interview is not a natural kind of task and so you’re going to try to give the interviewer what they want, to present yourself in the most socially acceptable way that you can.

That is part of the explanation. But, the more that I thought about these stories, the more I came to believe that courage in an organizational or work setting is not really a very individual thing. Since there’s always one actor who stands out in these patterns, it’s easy to say that that person is courageous. But **courage is a pattern of social interaction**.

Over and over again, no matter how the theme of the story changes (reporting sexual harassment, someone protecting a group from being laid off, someone persevering on a project that seems doomed, or someone admitting a mistake), the same pattern appears.

In this pattern, there is always some kind of threat to the collective – either to the group of people or to the project that they are gathered together to do. Someone, often multiple people, feel and recognize that duress. But one person who feels that duress has a particular and unique combination of resources – knowledge, the connections within the organization, the outside assets, etc. – that allows that person to act and remedy the duress.

You can break the stories down into a variety of themes – confronting authority, admitting a mistake, persevering on difficult projects – and you can analyze them thematically. But, no matter what the theme is, it is this pattern, over and over again, that people call courage.

I am picking a fight with a long tradition in philosophy that has thought of courage as something that is firmly lodged in a person, in an individual. Aristotle conceived of courage as a kind of golden mean between reason and action. But you cannot use this conception in these instances, because you don’t know what was going on in the person’s head. But, even without that “inside knowledge,” something still exists that is being called courage. So, if it’s not what is going on inside the head of the actor, then what is it?

I looked across all of these themes, and it is the pattern that appears in every story. That’s what courage is in an organization: it is this pattern, this collective creation.

**I admire how all of your research is both value-centered and practical.**

I like taking these big words, like compassion and courage, and researching them in a way that makes clear how they come alive on a day-to-day basis. It is not some kind of grand heroic notion of courage that I study, it is something more mundane. But it is still very inspiring!

**Your research focuses on ethical values. Are you hoping to convince the business community that these are worthwhile investments? That they have business, as well as human, value?**

In the case of courage, I think that people in positions of authority in organizations can add a lot of fuel to the spontaneous organizing that is already happening in an organization by becoming involved in helping to deliver resources to people in need or by coordinating a compassionate response. They can convey permission for other people in the organization to take care of each other and create flexibility for one another. And, by doing so, they will end up with a staff of employees who are more hard-working, more committed to the organization, and who want to give back.

I think that the more people and businesses recognize the value of compassion – of recognizing suffering and responding to it – the better organizations will be. It will make the organization more profitable by creating positive work relationships, employees who are willing to stay, and employees who are willing to invest more in the organization.

In the case of courage, I don’t believe that organizations should, necessarily, go out there and try to create courageous employees. I think that creating courageous employees is something that we really know nothing about. Especially if you think that courage is a pattern of social interaction, rather than a personal value that can be instilled. These different ways of looking at the value of courage imply different trajectories of action for people and organizations.

continued on next page...
I am advocating a form of courageous leadership that is receptive, rather than one that is more active and initiative taking. I think that people in positions of authority and power need to be listening for and aware of times when employees are exhibiting courage. Leaders need to notice when employees are speaking up against norms, raising issues that are difficult, pushing back against the authority structure in certain kinds of ways, or are articulating an alternative position to something that the organization is doing. If you want to cultivate courageous employees, what you have to do is listen and be aware of moments when people are expressing concern for the collective and when they are giving voice to something that needs to happen in the organization.

That is really useful for Emory, given our focus on courageous inquiry. Yes! Think about what Emory has done by opening up this dialogue and by espousing the value of courageous inquiry. They have made it possible and even acceptable for people to raise really difficult questions. It is a dimension of leadership that is under-articulated right now.

Applications for the Ethics and Servant Leadership (EASL) Forum are due by noon on September 14th. The applicants who are chosen for this program, a mixture of undergraduate and graduate students, will meet for the first time on September 25th and will have their first retreat September 29th - October 1st.

The Forum brings together the twenty selected students in a yearlong collaborative learning experience that includes retreats, skill-building sessions, outside speakers, and student-developed projects. The mission of the Ethics and Servant Leadership (EASL) Forum is to animate, advance and support students as they develop the power to serve and lead for the common good.

Toward that end, we aim to deepen the competence and confidence of students through an experience that:

- Cultivates a sense of shared community among the participants through group and individual exercises
- Provides training that equips students with skills for effective group engagement
- Develops ethical attentiveness and moral imagination
- Challenges students to develop a strong group that utilizes group assets and nurtures individual needs for growth
- Promotes a culture that supports open dialogue and risk-taking
- Integrates multiple learning styles and educational elements in order to engage the whole individual.
by Adelle Frank

On October 16th, 2006 at 7:00pm, the Center for Ethics is sponsoring a showing of The Corporation – a witty, provocative documentary that asks, “If corporations are legal persons, then what kind of people are they?” Interviewees for the film include Ray Anderson – Interface, Inc.’s founder and environmental business convert – and Dr. Vandana Shiva – renowned Indian physicist and environmental activist.

One hundred and fifty years ago, the corporation was a relatively insignificant entity. Today, it is a vivid and pervasive presence in all our lives. Like the Church, the Monarchy and the Communist Party in other times and places, the Corporation is today’s dominant institution. But history humbles dominant institutions. All have been crushed, belittled or absorbed into some new order. The corporation is unlikely to be the first to defy history.

This complex, exhaustive and highly entertaining documentary examines the far-reaching repercussions of the corporation’s increasing preeminence.

Based on Dr. Joel Bakan’s book, The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power, the film is a timely, critical inquiry that invites its audience on a graphic and engaging quest to reveal the corporation’s inner workings, curious history, controversial impacts and possible futures.

The Corporation charts the spectacular rise of an institution aimed at achieving specific economic goals as it also recounts victories against this apparently invincible force.

The film’s MTV-style format is engaging and includes a provocatively informative variety of interviewees:

- seven CEOs
- a Nobel-prize winning economist
- the first management guru
- a corporate spy
- a range of academics, critics, historians and thinkers

This documentary has won 25 international awards, including Audience Award at the Sundance Film Festival and Best Documentary at the 2005 Genie Awards. Canadian-produced, The Corporation earned $28,671 on its opening night but, through grassroots advertising, has grossed over $3 million in theatres and has recently released a feature-packed DVD, as well.

We invite you to view this film on October 16th and then to hear Dr. Vandana Shiva, in person, on October 17th. See page 4 for further details on Dr. Shiva’s talk.
Duties & Challenges for an Ethically Engaged University

by John Banja

In a number of its recent publications and announcements, especially its vision statement and strategic planning initiatives, Emory University has repeatedly characterized itself as an “ethically engaged” institution. The Center for Ethics decided that this was the perfect opportunity to explore what ethically engagement means during our annual faculty ethics seminar. Read on to discover the common duties and challenges faced by such a University.

In May of 2006, the Center for Ethics hosted its annual interdisciplinary faculty seminar with “ethical engagement” as its central theme. Attended by more than two dozen University faculty and administrators, the seminar’s participants identified and explored a host of issues related to the implications of the University’s ethical engagement.

Duties

1. Teaching and generating new knowledge, while being attentive to human variation and to the influences of bias.
2. Instilling and modeling the habits of ethical engagement.
3. Practicing engagement with ethically like-minded businesses.
4. Practicing inclusivity, in both the intellectual and practical realms.
5. Protecting the physical and psychological wellbeing of Emory’s citizenry.
6. Giving back to the public in a manner that is fair, compassionate, and regularly reviewed.

Challenges

The fundamental ethical challenge is to discover and convincingly demonstrate a theoretical model or set of grounded and coherent principles that provide rules specifying “right” behavior in specific cases. Failure to do this creates multiple and often conflicting value systems. These challenges are compounded by the fact that Emory has various historical, organizational, or contractual ties with over thirty stakeholder groups.

1. Defining and publicly modeling the University’s moral personality, despite the variation of stakeholder interests.
2. Determining what the University “owes” its constituents.
3. Combining caring and “empathic attention” with the pursuit of truth and knowledge.
4. Managing ethical incoherence and conflict among and across the diverse units of the University, as well as within a particular activity or domain.
5. Balancing cautious prudence and courageous risk.

Check our website for future, more detailed updates on the ethically engaged University — including examples of ethical challenges that Emory has faced, duties at which we have succeeded, and models for furthering our ethical engagement.
...continued from page 8

for others, right? Hadn’t she? Was anyone annoyed but me?

I scanned the room for a bothered face, an annoyed expression. Nothing.

Our contemporary society is one where boundaries between work and leisure are blurry. Cell phones, laptops and Blackberrys allow business to happen in our cars, at our dinner tables, in coffee shops and elevators. Places that used to offer a respite from the office, whether for a few moments or several hours, now hold people talking, “texting”, emailing.

Public spaces, once created for conversations between people, now function as places to host conversations on cell phones or check email. Sounds of the “public” are masked by iPods, and personal soundscapes. One used to smile upon seeing a window reading “Café.” Today those windows host words like “wireless hotspot” to entice consumers.

What does all of this mean for us? How does it shape how we understand public space? Where is the office? Where is a refuge?

As usual, when something leaves me confounded I ask my students for their thoughts and opinions. They are, after all, living in a world of “e” much more than I did at their age, or do now. (My favorite story to tell students is how, in college, I didn’t have email. We talked to people in their offices – to their faces. It always gleaned a great reaction.)

After sharing my story, I asked the following questions:

- What are the rules for sharing public space in regards to cell phones and email?
- What is the etiquette for having private conversations in public spaces?
- Who decided these rules?
- How are they determined?
- What is the recourse if they are broken?

- How does one learn them? (Had I missed some global memo?)
- Is it okay to have an argument on a cell phone in a public space?
- How about a short conversation in which you are confirming a date for later that day?
- Can you chat with a boss?
- Can you call home to your mom?
- Can you check your bank balance?

I received the following as the answer: “It depends.”

According to the “moderns”, A.K.A. my students, “etiquette” was the wrong word, the wrong concept for this series of questions. Rules of public space had nothing to do with being polite, I was told. Instead it was about being productive, “handling your business.” The goal was getting work done, not being an agent of public space.

According to my students, I was entitled to be annoyed that my computer had been unplugged by a mobile-working coffee shop customer, but not by the fact that she held a business meeting twelve inches from my ear drum. She was just getting her work done.

“Would you agree,” I asked “that in our culture there are rules to sharing public space?” They looked at me. “For example, it is rude to spit, talk through a movie, play your music loudly without ear phones, and yell at your dining partner, belch, scream or interrupt a speaker in public, right?”

The resounding answer: “It depends.”

My students’ sensibilities regarding public space, electronics etiquette, and the importance of producing work over polite participation in public space have left me with many more questions for them. I asked if they’d meet at a coffee house to keep talking with me about it. They asked that I set up an e-mail chat room for the conversation instead.

HCECG Events

by Karen Trotochaud

The Health Care Ethics Consortium of Georgia (HCECG) is holding two major events this fall: an ethics committee workshop and a workshop on ethics, religion, and spirituality.

On September 28, HCECG will be holding an Ethics Committee Workshop. This one-day workshop will provide foundational information and interactive explanation about the roles and responsibilities of Ethics Committees and committee members. Content information is interspersed with models and small group discussions that allow for integration of knowledge with skills. Ample opportunity is provided for active attendee participation.

On November 30, HCECG will be holding an Ethics, Religion, and Spirituality Workshop. This workshop will address the impact religion and spirituality have on ethics within the healthcare setting. We will start with a discussion of spiritual assessment and expand our discussion to varying religious perspectives on such views as belief in miracles, the concept of healing and end of life decision making and practices. Participants will be challenged to consider their own spiritual beliefs and as well as those of their patients and families.

See http://www.hcecg.org/ for updates and further details on HCECG events.
September

Sep. 14, 12:00pm  1462 Clifton Rd, Suite 302
EASL Forum Application Deadline
See article on page 11 for more details.

Sep. 25, Time TBA.  Location TBA.
EASL Forum First Meeting
See article on page 11 for more details.

Sep. 28, 4:00pm-5:00pm  Rollins School of Public Health, Rm. 864 (1518 Clifton Road)
Title TBA. (Clinical Ethics Seminar)
Presenter TBA.

Sep. 28, 9:00am-4:00pm.  Medical Ctr. of Central GA (777 Hemlock Street, Macon, GA)
Ethics Committee Workshop
See facing page for more details.

Sep. 29-Oct. 1, All Day  Off-campus location TBA.
EASL Forum Retreat
See article on page 11 for more details.

October

Oct. 16, 7:00pm-9:30pm  Location TBA.
The Corporation (Film Showing)
See page 12 for further details.

Oct. 17, 7:00pm-8:30pm  Winship Ballroom, Dobbs University Center (605 Asbury Circle)
Creating Food Democracy (Keynote Speaker)
See page 4 for further details.

Oct. 26, 4:00pm-5:00pm  Rollins School of Public Health, Rm. 864 (1518 Clifton Road)
Motivated Reasoning: Its Challenge to Moral Decision Making (Clinical Ethics Seminar)
Presented by Dr. John Banja. See page 7 for more details.

November

Nov. 16, 4:00pm-5:00pm  Rollins School of Public Health, Rm. 864 (1518 Clifton Road)
Title TBA. (Clinical Ethics Seminar)
Presenter TBA.

Nov. 30, 9:30am-3:00pm  Southern Regional Health System (Riverdale, GA)
Ethics, Religion, and Spirituality
See facing page for more details.

December

Dec. 21, 4:00pm-5:00pm  Rollins School of Public Health, Rm. 864 (1518 Clifton Road)
Title TBA. (Clinical Ethics Seminar)
Presenter TBA.
Become a Friend of the Center for Ethics!

The generosity of individuals, foundations, and organizations provides the Center for Ethics with vital resources needed to fulfill and expand its mission and service to the University and community.

We invite you to join the Friends of the Center for Ethics gift club or renew your membership for the coming year with your tax-deductible gift.

Student $25
Friend $50
Contributing Member $100
Sustaining Member $250
Patron $500
Director’s Circle $1,000
Ethics Benefactor $10,000+ (cumulative)

Read about the different ways to donate online, by clicking on the "Giving" link at the top of our home page or call Amy Russell at (404) 727-2212.

HTTP://WWW.ETHICS.EMORY.EDU

Center for Ethics
Emory University
1462 Clifton Road NE, Suite 302
Atlanta, GA 30322